

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE DEVELOPMENT  
OF CANBERRA

(Minutes of Evidence)

Taken at Canberra

TUESDAY, 7th DECEMBER, 1954.

PRESENT

The Chairman (Senator McCallum)

Senator Benn	Senator Tangney
Senator Hannaford	Senator Vincent
Senator Ryan	Senator Wood

WILLIAM ALEXANDER McLAREN, Secretary, Department of the Interior, sworn and examined.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Our general purpose is to get an idea of the plan of Canberra and of the departures that have been made from it. If you would give, in your own way, such information as you think necessary, we should be grateful.

MR. McLAREN. - I think perhaps I should begin by saying something about the origin of what is known as the Canberra Plan. The Canberra Plan was obtained as the result of an international competition held in 1911. The competitors were supplied with a topographical map of Canberra. The only notation on the map was the indicated route of the railway that was to run from Yass to Queanbeyan. Apart from that no suggestions about the layout of the plan were made to the competitors. However, certain conditions were set out for the guidance of the competitors. Some of them were embodied in certain Parliamentary papers to which I directed the attention of the Secretary of this Committee some time ago. I shall mention some of the requirements that were placed before the competitors. They are as follows:-

A1.

1.

W.A. McLaren.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

1. Requirements. - The Federal Capital City will be the permanent Seat of Government of the Commonwealth of Australia, the place at which the Federal Parliament will meet, where all Commonwealth legislation will be enacted, and where the Governor-General will have his official residence. The city will, therefore, be primarily the official and social centre of Australia.

2. The special consideration of designers must be given to the allocation of appropriate areas, suitably situated, and embracing sites for the following:-

Houses of Parliament (should be so placed as to become a dominating feature of the city. The building will probably have a frontage of 600 feet and a depth of 200 feet).

Residence of the Governor-General  
Residence of the Prime Minister  
Public Offices as follows:-

The Department of the Prime Minister.  
The Department of External Affairs.  
The Attorney-General's Department.  
The Department of Home Affairs.  
The Department of the Treasury.  
The Department of Trade and Customs.  
The Department of Defence.  
The Postmaster-General's Department.

Courts of Justice.  
Places of Public Worship.  
Mint.  
National Art Gallery and Library.  
State House.  
Printing Office.  
Government Factories.  
University.  
Technical Colleges.  
City Hall.  
General Post Office.  
Museum.  
Central Railway Station.  
Railway Marshalling Yards.  
Military Barracks.  
Criminal and Police Courts.  
Gaol.  
Hospitals.  
National Theatre.  
Central Power Station.  
Gas Works.  
Markets.  
Stadium.  
Parks and Gardens.

3. In addition to the foregoing, areas must be laid out within the city for commercial, residential, and industrial purposes. (It is probable that the manufacture of military equipment and other productions for Commonwealth use will be undertaken within the Territory.)

4. Railway. - The proposed route shown on Contour Plans (b and c of paragraph 6, Invitation to Competitors) while occupying the best position, having regard only to gradients, curves, and cost of construction, is subject to modifications both as regards location and formation-levels in order to minimize the ill effect due to severance, provide the freest access, and secure harmony with the general city Design.

5. Tramways. - Designers should bear in mind the necessity for providing inter-communication between distant parts of the city by means of tramways.

6. Ornamental Water. - Two sites for weirs across the Molonglo River have been examined - one at the rocky bar, almost in line between trigonometrical stations "Sullivan" and "Shale", and the other beyond the Western boundary of map (c of paragraph 6, Invitation to Competitors).

7. The catchment area of the Molonglo River and its tributaries, may be taken as 700 square miles, over which the annual rainfall is approximately 23 inches, and the annual evaporation from extensive areas of water surface may be assumed to be 40 inches.

8. Regulating weirs, at least 14 miles above the city site, will be constructed on the Molonglo and the Queanbeyan Rivers to control flood waters, to equalize the flow of the river, and to maintain a constant level behind any weir within or near the city site. It may be assumed that a flow of not less than 20 cubic feet per second could be maintained at the site during successive years of minimum rainfall.

9. Water Supply. - A water supply for city purposes will be provided on the basis of 100 gallons per capita per diem, which will be delivered by gravitation from a service reservoir at an elevation of about 2,250 feet above sea level, the position of which has been determined. The supply will be available within the city area below the 2,150 feet level.

.....

13. Scientific Observatories. - A site for scientific observatories has been selected at a distance of some 6 miles from the city.

14. Traffic and General. - The contour of the surface and the panoramic value of the city surroundings should influence the designing of the main avenues; the principal means of inter-communication, and the location of the park lands, together with the adornment of the whole.

(continued on page 4)

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

McLaren (speaking) - As you know, the first prize - incidentally, it was £1,750 - was awarded to Walter Burley Griffin, of Chicago, U.S.A. On the 27th June, 1912, the Minister for Home Affairs - who, I believe, at that time was Mr. W. H. Kelly - appointed a Board of Officers of the Department to investigate and report as to the suitability of the designs for adoption for the purposes of the layout of the city. On the 25th November, the Board reported that it was unable to recommend the adoption of any one of the designs and advised approval of the plan of layout prepared by the Board. The Minister approved of the adoption of the design - that is, the Board's design. Instructions were given for the projection of part of the adopted design. On the 20th February, 1913, the Minister for Home Affairs - who at that time, I think, was Mr. King O'Malley - drove the first peg marking the centre line of the main avenue or parkway from the Capitol towards Ainslie, and the axes of the more important avenues were marked on the ground.

On the 10th July, 1913, the Minister for Home Affairs suggested to the Prime Minister that the advice of Professor Mawson, Professor of Town Planning at the University of Liverpool, be sought on alterations of detail, or alternatively, that Mr. Griffin be asked to visit Australia to consult in regard to such modifications of his plan as might, for topographical reasons, be considered necessary. Later in July, Mr. Griffin accepted an invitation to visit Australia for consultation with the Department. After his arrival in August, Mr. Griffin discussed with the Board <sup>the</sup> /premiated design - that was his own - but no conclusions were reached.

On the 15th October, 1913, the Board assembled, under instructions from the Minister, to meet Mr. Griffin and to consider the amended design which Mr. Griffin had submitted for the layout of the city. After examining the sketch design and hearing Mr. Griffin's explanation of the main principles, the Board decided that they were unable to concur with the amended design submitted by Mr. Griffin. At this point, the Minister

B.l. - 4 - W. A. McLaren.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

personally conveyed to the Board his appreciation of the services rendered by them and disbanded the Board.

On the 18th October, 1913, an agreement was entered into between Mr. Joseph Cook, the Minister for Home Affairs, and Mr. Walter Burley Griffin, under which the Minister agreed to engage the services of Mr. Griffin as Federal Capital Director of Design and Construction for a period of three years, with pay at £1,050 a year and travelling allowances, reserving to Mr. Griffin the right to engage in private practice on the understanding that at least a half of his time would be devoted to his duties under the agreement. Mr. Griffin held this position until the end of 1920.

After some period of uncertainty, definite approval for the adoption of the Griffin plan was given by the Minister, Mr. King O'Malley, in November, 1916. From 1916 to 1920, Mr. Griffin carried out a certain amount of formation work on main avenues and roads, but development was generally retarded due to the war. Up to the 31st December, 1920, when his association with Canberra ceased, Mr. Griffin had made progressive minor alterations in the evolution of his design as a result of further study and practical experience in adapting it to the site. Many of the minor alterations and adjustments made by the author were dictated by practical considerations and did not affect any main principle of his design.

After Mr. Griffin's departure, the Government appointed a Federal Capital Advisory Committee, under the Chairmanship of Sir John Sulman, a prominent architect and town planner, to review what had been done and to prepare a detailed scheme for the transfer of the Parliament and Administrative Departments. The Government stipulated that all developments should be on the basis of the acceptance of the plan of Walter Burley Griffin.

In 1924, the Seat of Government (Administration) Act was passed. This act provided for the setting up of a Federal Capital Commission to control the Federal Capital Territory and to accelerate the transfer. Section 4 of the Seat of Government Act B.2.

required the Minister to publish in the Gazette, as soon as practicable after the passing of the Act, a plan of the layout of the City of Canberra and its environments. It provided also that the Minister could at any time, by writing under his hand, modify or vary the plan so published, but that no such modification or variation should be made until after the expiration of thirty days after notice of such intention. The act provided also that a copy of the instrument making the modification should be laid before both Houses of the Parliament within 15 days of the making thereof if the Parliament was then sitting, or, if not, then within 15 days of the next meeting of the Parliament. It provided further that if either House of the Parliament passed a resolution, of which notice had been given at any time within fifteen sitting days after the instrument had been laid before it, disallowing the modification or variation made by the instrument, the modification or variation should cease to have effect.

A plan of the city was accordingly gazetted, and it became the basic plan in accordance with the act. It was the general plan of the city of Canberra, prepared by Mr. W. B. Griffin with such minor modifications as had been approved up to that time. The modifications were mostly sub-divisional changes rendered necessary by a closer study of the ground and in relation to constructional economies. I hand to the committee a copy of the original plan.

THE CHAIRMAN - That is, after the modifications? It is the plan gazetted in 1925?

MR. McLAREN - Yes. In other words, the Canberra Plan is not the original Burley Griffin Plan.

SENATOR HANNAFORD - There are certain modifications in connection with the sub-divisions?

MR. McLAREN - That is right.

SENATOR WOOD - But only minor ones?

MR. McLAREN - Only minor ones.

SENATOR RYAN - Have there been variations since then?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

MR. McLAREN - Yes. The point I want to stress is that the plan of Canberra prepared by Mr. Griffin was a sketch plan of a city. In working out the details on the ground, it is inevitable that minor alterations must be made from time to time. Griffin made numerous modifications of the plan himself during the period he was in charge of the development of the city. Other variations were made on the recommendation of the Federal Capital Advisory Committee. In 1922, the Chairman of the Advisory Committee reported to the Minister for Works and Railways that many of the details of the plan were unwise, if not impracticable. The Minister concurred in the proposal that the committee should be empowered to make recommendations for such rational amendments as would improve the plan economically, practically and aesthetically without departing from the general scheme of layout of the city.

Another important point is that on the 16th June, 1926, the Solicitor-General, then Mr. Robert Garran, expressed the opinion that any modification or variation of the scheme of road communications specified in the published plan was covered by Section 4 (2) and could be made only in the manner provided by sub-Section 4. That opinion has been followed. The result has been that every sub-division of a section showing sub-divisional roads is a variation of the plan and has to be taken through this whole procedure. That accounts for, probably, 98% of the variations that have been made. I think something like 18 variations have been gazetted, but probably many of them have contained up to 100 actual variations. I hand to the committee a list of the variations published.

I have with me the only office record we have of the Gazettes showing all the variations. Perhaps it might be as well to have a look at how this is done. I produce a map showing the plan of the city at the 18th August of this year.

THE CHAIRMAN - That is after 18 variations?

MR. McLAREN - Yes.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

This is the plan that varied the West Lake scheme. That variation was made by <sup>the</sup> Minister after notice of intention to vary had been published in the Gazette. It went through the normal processes of gazettal and tabling in the Parliament

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you mind explaining one of the variations as an example?

MR. McLAREN: West Lake, as originally planned, covers an area of about 860 acres. It was substituted by a ribbon of water, roughly 120 yards wide, following the course of the river for about  $5\frac{1}{2}$  miles. That change was made in 1951.

SENATOR VINCENT: By whom?

MR. McLAREN: By the Minister. I have here a copy of the document that was tabled in the Parliament.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: Is that to be achieved by a weir?

MR. McLAREN: It has never been worked out. That is the whole trouble with the lakes scheme.

THE CHAIRMAN: Was the gazettal of the change tabled in both Houses?

MR. McLAREN: It takes a long time to go through this process. In this case it took about nine months. Considerable publicity was given to it but apparently nobody took much notice of it.

THE CHAIRMAN: All the processes were observed?

MR. McLAREN: It was tabled in the House. The Clerk of the House always announces what is tabled. Looking at the matter realistically, the East Lake was taken out of the plan some years ago, and all this terrific volume of water has been shown on the plan for a forty-odd years and no step has been made to do anything about it. In effect therefore, nothing has been taken away because nothing material was ever there. It was all on a plan only and some people seem to think that it is a very serious thing to remove something from a piece of paper. Parliamentary Papers 14, 15 and 16 contain a colour plan, worked up on the Griffin Plan, which shows the various basins. The central basins are the only ones that remain in the present plan, plus the ribbon of water.

C.1 9. W.A. McLAREN



SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

It is obvious that Griffin had in mind the throwing upon the water of the reflections of some of the magnificent buildings of Canberra. The whole trouble of course was that all that was gazetted was a series of lines. There were no zoning principles. All that had to be filled in later.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you any further remarks or would you prefer that we question you on definite aspects?

MR. McLAREN: I should like to direct the attention of the committee to the fact that Griffin did give an explanatory memorandum of his general zoning principles, but, when the plan was gazetted, no zoning was mentioned in the Gazette. The plan of lay-out was adopted but not the zoning. That is the general story of the Canberra Plan. I am having printed for presentation to the Committee tomorrow some maps asked for by the Secretary of the Committee. Some of the contour maps that I have with me at the moment are quite useless. The only copy of the map went to the competitors in the world competition for the Canberra Plan is in the archives. I suppose we could borrow it and print some maps from it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think it would be worthwhile to do so.

MR. McLAREN: It is not very informative. It is just a series of contour lines.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you like to give us your ideas about the suitability of the plan?

MR. McLAREN: It is rather useless to question the general lay-out of the plan because most of the road plan has been done, but my own views about it are that it is quite obvious from the conditions that I have read out that in those days the authorities were thinking in terms of railways and tramways running through the city. In those days the motor omnibus did not seem to be thought of much. It is a very difficult plan to work on because it gives us some very difficult sections from the traffic point of view. Many streets run off at difficult angles.

THE CHAIRMAN: I should like to get some general ideas about the soundness of the plan in the light of the ideas of the

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

time. If Griffin was not a competent planner, that is a very important consideration to start from. Do you really think that in the light of the ideas and the situation at the time, it was a good plan?

MR. McLAREN: I am not very competent to answer that question. I realise that 126 designs were entered in the competition, and Griffin's design was selected by a majority of the Committee appointed to consider the designs. As a matter of fact the majority, two out of three adjudicators, selected three designs in order, and the minority of one selected three completely different designs in order. Apparently, from the records, as I have indicated to you, the departmental board did not favour any of them. So there was a lot of controversy at the time as to whether it was a satisfactory design. I think we have to accept the situation that it is there, and the city is laid out on that basis.

THE CHAIRMAN: The thing we have to accept is the 1925 modified plan?

MR. McLAREN: Yes, you cannot get away from it because the place is pegged out on that basis.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you tell us what the modifications have been up to date?

MR. McLAREN: The ornamental water scheme was considered by a Parliamentary Committee in 1916 which recommended that the East Lake be postponed indefinitely. It did not consider it a practical proposition.

(Mr. McLaren continuing). - The recommendation was to postpone the rest of it for a period of years. No effect had ever been given to the various recommendations regarding East Lake until about three years ago when it was decided to remove East Lake from the plan. The main reason for that decision was that East Lake, according to Griffin's idea, would be from 15 to 20 feet above the level of the other lakes and it would cover an enormous area. I think that it was on a 1845 foot contour whilst the rest was on 1825 feet. That would have required a large weir with no connection between East Lake and the other lakes by water.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Has the ground been built on?

MR. McLAREN. - Some of it has been built on but it is mostly used for dairying purposes.

THE CHAIRMAN. - What about the central basins?

MR. McLAREN. - They are still on the plan. West Lake has been altered to provide for a "ribbon of water". It has already a "ribbon" pattern except for a spread across the part occupied by the race-course and the golf-links. It goes half way across the race-course for about 400 yards and there would only be about 2 feet 6 inches of water over that area which is regarded as too shallow to avoid swampy conditions. West Lake was altered to a "ribbon of water" on the recommendation of the National Planning & Development Committee which was set up about 1938. The Committee was set up to advise the Minister on proposals for the development of Canberra in the broadest terms and it was empowered to raise any matter that it wished with the Minister.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Is there a statutory requirement that the Department of the Interior must consult that Committee?

MR. McLAREN. - No.

THE CHAIRMAN. - How are the members of the Committee appointed?

MR. McLAREN. - They are appointed by the Governor-General on the recommendation of the Minister for the Interior for an indefinite period. The Committee has six members comprising the Chairman of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, the Chairman of the Australian Capital Territory Advisory Council, <sup>the</sup> ~~the~~ Assistant-Secretaries

Interior and, I think, three outside people who must have qualifications in architecture, engineering or town planning. That Committee is still functioning but its capacity is purely advisory.

THE CHAIRMAN. - If the advice of the Committee is not accepted it can do nothing about it?

MR. McLAREN. - That is so. But the work of the Committee extends beyond variations to the plan.

THE CHAIRMAN. - What is your opinion of the roads in the Australian Capital Territory, first with regard to their efficiency for moving traffic? Is the ornamental nature of the roads a serious impediment to their efficiency?

MR. McLAREN. - I do not think so. The plan could still be amended to provide for high speed highways if they were required. I think that the existing roads tend to slow down traffic which may be a good thing. One traffic difficulty has been created by bad corners but some of them have been removed.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Is the width of the roads sufficient?

MR. McLAREN. - I would say that the width is excessive. Every street that is shown as an avenue in the plan is 200 feet wide. It would be possible for those roads to carry 8 or 10 lanes of traffic. The width of roads is stated from building line to building line. In Constitution Avenue there is only a small pavement. The road has been reserved as being 200 feet wide. All the other roads on the Griffin Plan were 100 feet wide, including foot-paths. In my opinion, some of them were too wide. Some of the avenues are quite short and lead nowhere in particular.

THE CHAIRMAN. - The plan was devised mainly to serve the administrative area from the suburbs?

MR. McLAREN. - Yes. I suppose that you could put it that way.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Has any provision been made for the establishment of industry?

MR. McLAREN. - We have set aside minor industrial areas. At present we have under offer, as a test, 39 leases of land in the suburb of Fyshwick. A thousand acres of land have been reserved

there for industrial sites. We do not think that we will dispose of the sites under offer.

SENATOR RYAN. - In that area?

MR. McLAREN. - Or anywhere else in Canberra.

THE CHAIRMAN. - The industries that you have in mind at the moment are intended to serve the existing population?

MR. McLAREN. - No. We are trying to encourage major industries. Unfortunately, we have not any raw material in Canberra although I hope that it may be possible eventually to interest a paper pulping concern in establish<sup>ing</sup> itself here and using small trees from the pine forest.

THE CHAIRMAN. - But in the main, all the planning for the development of the city, so far, has been to supply the needs of public servants and the departments?

MR. McLAREN. - Yes. Of course, that is the main purpose of the city. Without that there would not be any Canberra.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Will the administrative section of the plan be ample for all conceivable requirements?

MR. McLAREN. - It seems to me that it will be ample for many years.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Despite the existence of the National Planning and Development Committee, I take it that the duty of developing the city for the future mainly rests on your department?

MR. McLAREN. - It rests wholly on my department.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Is the Town Planner an officer of your department?

MR. McLAREN. - Yes. He is in charge of the section which prepares the town planning studies and sub-division proposals and the lay-out of the roads within sections and the siting of houses.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Your department plans new housing areas?

MR. McLAREN. - Yes. That is done by the Town Planning Section which prepares the design of the sub-division.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Would you necessarily submit that to the National Planning and Development Committee?

MR. McLAREN. - Yes.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

Every such plan is submitted by Mr. Gibson who is an employee in the Planning and Development Branch, the head of which is the executive member of the National Planning and Development Committee. He presents all our sub-division proposals to the Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN. - How far ahead have you prepared your plans?

MR. McLAREN. - We have sub-divisions prepared for about 4000 houses. All those sub-divisions have not been surveyed in detail and pegged out. But our general planning is well ahead of construction.

THE CHAIRMAN. - When the new administrative building is finished a lot more public servants will move to Canberra?

MR. McLAREN. - Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Has your housing plan taken that into account?

MR. McLAREN. - It has taken it into account as far as possible. To what extent we will be able to accommodate everybody I do not know.

SENATOR TANGNEY. - Mr. Chairman, were you aware of the existence of the National Planning and Development Committee when you suggested the formation of this Committee?

THE CHAIRMAN. - Yes. It was not my intention merely to duplicate the work of that Committee. We have other objectives but we shall need information concerning the National Planning and Development Committee.

(continued on page 17)

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

MR. McLAREN - I would say there is no duplication.

THE CHAIRMAN - I have heard complaints about a lack of land sites and the suggestion has been made that this is impeding industrial and retail development. Is there any truth in that?

MR. McLAREN - There is no truth in it on the retail side because we have probably forty leases yet to be built on. They will all be built on within the next twelve months. They are shop sites. Some of the shops will be very large.

SENATOR HANNAFORD - Will they be in established centres or in other areas?

MR. McLAREN - In both. We are working on the district idea as well. The plan is to have perhaps eight or nine shops at each suburb. There are probably 30 or 40 leases at City, 20 at Kingston, and another 10 or 12 at Manuka.

THE CHAIRMAN - Is there any safeguard for the reservation of parklands, sporting areas, and so on?

MR. McLAREN - That is a very interesting point. The people here have become accustomed to calling any land that has trees and grass on it, a park. There have been plantings all round the place to keep it respectable. As the result, when an area comes into development, people become concerned about what they believe to be the filching of parklands. If all the open paddocks in the centre of the city were to be regarded as parklands, all the development would take place in surrounding areas and there would be nothing at all in the middle. Therefore, there is some misconception. In fact, no lands at all have been dedicated as parks in the sense that lands are so dedicated in say New South Wales under State land laws. Up to the present, that has not been necessary. The Government controls all the land.

SENATOR VINCENT - There is no question of alienation?

MR. McLAREN - No.

THE CHAIRMAN - But it is an important matter because the history of New South Wales at least, and particularly of the Sydney area, show that unless certain lands are specifically put aside they will not be reserved as parks. Even when land has been reserved,

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

constant efforts are made to filch it. That is a matter which the committee will have to take into account - whether certain areas should be laid down as parks.

MR. McLAREN - I point out that so far as recreation reserves are concerned, Canberra is better provided for than any other city in the Commonwealth.

THE CHAIRMAN - Is there anything laid down in the plan about parks or zoological gardens?

MR. McLAREN - We have dedicated a certain area for zoological gardens. That is on the western side of the city. The area is probably 600 or 700 acres. That is a matter on which I can obtain some information for the committee.

THE CHAIRMAN - So far as the plan is concerned, are all the basic services such as sewerage, electricity, water supply and so on adequately provided for?

MR. McLAREN - No. The Public Works Committee is now considering a proposal for additional water storage capacity. It is also considering a proposal for a new bridge across the Molonglo. The original concept of Canberra was that the city should contain within its borders sufficient water supply resources to meet its needs for all time. It is interesting to note that the water supply was based on a consumption of 100 gallons per head per day. We have already reached the figure of 160 gallons.

SENATOR HANNAFORD - But there is a lot of waste.

MR. McLAREN - That could be.

SENATOR HANNAFORD - The difference between per capita consumption in Queanbeyan and that in Canberra is considerable?

MR. McLAREN - That is so.

THE CHAIRMAN - Can you tell us the names and official positions of the officers of your Department who are primarily concerned with the planning and administration of Canberra?

MR. McLAREN - Mr. Rogers, Surveyor-General of the Commonwealth, is Assistant Secretary, Planning and Development. His Branch deals with land administration. Then there is the Town Planning Section, the Agriculture and Stock Section and the Survey and Drafting Section.



SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

We have a very large survey staff. Then, Mr. Gibson is Senior Town Planner and Mr. Morrow is the Lands and Agriculture Officer. Mr. Boyle is the Chief Surveyor. That is about all. I might mention, however, that we also have a Branch which we call the A.C.T. Services Branch in which I have endeavoured to integrate all the activities of a civil character, that is, local administration on the municipal and State level. Health matters and the administration of the law do not come under the Department of the Interior. The Police come under the Department of the Interior but the law <sup>drafting</sup> ~~making~~ comes under the Parliamentary Draftsman.

THE CHAIRMAN - That is a matter for the Attorney-General's Department?

MR. McLAREN - Yes. That Department also handles titles work and that sort of thing. The Health Department deals with the local health administration.

THE CHAIRMAN - I suppose that the advice of all those officers comes to you as Permanent Head of the Department.

MR. McLAREN - No, it does not. I have successfully avoided such a contingency. The Assistant Secretary, Planning and Development, has very considerable delegations of power from the Minister. It would be quite impossible to oversee the work of all these Branches, **except** on major policy. There are more than 4,000 employees in the Department of the Interior and we have many other functions besides looking after Canberra. .

THE CHAIRMAN - Is there one officer, under you and under the Minister who is responsible for all Canberra matters, or is that responsibility piecemeal?

MR. McLAREN - The responsibility for everything in Canberra is mine under the Public Service Act. The Planning and Development Branch is wholly concerned with Canberra. The A.C.T. Services Branch is wholly concerned with Canberra. Then we have our Housing and Accommodation Branch which is the landlord for nearly 5,000 Government owned houses in Canberra and for eight or nine guest houses.

THE CHAIRMAN - How does the Post Office operate?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

MR. McLAREN - It operates in the same way as it operates any where else in Australia.

THE CHAIRMAN - Except that your Department takes the place of the State Government.

MR. McLAREN - Yes, and the local authority too. We have building regulations and so on as well.

THE CHAIRMAN - You have mentioned that there is a secretariat to co-ordinate development. Is that the one you have referred to as being concerned with Canberra alone?

MR. McLAREN - It only started to operate last week. That comes under my personal direction. It is a small secretariat which will be responsible for dealing with policy on all matters relating to actual construction and facilitating the transfers.

THE CHAIRMAN - Only in Canberra?

MR. McLAREN - Only in Canberra. The Government approved the idea because of the imminence of the completion of the new administrative building.

THE CHAIRMAN - How does the Department of Works come into the picture?

MR. McLAREN - It is primarily a construction authority as it is in other parts of the Commonwealth. It carries out works on requisition from various Departments including, of course, the Department of the Interior.

THE CHAIRMAN - If a job were in Canberra, it would not necessarily emanate from you first. It might come from a Cabinet direction? Supposing we decided to build the National Library. That comes under the Parliament. How would you fit into that?

MR. McLAREN - Our responsibility would pretty well end with the site. I think it is the practice for other Departments to refer their major construction proposals to the National Planning and Development Committee. Take the Library, for example. That was considered by the Public Works Committee, the Chairman of which is a member of the National Planning and Development Committee. That provides a pretty good link.

THE CHAIRMAN - What degree of control is exercised by the

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

Public Service Board in the development of Canberra? Does your Department have to work with the Board?

MR. McLAREN - In practice, we work together but the Board has no real authority.

THE CHAIRMAN - How far does the Board's authority over the wages etc. of employees affect you?

MR. McLAREN - In regard to departmental establishment the Board has pretty well all the say.

THE CHAIRMAN - How far would the Board have influence in a matter such as transport? Your Department actually controls transport?

MR. McLAREN - Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN - But when it comes to starting and stopping times etc. the Public Service Board has control?

MR. McLAREN - They are fixed by the Department but we do generally get the views of the Board on matters like that.

THE CHAIRMAN - How is Health administered in Canberra?

MR. McLAREN - That comes under the Department of Health.

THE CHAIRMAN - Does your Department have anything to do with the Canberra Community Hospital?

MR. McLAREN - No. That is entirely under the Department of Health.

THE CHAIRMAN - The Attorney-General's Department comes into the picture in regard to the framing of ordinances, I suppose?

MR. McLAREN - Yes. They give the final 'O.K.' and they do administer certain ordinances.

THE CHAIRMAN - Your Department would decide the necessity for an ordinance and perhaps make the original draft of it.

MR. McLAREN - Yes. We have a couple of legal men who are engaged full time on ordinances. They present drafts in a fairly advanced stage for final approval by the Attorney-General's Department.

THE CHAIRMAN - The Treasury, of course, has a great influence on all Departments. If this is not a reasonable question, you need not answer it: could it be said that the Treasury has a restraining influence on the development of Canberra.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

MR. McLAREN - I do not think there is any secret about the fact that at times in the past that complaint has been made against the Treasury. Reports of committees at various times have drawn attention to it. There could be <sup>no</sup> another complaint last year or this year that there was insufficient money.

Continued on page 22.

THE CHAIRMAN: When you ask for funds, I presume the Treasurer has some kind of voice in the matter.

MR. McLAREN: The budget is submitted by the Treasurer. It is the Treasurer's budget. We have a battle royal every year of course.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you fairly satisfied with the way in which things work out? Would you like more money to spend?

MR. McLAREN: Not at the moment. We are finding it a bit difficult to spend what we have. Last year we did not spend all that we had.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been said that the capital has developed more rapidly at some periods than others. We know that that is so. We know that during the depression and the war development was necessarily slow. However, it has been said that from 1926 to 1929 or 1930 there was fairly rapid construction and orderly development. That was under the Commission, was not it?

MR. McLAREN: Yes, from 1924 to 1930 actually.

THE CHAIRMAN: Considering the time and other factors, do you think development under the commission was fairly satisfactory?

MR. McLAREN: To tell you the truth, I have never looked into that matter very much. If you are asking whether the commission form of control could speed up development, I should say that with a carefully arranged charter for the commission, it could probably do it. But there again, much depends on money. A commission could perhaps, and indeed did, succeed very well. A commission is not bound by public service regulations and Treasury instructions. There is not the same detailed examination of its work.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think the circular system of roads makes the cost of transport here much greater than it would be if the city were laid out on, say, a grid-iron plan?

MR. McLAREN: I should say that, generally speaking, the buses do a greater mileage here than perhaps would be necessary if the roads were straight. The present plan is very confusing to people. There are two ways of going from my house to here, two

very definite ways, but the one that I should have thought was a little longer is actually a little shorter. Some of the roundabouts here are excessive in size and are becoming a positive menace.

THE CHAIRMAN: Suppose the Parliament thought fit to put the transport system of the city under private enterprise or under some outside body. Do you think that this uneconomic layout would be a big obstacle to the economic running of the services?

MR. McLAREN: I am quite certain that no private operator would take the job on without a subsidy or without a completely free hand as to the fares he charged. We employed private operators to report on our show and give it a thorough going over. Mr. Schumer, of the Yellow Express Carriers, had a look at the show and reported that he did not think we could do very much about it. He said he thought that generally it was well run. He made a few suggestions but, taking it all round, he said we could not do very much about it in a place like this. In point of fact, a private operator would not run some of the buses that we run.

THE CHAIRMAN: How do fares here compare with fares in Sydney?

MR. McLAREN: They are just about the same.

SENATOR VINCENT: That means they are the dearest in Australia?

MR. McLAREN: It could be.

THE CHAIRMAN: How do you think Canberra compares with parts of, say, New South Wales in regard to the provision of housing?

MR. McLAREN: I should say that, as far as getting a house is concerned, the position here is more favourable to the individual. As you know, in some of the housing commission areas, particularly in New South Wales, a man can wait for seven or eight years and then not get a house, but here a chap is pretty well assured of getting a house within, say, two and a half years. I do not know where else that applies.

SENATOR RYAN: Will that apply when the influx of public servants takes place next year?

MR. McLAREN: I think there will have to be some special arrangements made for those people. A lot of them have booked up

already.

THE CHAIRMAN: Complaint has been made in the past that Canberra residents had too many free services. Do you think that complaint was justified?

MR. McLAREN: Too many free services?

THE CHAIRMAN: As opposed to people in other towns. For instance, I understand that the Department of the Interior used to cut hedges and do little jobs like that.

MR. McLAREN: There are two ways of looking at it. Hedges were planted by the original people laying out the place, without consulting the tenants. They were practically all tenants then. There were very few privately owned houses in Canberra at one stage. A lot of those arrangements were necessary at a time when people were brought here and told to stay. The Minister has very definite views about this matter, and so have I. We feel that the place is approaching some maturity and that it is very desirable that people here should be taught, if possible, to act in a mature way.

SENATOR WOOD: To develop a community spirit?

MR. McLAREN: Exactly. There is great evidence that that is happening. The complaint was made in the past that anything in the nature of a community enterprise was discouraged because the department liked to be on top all the time and arrange everything. I should say that in certain respects, such as recreational areas and sporting facilities, the people here are fairly well treated. The land is rated lowly, but there again we are trying to encourage owner construction. We have been very successful in recent times. If you want to encourage that sort of thing, you do not make the conditions extremely difficult.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: Can you give us an idea of the average rate paid annually by the average householder in an ordinary suburb? I understand the rates are based on the unimproved value.

MR. McLAREN: The rating is a combined rate, which includes water and sewerage. I think the water rate is  $3\frac{1}{2}$ d in the £

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

and the sewerage rate is 2½d. There is a lighting rate of 3½d.

SENATOR BENN: The general rate is 2d in the £.

MR. McLAREN: It is a bit higher than that.

SENATOR BENN: 7d.

MR. McLAREN: That is more like it. It would work out roughly at about £8 or £10 a year. Perhaps that would not be the average; that would be about the lowest.

THE CHAIRMAN: I believe there was an inquiry recently into the possibility of introducing some measure of local government. Could you tell us the result of that inquiry?

MR. McLAREN: The result was nil. The inquiry was made by Mr. Cole, the Town Clerk of Hobart, I can let you have a copy of his report, but it was not a very satisfactory one.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: Would those rates cover the amenities that are provided? Would they meet the situation as far as the actual cost of the amenities is concerned?

SENATOR TANGNEY: What amenities are provided? That is the important question.

Continued on page 26



MR. McLAREN. - I think it is easy to get confused by regarding Canberra as merely a local government centre. It must be remembered that the citizens of Canberra are entitled to some expenditure from the taxation revenues of the Commonwealth, to take the place of tax re-imburements made to the States in the form of grants, in addition to what local rating would give. It is a very difficult thing to draw a distinct line between State and local functions and that is where these partition schemes have come to drift. Of course, there is undoubtedly an attempt to make this a national capital a bit above, say, Queanbeyan or Yass.

THE CHAIRMAN. - You have said that there have been 18 variations of the plan? What is the normal procedure if there is to be a variation? If it emanated from your department, would you necessarily refer it to the National Planning and Development Committee?

MR. McLAREN. - Yes. I might say that in dealing with a variation of the plan which arises from the sub-division of sections, if the Planning Committee approves the sub-division for the access roads and so forth, inside the section, we would not refer the variations arising from that. They would be automatic.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Do you receive questions or objections from any quarter when the gazettal of intention to vary has been made?

MR. McLAREN. - I should say that the only occasions on which there is public reaction, to my knowledge, are when sub-divisions are proposed in a district where somebody has perhaps a special interest.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Has Parliament ever raised an objection?

MR. McLAREN. - Not as far as I know. Of course, there have only been two or three major variations.

THE CHAIRMAN. - The others have only been sub-divisions?

MR. McLAREN. - Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN. - The alteration of the Lakes scheme would be a major variation?

MR. McLAREN. - Yes. It must be realised if at any time the Government of the day decided to have a Lakes scheme it would be properly examined from all aspects and, if necessary, the Government could easily arrange to restore any part of the Lakes scheme that it considered should be restored.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Provided there had been no building or such permanent development in the area concerned?

MR. McLAREN. - Yes. Quite a large part of the area concerned is subject to inundation.

THE CHAIRMAN. - I think that we shall have to obtain expert engineering advice on the question of flooding and the amount of water.

MR. McLAREN. - Yes, but you will not get very much about it. I think it is as well to be wary of expert engineering advice.

THE CHAIRMAN. - When various local bodies or institutions with interests here want anything done, do they approach your department directly or do they move through the Advisory Council?

MR. McLAREN. -  
/Nowadays mostly through the Advisory Council the membership of which was altered about two years ago to give majority representation to elected members. Coincident with that alteration the elected members organized the local bodies better so that they would channel their requests through the elected members rather than make separate approaches to the Minister.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Has a certain amount of land been set apart for the various churches in Canberra?

MR. McLAREN. - Yes, I think most of them have land set apart.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Was that in the original plan or did they have to apply for the land?

MR. McLAREN. - There was no zoning in the original plan. It has all been by application.

THE CHAIRMAN. - I presume that the larger denominations have a fair area of land at present?

MR. McLAREN. - The Church Lands Ordinance limits the area for any primary church to five acres.

THE CHAIRMAN. - That is the actual ground the church is on?

MR. McLAREN. - Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Is that so in the whole of the city area?

MR. McLAREN. - That is for a primary church, for instance, for an Anglican or a Roman Catholic cathedral.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Have all of them taken that land up?

MR. McLAREN. - Yes, I think so.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Has the Presbyterian Church got five acres for St Andrew's Church?

MR. McLAREN. - I think there are five acres there.

THE CHAIRMAN. - What would be the position of a smaller denomination like the Society of Friends? Would it have to approach the Department of the Interior if it wanted to build a church?

MR. McLAREN. - They would approach us and we would find them a site. We do ask them for a scheme of development so that we shall not have great areas lying idle. We have areas for, say, the Roman Catholic church and the Church of England for cathedral sites, but the place has not justified much yet.

THE CHAIRMAN. - But if they wanted to go ahead and build, they could do so?

MR. McLAREN. - They have the land, and could go ahead.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Do you think that the people in Canberra generally are satisfied with the plan as they understand it?

MR. McLAREN. - I should say that, generally speaking, they are quite indifferent about it.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Who made the decision regarding the erection of make-shift and temporary buildings during the depression period and in the war and post-war periods? Was it a decision made by the Department of the Interior or the Minister concerned? Did any committee consider the matter?

MR. McLAREN. - No, you will find that certain temporary roads have been planned. The road across Scott's Crossing is a temporary road only and you will find various things like that for various purposes which were important at the time. The demountable housing area at Narrabundah which was a temporary development to accommodate the labour force is an example.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

MR. McLAREN (continuing) - Quite a number of people who went there originally have moved to other areas. However, the rents are low and some of them are not very anxious to leave.

THE CHAIRMAN - Are the departmental buildings at Barton regarded as temporary or permanent?

MR. McLAREN - They are regarded as temporary.

THE CHAIRMAN - Would it be possible to move them somewhere else at no great cost?

MR. McLAREN - I do not think that they could be moved.

THE CHAIRMAN - Then they have to be regarded as permanent?

MR. McLAREN - No. If the Government proceeds as it intends to do, the central offices of the Departments will be established in Canberra in about ten years time and the Barton offices will then be pulled down. They will not last very long.

THE CHAIRMAN - Are there definite plans for the replacement of houses at Westlake and the Causeway?

MR. McLAREN - All the people who live at Westlake and the Causeway have been told that they can register for other housing but very few have done so. People are not anxious to move from Westlake because they only pay about 14/- a week in rent. They do not wish to move to another house which would cost them £3. 15.0. a week. Some of the houses at Westlake and the Causeway are not too bad. Westlake was built by the contractor, MacConnell, when the Hotel Canberra was being constructed. MacConnell intended to pull down the houses at Westlake but the Federal Capital Commission bought them from him.

THE CHAIRMAN - Is it intended to demolish the Acton offices?

MR. McLAREN - Most of the Acton offices are located on hospital land. Eventually, the hospital will extend across that land and those buildings will then have to be removed. A part of the Department of the Interior will leave the Acton offices next year.

THE CHAIRMAN - Is there any intention to extend the existing railway in the Australian Capital Territory?

MR. McLAREN - No. The terminus of the railway will remain

where it is. Under the agreement between the Commonwealth and the State of New South Wales, if New South Wales builds a railway from Yass to the border of the Australian Capital Territory, the Commonwealth undertakes to extend it to link up with Queanbeyan. But in my opinion the chances of New South Wales building such a railway are nil.

THE CHAIRMAN - Would you say that Parliament has been almost indifferent to Canberra in the past?

MR. McLAREN - I would not say that. At times, Parliament has been very active on the subject.

THE CHAIRMAN - But that was mainly in the early days. Since 1930 there has been no great Parliamentary concern about Canberra?

MR. McLAREN - It has been left mainly to the Executive. Cabinet has taken considerable interest in Canberra over the years.

THE CHAIRMAN - Since the 1930's, do you remember any discussion in Parliament on proposed variations to the plan of Canberra?

MR. McLAREN - My term of office as Secretary of the Department of the Interior does not extend back that far. There were discussions concerning the elimination of the railway and the elimination of the East Lake but everybody was in agreement concerning the advisability of those variations. The extension of the railway would have required the reservation of a very large slice of land right across Canberra as far as the shopping centre at Civic which would greatly have restricted development. The decision not to extend the railway allowed us to make land at Civic Centre available for the construction of shops and for other purposes. The only variation to the plan of Canberra on which there has been any significant discussion was that which concerned West Lake.

THE CHAIRMAN - When was the variation to West Lake first gazetted.

MR. McLAREN - In 1951. I shall have a plan showing the variation produced for the information of the committee to-morrow. The procedure in connection with a variation to the plan is as follows. The Minister notifies his intention to vary the plan in the Commonwealth Gazette. After thirty days, he declares in the H.2.

Gazette that the variation has been made. Then the relevant papers are tabled in Parliament.

THE CHAIRMAN - Have you noticed Canberra figuring prominently in the discussions on the Estimates in Parliament?

MR. McLAREN - It has done so at times. During the last two years there has been increased interest in Canberra. There was more discussion on Canberra during the last budget session than at any previous time that I can recall.

SENATOR BENN - Has your Department a fixed standard for the construction of houses?

MR. McLAREN - There are certain standards.

SENATOR BENN - Have they been gazetted?

MR. McLAREN - No.

SENATOR BENN - They are only departmental standards?

MR. McLAREN - Yes.

SENATOR BENN - Is the Police building at Civic Centre a permanent building?

MR. McLAREN - It is temporary

SENATOR BENN - How long has it been in existence?

MR. McLAREN - I do not know. About 25 years I suppose. But it is only in recent times that the Police Force has attained any size.

SENATOR BENN - Your officers have a fixed standard for the construction of houses?

MR. McLAREN - Yes. We have hundreds of designs for houses which have been examined by the National Planning and Development Committee. I would say that the standard is reasonable.

SENATOR BENN - Would all the houses in Canberra be up to that standard?

MR. McLAREN - Not all of the existing ones. About 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ % would be sub-standard.

SENATOR BENN: You have mentioned the lakes scheme. It appears from your remarks that West Lake has gone by the board and that a ribbon of water along the Molonglo has been substituted for the general lakes scheme.

MR. McLAREN: No, only for West Lake. The central basins have not been altered at all.

SENATOR BENN: Your department intends to adhere to the rest of the lakes scheme? You have not given consideration to the substitution of any other ornamental scheme?

MR. McLAREN: The ornamental scheme that has been approved in substitution is the 120 yard wide flowing ribbon of water. That would be probably 25 feet lower than the proposed lake level. It is a much more economical scheme. In 1929, the lakes scheme, without East Lake, was estimated to cost £15,000,000. <sup>£1,500,000</sup> That will give some idea of what the scheme would cost today.

SENATOR BENN: You said a while ago that part of your department's policy is to encourage some industries to come to Canberra.

MR. McLAREN: Yes.

SENATOR BENN: Has the department anything fixed in respect of the construction of industrial premises?

MR. McLAREN: As I have explained, major industries are at present being invited to take up land. We are testing the position by public offer. I could give the Committee a copy of the plan of the industrial area that is being opened up. The restrictions that we are imposing are first that certain noxious trades will not be encouraged. There is also a building covenant. Furthermore, there can be only one residence on an industrial lease. That is for a caretaker or some other such person. The object is to prevent residential development becoming mixed up with industrial development. The terms and conditions are laid down under the authority of an ordinance.

SENATOR BENN: It is part of the policy of your department.

MR. McLAREN: Yes.

SENATOR BENN: Apparently there is a difference between

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

New South Wales and the A.C.T. In New South Wales these things are fixed by act and by regulation.

MR. McLAREN: You mean zoning?

SENATOR BENN: No, the construction of industrial premises.

MR. McLAREN: I see what you mean. We have our own building regulations which govern the standard of construction but they do not apply to government homes. The Government is supposed to observe the standards itself.

SENATOR BENN: Transport has been rather a bugbear in the A.C.T. In view of the early delivery of power from the Snowy Mountains Hydro Electric Scheme, has your department ever considered the introduction of trolley buses?

MR. McLAREN: No.

SENATOR BENN: Travelling around the city I noticed that fair progress has been made in the provision of public buildings. Is the National University now complete?

MR. McLAREN: No.

SENATOR BENN: Would you say that the construction of the National University has been more rapid than the construction of other buildings?

MR. McLAREN: That depends on the sort of premises you mean. The National University programme has been pushed on fairly vigorously and necessarily so because it is not the sort of institution that you can have in a half-baked state for years. Probably four million pounds has been spent on it. The medical school has just been started.

SENATOR BENN: You do not think that the National University programme has been advanced to the prejudice of other buildings?

MR. McLAREN: No.

SENATOR VINCENT: What is the policy with regard to the establishment in Canberra of industries that are not essential to the functioning of the National capital as an administrative centre?

MR. McLAREN: The policy has been an open one, but frankly there is not very great interest in the matter.

SENATOR VINCENT: Is there anything to prevent a boot manufact-



1960-61

urer starting a factory in Canberra?

MR. McLAREN: Nothing at all. I think the main deterrent has been the absence, up to a few years ago, of suitable labour. I might mention that, at the present time, we have on offer a number of leases. This will enable us to test out the market.

SENATOR VINCENT: Do you consider it desirable that the establishment of industrial enterprises, other than those required to maintain the city as an administrative centre should be encouraged?

MR. McLAREN: Yes.

SENATOR VINCENT: In other words, you do not think that Canberra should be developed only as an administrative national capital.

MR. McLAREN: I do not think there is any doubt that the establishment of other industries would be a good thing if only to provide alternative employment to public service employment. Such industries would also lend variety to the scene. That is why we have had discussions with various people in which we have tried to get them to take this on.

SENATOR VINCENT: What type of industry do you consider would be suitable for establishment here?

MR. McLAREN: That is very hard to say. There are some preconceived notions about what type of industries might be established here. I do not like to reveal the nature of some of the discussions because I might be prejudicing the interests of some people concerned. But some enterprises are looking at Canberra as a sort of centre for southern New South Wales. I have in mind for instance the final assembly of motor cars which is now carried out in the state capitals. Apparently some large concerns are thinking of Canberra as a centre for south eastern New South Wales at least.

SENATOR VINCENT: Has Canberra any natural advantages in regard to the establishment of industries?

MR. McLAREN: I do not think so.

SENATOR VINCENT: It has certain disadvantages?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

MR. McLAREN: The only advantage it would offer is that it is a pleasant place to live in and is the fastest growing centre in the southern districts.

SENATOR VINCENT: As against that there are certain disadvantages?

MR. McLAREN: Yes.

SENATOR VINCENT: What do you consider them to be?

MR. McLAREN: Particularly the labour market. It is much easier to take raw materials to where the labour is available.

SENATOR VINCENT: Do you think there would be any disadvantage in relation to the distribution of goods?

MR. McLAREN: I do not think that is much of a disadvantage today with motor transport.

SENATOR VINCENT: I should like to be clear in my own mind about what I would call an over-all scheme for the development of this city. Can you say whether there is any planned maximum population for Canberra?

MR. McLAREN: No, there is not.

SENATOR VINCENT: Have you any ideas of your own on that matter?

MR. McLAREN: No, we have had various shots at it but it is difficult to make estimates very far into the future. The point that crops up all the time is the extent to which governments will insist on aggregating Commonwealth central staffs here. That is something on which it is difficult to get anything very solid at present.

SENATOR VINCENT: What would you consider to be a fairly high estimate of the ultimate population?

MR. McLAREN: In twelve or fifteen years time I think Canberra should have between 60,000 and 70,000 people.

SENATOR VINCENT: It would be desirable to get some overall picture of the maximum population having regard to the provision of services and so on?

MR. McLAREN: Yes. I think the population aimed at in the way of services has been tentatively regarded as 100,000 but

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

no time has been set for that. I feel that, within fifteen years, the population should exceed 60,000.

SENATOR VINCENT: And it might go as high as 100,000?

MR. McLAREN: Yes.

SENATOR VINCENT: Having regard to that fact, is there what one might call an overall scheme of development including the erection of public buildings and suburban dwellings, and the provision of services, that one can read and appreciate as being the general plan for the development of this city?

MR. McLAREN: If when you speak of public buildings you mean such buildings as an art gallery, a national museum and so on, there is no overall plan.

SENATOR VINCENT: Why is there no such plan?

MR. McLAREN: I think the real reason is that the designing of those buildings would be a pretty solid job. The two wars and the depression proved severe setbacks to the provision of ordinary housing and other bread and butter services and it has not been practicable to get round to the other buildings.

SENATOR VINCENT: Do you think it would be practicable to have an overall plan?

MR. McLAREN: I do. I would very much like to see one, even if it were only for guidance and could be altered as the necessity for alteration became apparent.

SENATOR VINCENT: Do you think that the National Capital Planning and Development Committee is an adequate body to establish such an overall plan?

MR. McLAREN: I think it could be.

SENATOR VINCENT: What prevents it being done?

MR. McLAREN: I do not think it has really been bothered about.

SENATOR VINCENT: It would be open for the Minister at any time to suggest that the Committee get on with that job?

MR. McLAREN: It could be.

SENATOR VINCENT. - There must be some planned development at a lower level than the plan I was speaking of. I refer to the establishment of houses and to services such as water and electricity supplies. Is there such a plan?

MR. McLAREN. - With regard to public utilities such as electricity supply, much will depend on the success of the Snowy River scheme.

SENATOR VINCENT. - These plans are related to a possible population of 60,000 in the time you have mentioned?

MR. McLAREN. - Leaving the Snowy aside, we are on the same grid as the general New South Wales supply. Our estimated population increases and electricity consumption increases have been worked out for quite a number of years ahead and handed to the State Electricity Authority in New South Wales. It is well within the scope of that authority to meet our demands in the future.

SENATOR VINCENT. - Would you care to say whether you consider there should be any modification, and if so, to what extent, of the plans that are in being, having regard to the possible ultimate size of the city?

MR. McLAREN. - I think we have reached the stage where no material alteration of the plan could be made. I might mention that we have exceeded by quite a long way the limits of the area which Griffin included in his original plan. I think I have pointed out that the competitors were asked to design a city for a population of 20,000.

SENATOR VINCENT. - Let us get down to some finite examples. Do you consider that the shopping centres would be adequate for a city of 60,000?

MR. McLAREN. - Probably not, but I should say that when the present centres are developed further they will be quite adequate for some time.

SENATOR VINCENT. - You do not think there should be any more?

MR. McLAREN. - I do not think so.

SENATOR VINCENT. - During the tea break, we spoke about the distances that separate housewives from the shopping centres. Have you any ideas on how that could be rectified?

MR. McLAREN. - I do not think it is possible to meet all the shopping demands at every street corner.

SENATOR VINCENT. - Why should we have our commercial centres in just two or three fixed areas?

MR. McLAREN. - In fact, we have not. We have quite a number of district shopping centres now. In every district, there is a shopping centre with anything up to eight or nine shops. They are not finished in all places.

SENATOR VINCENT. - You do not think the position could be improved by bringing the shops closer to the house-wives?

MR. McLAREN. - They seem to meet the general day to day requirements. We shall never get a decent shop if we distribute all the shops as small shops.

SENATOR VINCENT. - Would you say that the development of the city is being held up at all, and if so, to what extent, by lack of finance?

MR. McLAREN. - I should not say so now, although that has been the case in the past.

SENATOR VINCENT. - Is there some attempt to preserve what one might call a pattern of architectural style throughout the city in regard to the major public buildings?

MR. McLAREN. - There have not been many major public buildings put up.

SENATOR VINCENT. - I am rather appalled myself at the standards but I may not have any taste in these matters. Who is responsible for approving the architectural styles of the major buildings in the city? Take anything from a picture theatre to the ultimate National Library.

MR. McLAREN. - With regard to private buildings, I do not think the Planning Committee would ever attempt to dictate style. It would be a pretty fruitless task because you can never satisfy any large number of people on design.

SENATOR VINCENT. - Who are the designing authorities who approve of the styles of the large buildings?

MR. McLAREN. - I suppose the Parliamentary Public Works Committee. They would consider the Works proposals for major buildings.

SENATOR VINCENT. - I am referring particularly to the styles.

MR. McLAREN. - If the designs are competitive, it could be arranged quite readily, but if they are normal Public Buildings, it would be the Works designing staff in consultation with the department concerned.

SENATOR VINCENT. - I am a little concerned lest in 50 years time we have what one might call a conglomerate city, with buildings resembling anything from a Moslem mosque to an igloo. Do you think the policy in regard to architectural styles requires improvement in any way? I am referring to the administrative side.

MR. McLAREN. - Do I think so?

SENATOR VINCENT. - Yes.

MR. McLAREN. - ~~My dear~~, I do. There is no doubt about that. Some buildings were never intended to have any architectural style about them.

SENATOR VINCENT. - Personally, I think some of the architecture is deplorable. Let me refer to temporary buildings, which is a very sore point so far as I am concerned. Will you indicate the present policy with respect to the erection of temporary structures?

MR. McLAREN. - The present policy is not to erect any at all.

SENATOR VINCENT. - Would I be right in saying that from now on we shall have no more temporary buildings?

MR. McLAREN. - If the present policy is not changed, that will be the position.

SENATOR VINCENT. - Who is responsible to see that that policy is adhered to?

MR. McLAREN. - At the present time, it has to be the Minister. It was the Minister who issued the direction to the Works Department and the Department of the Interior, "No more temporary buildings".

SENATOR VINCENT. - Opposite the Hotel Kurrajong there is a most deplorable structure which was erected for the P.M.G.'s department. Would your Minister have approved of that as a temporary structure?

MR. McLAREN. - He would not have been asked.

SENATOR VINCENT. - There are some exceptions to this overall policy in regard to temporary structures?

MR. McLAREN. - You asked me about the present policy. That is not a temporary building. It is the first instalment of a building.

The major postal buildings will surround it. It was put up because the Telephone Exchange was needed much before the other buildings.

SENATOR VINCENT. - Take the interesting little building called the Archives building, down near the river, That is temporary, is not it?

MR. McLAREN. - I cannot account for that one.

THE CHAIRMAN. - I asked a question in the Senate about the <sup>Kurrajong</sup> building, and this is the reply I received from the P.M.G. -

A modern aluminium alloy prefabricated building is being erected on National Circuit, near the Kurrajong Hotel, to provide accommodation as expeditiously as possible. It will serve as a permanent telephone exchange for that area. The building will be painted and the surroundings treated with lawns and shrubs so that the property will represent a satisfactory appearance.

There is no suggestion in that answer of any other buildings being added.

MR. McLAREN. - It is not an adequate answer. A site very much bigger than that occupied by the Exchange will be covered. The central office for the Area Deputy Director and his staff will be there.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Ultimately there will be a big building there?

MR. McLAREN. - Yes.

SENATOR VINCENT. - I am concerned with the possibility that more igloos will be constructed round here. Are you satisfied that the present administrative machinery is adequate to prevent that?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

MR. McLAREN. - With regard to the igloo building, perhaps I might mention that the National Library had a lot of material stored in all sorts of places around Canberra. The idea was to put something up to hold those things, because of the inevitable delay in building a new National Library. The difficulty in this place is that you have got day to day problems of accommodating things and people. Sometimes they become very urgent. When you think of a national library building, you might think of something costing about £2,000,000.

SENATOR VINCENT. - This does tend to suggest that an overall scheme of development might be most desirable, because then we might get a national library building under way. Are you satisfied that the present administrative arrangements are such that hereafter no temporary structures will be built without the Minister's concurrence?

MR. McLAREN. - If it is left to the Executive, they can make a decision about any particular thing at any particular time. There is no prohibition on the Executive.

SENATOR VINCENT. - There is no possibility that some department will construct a temporary building without reference to your department and to your Minister?

MR. McLAREN. - Not while he remains Minister for Works I should say.

(continued on page 41.)



SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

SENATOR TANGNEY - Changes in recent years, particularly the development of the Snowy Mountains Scheme have made Canberra to some degree the centre of the Southern Tablelands area and much business that was hitherto done in Goulburn is now done in Canberra. Has due regard been given to the possible development of Canberra as the business and industrial centre of the Southern Tablelands area?

MR. McLAREN - It is a fact that at times we have circulated Chambers of Commerce to get their ideas about the type of industry that their members might be interested in establishing in Canberra, and have asked them to indicate the unit size of the blocks that they would require. The response has been very poor.

SENATOR TANGNEY - There are a large number of retail shops near Kinslie, some of which seem to be tiny and squat. Are they permanent structures?

MR. McLAREN - Some of them probably would be. They were intended to provide for the needs of the minor industrial area in Braddon.

SENATOR TANGNEY - They might have looked somewhat better if they had been planned on the lines of the arcade at Civic Centre.

MR. McLAREN - Yes, but opinions differ about that arcade.

SENATOR TANGNEY - Is there any prospect of the railway station being improved?

MR. McLAREN - That is up to the Department of Railways, but I do not know of any immediate prospect.

SENATOR TANGNEY - Is there any plan for the construction of an improved road to the coast to give Canberra people an outlet to the sea?

MR. McLAREN - The road runs through New South Wales most of the way.

SENATOR TANGNEY - How far does the Australian Capital Territory extend?

MR. McLAREN - Only to Queanbeyan.

SENATOR TANGNEY - What is the connecting link between the A.C.T. and Jervis Bay, for instance, which is also Commonwealth Territory?

MR. McLAREN - There is no direct road. It is a round about run.

SENATOR TANGNEY - There has been a great deal of school development by churches in Canberra by the major denominations. Is there any possibility of other religious denominations who go in extensively for secondary education, for instance, the Presbyterian Church, establishing more schools? Are there any plans for private secondary school development?

MR. McLAREN - We meet them as they come along but I do not know whether any other religious denominations have any plans at the moment.

SENATOR TANGNEY - No land has been set aside?

MR. McLAREN - No, but it would be if requested.

SENATOR TANGNEY - Canberra is not going to become an industrial centre but it could easily become a cultural and educational centre. I think that if some of the churches knew they could have the facilities, they might help to develop it as such.

MR. McLAREN - I think they know the facilities are available but they are having difficulty even with their permanent churches.

SENATOR TANGNEY - Boarding Schools in the Capital Cities seem to be overtaxed. Some of them have been booked up for the next ten years.

MR. McLAREN - I would suggest that there has been a general decline in what is known as the Great Public Schools system.

SENATOR TANGNEY - Could any encouragement be given to churches and other bodies to establish secondary schools?

MR. McLAREN - We have met all demands that have been made.

SENATOR TANGNEY - They have to put in their requests? There is no encouragement?

MR. McLAREN - They know that we offer special conditions such as exemption from rates and lower rental for the land used. The rental is only 1% against the ordinary rate of 5%. There are considerable inducements. The principal problem is not the land but the cost of building.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

SENATOR TANGNEY - Is any help given to them in regard to the cost of buildings?

MR. McLAREN - No.

SENATOR TANGNEY - Do you think it would be possible to give such help?

MR. McLAREN - I should rather not discuss that question.

SENATOR TANGNEY - Is there any way in which Canberra could be developed along that line?

MR. McLAREN - If you ask me whether it would be practicable to do so apart from its advisability, I would say that it would be practicable.

SENATOR TANGNEY - Oxford and other areas in England are developing as industrial areas as well as cultural areas. Canberra might well become the Oxford of Australia in relation to secondary schools.

MR. McLAREN - It seems to be showing a trend that way. The only thing is that we do not grow up in the same pattern and that people look for some variety of employment and the future belongs very largely to the children here. It distresses some people that their children leave home to find employment elsewhere.

SENATOR TANGNEY - Do you think that the number of people wanting to build their own homes in Canberra is limited, particularly among civil servants, because of the lack of employment for their children, other than in the public service, and that that causes them to prefer permanent homes in the State capitals?

MR. McLAREN - I have heard it suggested.

The Committee adjourned.

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE DEVELOPMENT  
OF CANBERRA

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

Taken at Canberra

WEDNESDAY, 8th DECEMBER, 1954.

PRESENT

The Chairman	(Senator McCallum)
Senator Benn	Senator Tangney
Senator Hannaford	Senator Vincent
Senator Ryan	Senator Wood

WILLIAM ALEXANDER McLAREN, Secretary, Department of the Interior, further examined.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: Has the plan of Canberra, as originally drawn up, been adhered to with the exception of the 18 variations that you have mentioned?

MR. McLAREN: Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: You said that the East Lake scheme was abandoned because of engineering difficulties?

MR. McLAREN: Yes. It would have been at a much higher level than the other lakes and it was considered that the supply of water would be insufficient to keep it full.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: Is it considered that the Molonglo River would provide sufficient water to maintain the level of the lakes?

MR. McLAREN: The scheme that was set out in the Owen Peake Report of 1929 provided for dams on the Queanbeyan and Molonglo Rivers which would release water to counteract evaporation, soakage and other losses. Some stored water would be necessary to maintain the level of the lakes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: The Molonglo would not be adequate to maintain the level?

MR. McLAREN: Some people seem to think that it would, but <sup>and</sup> Owen Peake did not.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

SENATOR HANNAFORD: I was interested to know whether pressure had been put on the department to bring about the variations of the original plan. What is the reason for the variation of the lakes scheme, apart from the elimination of East Lake?

MR. McLAREN: The only reason for the elimination of East Lake was to make it possible for my department to deal with the land on a permanent basis. The trouble with the reservation of lands is that if there is not an immediate prospect of carrying out the intended development, they might lie for up to seventy years with the dead hand of planning over them. That makes it impossible to deal with them on the usual leasehold basis.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: It has been suggested that the abandonment of the West Lake has been brought about by the Royal Canberra Golf Club. Has that body or the body which uses the Race course made representations to the department?

MR. McLAREN: The golf course will have to go, in any case. The "ribbon of water" scheme will make it impossible to retain the golf course because the "ribbon" will flow right through the course. The advantage of the "ribbon" scheme is that, on either side of the water, there will be an area of land which could be developed as a public park. But it would be impossible to play golf on a course with a strip of water <sup>120</sup>~~100~~ yards wide through the middle of it. There would be no means of access from one side to the other.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: Has the golf club made any objections to the proposed "ribbon of water"?

MR. McLAREN: No. They have not lodged any objections to the lakes scheme. I do not think that they are worried about it. Previously, you mentioned the abandonment of Westbourne Woods. The scheme to have a golf course there was abandoned because it was premature. If the government decided, on any particular date, to initiate the lakes scheme, it would be some years before any progress would be made with the scheme. During that time, if the government felt so disposed, it could construct another golf course elsewhere. ~~So~~ A state of affairs in which the government had no intention of implementing the lakes scheme and in which

the Royal Canberra Golf Club had two golf courses, in my opinion would be crazy. An expenditure of £40,000 would have been required to complete the course at Westbourne Woods so the plan was abandoned.

SENATOR RYAN: But the course had been almost completed?

MR. McLAREN: No. Some trees had been cut down and a certain amount of grass had been sown; but there were no greens, no water had been reticulated there, and there were no structural improvements.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: If the present scheme of central basins were brought to fruition would the water in them have an economic value?

MR. McLAREN: I should not think so.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: The scheme is designed purely for aesthetic purposes?

MR. McLAREN: Yes. It may provide a certain amount of recreation such as boating.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: I take it that there was no public resentment at the alteration of the plan which resulted in the modification of the West Lake? Very little publicity was given to the matter?

MR. McLAREN: I would not say that.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: Have any objections been raised by way of public controversy?

MR. McLAREN: No. In December, 1952, the National Capital Planning and Development Committee gave unanimous endorsement to a proposal to substitute the "ribbon of water" for the West Lake. The matter was raised because we had a feeling that the government was nibbling at a lakes scheme. I know that certain members of Cabinet were keen to have such a scheme. We felt that we should give some consideration to it. The idea was to adopt what we considered to be a more effective and economic scheme, both from the point of view of funds and water. The late Alan McDonald who was Chairman of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works was present at a meeting which discussed this subject. On the 18th February, 1953,

the Minister approved of the adoption of the Committee's report. which was notified to the Director of Works, Canberra. The instrument of intention to vary the plan and layout of the City of Canberra was signed by the Minister on the 12th May. On the 9th June a copy of the plan was forwarded to the Director of Works. On the 11th June the Minister's intention to vary the plan was gazetted. On the 9th July the Director of Works referred to an early completion of what he called the "Wilson Report". That report has been mentioned publicly but has never been adopted by the Department of Works. The report was made by an engineer employed in that department.

(Mr. McLaren continuing). - On the 11th July the statutory period of 30 days after notice of intention was gazetted, expired. That 30 days from the date of gazettal is given to enable people to lodge objections. No objections were lodged. On the 30th July, the instrument of variation of the city plan adopting the ribbon, was signed by the Minister. On the 7th August copies of the instrument were forwarded to the Parliament and on the 27th August there was a gazettal of the Minister's variation. On the 9th September copies of the instrument, signed by the Minister, notifying the variation, were tabled in Parliament. The end of the statutory tabling period of 15 days required by section 12A of the Seat of Government (Administration) Act was on the 16th October. It was not until the 18th December that confirmation of non-disallowance by Parliament of the variation of the city plan by adopting the ribbon was conveyed to the Director of Works in Canberra. So, the matter extended for about twelve months.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - You have not given particulars of the other variations that have been adopted. You have said that they are mainly subdivisional. What is meant by that?

MR. McLAREN. - As I explained yesterday, the sections shown on the plan of layout are very large and, for housing development we have to break them up into, say, 20 or 30 blocks. That means that some access roads have to be put in. I mentioned yesterday that a former solicitor-general of the Commonwealth, now Sir Robert Garran, gave the opinion that the inserting of those roads is a variation of the city plan.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - That means that the same procedure has to be adopted on each occasion?

MR. McLAREN. - Yes. It does not vary the layout of the place. Probably 99 percent of the variations are of that type.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - Do you think that certain areas should be set aside for parkland?

MR. McLAREN. - I do not think that is an issue at the moment because of the very large areas of land available for public domains. Certain areas have been developed purely as parks.



There is, for instance, Telepea Park and parks in the Turner area and other parts of Canberra. They have been developed as parks and recreation grounds. Other areas have grass on them and have remained open spaces. The trouble is that they become accepted as parks whereas in fact, they are reserved for development for housing, offices etc.

SENATOR HANNAFORD - Take, for example, that area in front of the Hotel Kurrajong. Is that set aside for development?

MR. McLAREN. - Only part of it.

SENATOR HANNAFORD - There is no particular area set aside for a park?

MR. McLAREN. - Yes, York Park is in that area. It is to the south of the postal building.

SENATOR HANNAFORD - Would you agree that, as a fire prevention measure, it would be feasible, with the erection of a few fences, to have such areas grazed?

MR. McLAREN. - It has been tried at times but not very satisfactorily. It is true that livestock could be grazed on a good deal of the land but the graziers are not very happy about it because of the fly menace in Canberra and not being able to get at it quickly. Furthermore, there is a lot of rubbish in the grass. There is a lot of spear grass and corkscrew grass and stuff like that. We do cut those areas as soon as the grass starts to brown off but it is poor stuff really.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - You mentioned yesterday that the rates paid by Canberra residents are out of proportion <sup>to those</sup> paid by other citizens which means, in the long run, that the cost is borne by the taxpayers generally. Has any sort of local government for Canberra ever been envisaged?

MR. McLAREN. - It has often been talked about. The Advisory Council has, for the last two years, been conducting an inquiry on this very subject but it has not got very far. So far as I can judge, the majority of opinion in Canberra is that it would not be desirable.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - Canberra people are on a better wicket as they are?

MR. McLAREN. - Yes. It is a very paternal administration despite the criticism you hear.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - You admit it is a very paternal administration?

MR. McLAREN. - You put your finger on it when you say they get away with disproportionate rating. I do not see much evidence of anybody wanting to alter that system. They would undoubtedly have to pay more.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - The residents themselves would obviously be opposed to such a system if it were to mean greater burden on their finances?

MR. McLAREN. - Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - But it does seem to me that it would be a feasible proposition in the interests of the taxpayers generally if the people of Canberra were asked to fall into line in connection with the maintenance of the city itself because they have a city with all the amenities of modern civilisation. Do you think they should be asked to pay rates comparable with other cities?

MR. McLAREN. - I can assure you that is the Minister's view.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - The fact that one sees large numbers of cars parked on roadways around office buildings seems to indicate that even in Canberra there is not adequate parking space?

MR. McLAREN. - In most places there is parking space but you will get those people who will not walk 100 yards to and from a parking area. Take, for instance, the Barton offices. We put a very large parking area at the back of those offices. Usually it is only about one-third full yet you see cars parked in the streets surrounding the offices. There is an extensive parking area at Civic Centre but you will still see cars parked alongside the shops.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - Would it not be possible to compel motorists to use the parking areas?

MR. McLAREN. - At certain places there is a 10-minute limit but it takes an army of people to police these things.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - There always seems to me to be a terrific fire hazared in temporary office buildings. Have they an internal

fire prevention system?

MR. McLAREN. - They have a sprinkler system. Special attention has been given to this matter in the last 18 months. Practically all Government offices, including Parliament House, have been inspected by competent fire officers. We have had the Assistant Chief Fire Officer here from Sydney. We have a very competent man taking temporary charge of our station. He is from New South Wales and he has brought a new light to the problem. I know that certain measures have to be taken in this building.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - There is only one Fire Station in Canberra?

MR. McLAREN. - Yes. We have considered having more than one but we have not regarded additional stations as necessary in view of the protection that is provided in the buildings themselves and the efficiency and speed of modern fire-fighting vehicles.

SENATOR WOOD. - I take it from your position in the Department that, when it comes to making alterations of the city plan probably what you would say would go a long way?

MR. McLAREN. - I do not see 90 percent of the alterations. I seldom see sub-divisional alterations and so on. The National Capital Planning and Development Committee considers these things in pretty fair detail?

SENATOR WOOD. - You are not on that?

MR. McLAREN. - I have been on it at times but I am not at the moment.

SENATOR WOOD. - You have mentioned elected representatives?

MR. McLAREN. - I was referring to the Canberra Advisory Council. The National Capital Planning & Development Committee, which was established by ordinance, includes the chairman of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, the chairman of the A.C.T. Advisory Council, the assistant-secretary, Planning and Development, Department of the Interior - he is the executive member - and, I think, four outside people who are either architects, engineers, or authorities on town planning.

SENATOR WOOD. - Who are they?

MR. McLAREN. - Mr. Waterhouse is chairman. He is first president of the Institute of Architects of New South Wales, and Director of the National Art Gallery in Sydney. He is a very eminent architect. Then there is Mr. Heath from Melbourne. He is the man who planned the city of Heidelberg. He is a consultant on the Olympic Games and a lecturer at the Melbourne University on town planning. There is a man named <sup>Holland</sup> ~~Roland~~, a former Director of Architecture of the Department of Works, and an engineer named Walters who is in private practice in Victoria. That comprises the outside representation. They have done a really good job. Their work is honorary.

(continued on page 54)

SENATOR WOOD - Have you made any study of town planning yourself?

MR. McLAREN - I have no official qualifications in that regard, but I have read quite a good deal about it and necessarily have picked up a bit.

SENATOR WOOD - I notice in the article written by the town planner that the present population is given, but there does not seem to be any formulated idea of what population the plan is, so to speak, to be worked to. Have you any idea of the population for which Burley Griffin made his plan?

MR. McLAREN - The instruction to the competitors was to submit a plan for a city which, when established, would have a population of 25,000, but the population would be expected to grow with the population of Australia. I think the population of Australia at that time was about 4.3 millions. That would envisage today a population of somewhere about 50,000. The present population of the A.C.T. is over 30,000, and the population of the city area itself is about 29,000.

SENATOR WOOD - During your evidence yesterday you referred to various avenues being 200 feet wide. That, of course, is from building line to building line. It includes beautification strips, in addition to the roadways. Your opinion is that that is far too wide, I gather?

MR. McLAREN - In some instances. The trouble is that the width was related to the name. If it was called an avenue, it was 200 feet wide. I think I drew attention to Hobart Avenue. That could never be a very long street, yet it is 200 feet wide, with a double traffic way.

SENATOR WOOD - Is it, or will it be, a connecting link between important features of the city?

MR. McLAREN - No. It runs off at the back of the bowling club right into a group of streets. There must be about seven traffic ways running into one. At the other end, it must finish at Stato Circle.

SENATOR WOOD - A broad avenue like that may have been designed

for the purpose of a vista.

MR. McLAREN - That was not so in that case. The main vista of Canberra is from Parliament House to Mount Ainslie. That is the main land axis of Canberra. The Mall, in effect, is from here to the War Memorial. It was intended that there should be an unimpeded view.

SENATOR WOOD - The point I am trying to make is that if you were to reduce the width of roads, you might find that the reduction was a disadvantage.

MR. McLAREN - I agree with that.

SENATOR WOOD - When we speak of 200 feet, we speak of practically 3 chains. That is the width of St. Kilda Road, Melbourne. When you get a big population, you get dense traffic on such highways.

MR. McLAREN - St. Kilda Road carries a vast volume of traffic, mainly because of the limited number of bridges across the Yarra. There is a real bottleneck at Flinders Street Station, at Princes Bridge there. I might mention that, if you have a 200 feet reservation for your main avenues, with 100 feet for roads and streets, a very heavy and increasing maintenance burden is imposed on the department. It will be a tremendous burden in the future.

SENATOR HANNIFORD - You are referring to maintaining grass strips and so on?

MR. McLAREN - Yes. You have got to try and do something with the strips. You have got to keep them respectable.

SENATOR WOOD - We must also keep in view the fact that this is the national capital and that probably work of this kind has got to be done on a bigger scale than might be the case normally.

MR. McLAREN - I would not argue about Canberra Avenue, for instance, being 200 feet wide. That is a main road. It extends into Queanbeyan and carries the Cooma traffic. But when we come to some of the other avenues, I think a width of 200 feet is extravagant, because they have no purpose. They are only 200 feet wide because they have been called avenues. Take Sydney Avenue, which runs up to Telopea Park School. That is 200 feet wide, but if you took a traffic count there, you would be doing pretty well

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

if you counted fifty vehicles running along there a day.

SENATOR WOOD - I think you made a suggestion yesterday about 100 feet, which is about a chain and a half. That would not give you much opportunity for a <sup>a</sup> beautification scheme comparable with the rest of Canberra. You would get a garden strip in the centre, but you would not get much else.

MR. McLAREN - I admit there are arguments for and against, but I think the correct approach is not to commit yourself to any particular width but to adapt the width to the purpose.

SENATOR WOOD - In designing, you have got to plan for some width or other?

MR. McLAREN - Yes, I agree, but in my opinion some of the roads are excessively wide. Apart from the maintenance factor, the population density is very low. Probably Mr. Gibson will be able to give you the figures showing the proportion of the developed area taken up by roads and road and avenue reservations. The cost of providing and servicing roads, footpaths, kerbs and gutters, storm-water drainage, sewerage and other things is extremely high per house.

SENATOR WOOD - Are not all these areas laid out and constructed now?

MR. McLAREN - No. Take the development at O'Connor. In 1947, the population of O'Connor was, I think, 20. In 1954, it was about 3,000. That area was laid out and provided with services just prior to the construction of the houses.

SENATOR WOOD - Are the avenues shown in the plan already constructed?

MR. McLAREN - No. Perth Avenue is not constructed. That is the one that branches off just this side of the American Embassy and runs into the West <sup>Lake</sup> ~~Lake~~ <sup>area</sup> ~~really~~.

SENATOR VINCENT - It runs from nowhere to nowhere?

MR. McLAREN - Yes.

SENATOR WOOD - Apparently quite a bit of the Burley Griffin plan has not been completed.

MR. McLAREN - It has not been completely marked out.

SENATOR WOOD - What is your view of the geometrical design of the Griffin plan? Is it one that appeals to you as the head of the department?

MR. McLAREN - I have more or less accepted it. I have had a look at some of the other designs, and I must say that some of them appeal to me a bit more than the Griffin design.

SENATOR WOOD - Did you have a look at the Broinowski design?

MR. McLAREN - No. I had a look at the design submitted by Saarinen, the Finnish architect. The first three designs were from overseas people. The winning design was prepared by Griffin, an American; the second design was by Saarinen, a Finn; and the third was by L'Orange, a Frenchman. All of them are in the archives.

SENATOR WOOD - With regard to the lakos, the first lake to be eliminated was the East Lake?

MR. McLAREN - Yes, following a recommendation by the Parliamentary Public Works committee. That was away back in 1916. They recommended that, in view of the evidence submitted, it should be postponed indefinitely. I have not read the report for some years, but I think the principal reason for the recommendation was that they were not satisfied that there would ever be enough water to fill the lake. That was the first point. The second point was that they would have to construct at the time, to conform with the plan, a railway bridge, of which the estimated cost then was about £450,000.



That has since been deleted?

MR. McLAREN - Yes. The first point is that its level was to be 20 feet above the level of the main lakes, and I think that the water and the cost factors were the two sticky ones.

SENATOR WOOD - West Lake has now also been deleted, has it not?

MR. McLAREN - Yes, but I think that it is appropriate to bear in mind that West Lake was on the plan for forty years and nothing was done about it. We felt that something might be done about a ribbon of water which is 25 feet lower in level than the lake. It would not require anything like the engineering works to set a ribbon of water at 1800 feet that it would require to set a lake at 1825 feet. For a start you would not be impounding anything like the same volume of water and the associated engineering works would be much lighter. It was in fact a proposition that was considered I think by a Parliamentary Committee about twenty years ago. It was certainly mentioned in the Peake & Owen Report of 1929 - I am referring to the ribbon of water as an alternative. It was not just thought up on the spur of the moment.

SENATOR WOOD - Do you, as head of the Department of the Interior, take the view that because certain features that are in the Canberra Plan have not been utilised in a space of say forty years, it would be right to discard them on that account?

MR. McLAREN - I should not take such a view, but I think that as head of the Department there is a responsibility on me to advise the Minister whether in fact the original idea could ever be carried out, because of alternative uses that might be found for the land.

SENATOR VINCENT - There must be some flexibility?

MR. McLAREN - Exactly. Another point is that any feature taken out could be restored if necessary.

SENATOR WOOD - Do you have anything to do with town planning?

You know how difficult it is to remove buildings that have once been erected.

MR. McLAREN: It is difficult to alter any major construction. It would be necessary to watch the leasing policy.

SENATOR WOOD: I hope that the Department does not ignore the fact that any planning done might be for hundreds of years ahead.

MR. McLAREN: It might be, but I think it would be presumptuous for people in 1954 to assume what others might do in 2054.

SENATOR WOOD: The proposed lakes would probably be the finest and best feature of the whole of the plan?

MR. McLAREN: I do not think there is much doubt that if the lakes were provided as envisaged in the original scheme you would effectively make two cities. At the present moment people speak of the north side and the south side quite freely and there is a feeling about which is the more important side. To put a tremendous volume of water between the two sides of the city would effectively cut it in halves. As a matter of fact the Departmental Board to which I referred yesterday considered that the lakes should be on the outskirts of the city rather than dividing it in two.

SENATOR WOOD: Therefore you hold the view that it would be better if the city had been designed on one side with the lakes as a frontage?

MR. McLAREN: Yes.

SENATOR WOOD: I understand that several features such as the race course and golf links have encroached on land meant for the lake areas.

MR. McLAREN: They were put there twenty odd years ago. I think that the lake Rt. Hon. J. A. Lyons had something to do with the golf course. He was very keen on it and I think at one time was President of the club. Undoubtedly such people have influenced development. The race course has been there for many years as far as I know. We did have in mind the improving

of the general appearance of the course and the removal of buildings from the university side and the leasing of the area to a group of trustees who would be charged with its development, subject to the overriding provision that is in most of such leases, that if the land is required by the Commonwealth for a Commonwealth purpose, such as the lakes scheme, no compensation would be payable other than the actual purchase of the improvements that had been actually been made. There would be no compensation for severance or disturbance or loss of profit or anything like that. Our leases to all sporting bodies contain such clauses. I will put it this way - you have a very difficult decision to make sometimes. Land is reserved for some particular purpose and as far as can be seen it may be fifty years before that purpose will be achieved. I see very little harm in using that land in the meantime. Indeed, I think it is good business to do so provided you have control over the structures that maybe erected on it.

SENATOR WOOD: But you have to be careful because as areas become developed people with interests in the exert pressure against any change.

MR. McLAREN: If you have control over the development that goes on then I think you have it sewn up.

SENATOR WOOD: What are your feelings about the planning of Canberra? Do you feel that the situation should be reconsidered by some body of planners who will go into the plan completely again and see whether the scheme could be re-designed on a more modern basis that would probably be more acceptable? People come here from the States and cannot find their way around Canberra.

MR. McLAREN: I think it is a very good idea to have a re-appraisal or re-assessment of the whole plan. What I am concerned about, of course, is that if a body of people recommended a completely new deal it would be quite impracticable to do much about it. I feel that it would finish up as just another opinion on the Canberra Plan.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

SENATOR WOOD: I think we have to accept the fact that a city rebuilds itself every so often.

MR. McLAREN: Yes. And I think on the whole it would be a very good idea to have a re-appraisal of the plan. I do not doubt that we could get the men needed to do it.

SENATOR RYAN: I presume that the Advisory Council is subordinate to the National/Capital Planning and Development Committee?

MR. McLAREN: No, the National Capital Planning and Development Committee is a Committee that gives advice to the Minister. The Advisory Council is a body which considers matters relevant to the Australian Capital Territory. All the ordinances of the Territory are submitted to the Council for an expression of its views. It may make representations to the Minister on any matter affecting Canberra.

SENATOR RYAN: That is one of its functions?

MR. McLAREN: Yes, it is left to the Council itself as to what it raises. From time to time the Minister ... refers certain matters to the Council.

SENATOR RYAN: Does it meet frequently?

MR. McLAREN: At least once a month. The Planning Committee also meets once a month.

SENATOR RYAN: Does the Planning Committee have some say in variations of the plan?

MR. McLAREN: Yes.

SENATOR RYAN: Was provision made in the original plan for the setting aside of land for recreation areas?

MR. McLAREN: No, but it was included in the requirements that there would be proper provision for public recreation. As I pointed out yesterday, when the plan was gazetted it was just a plan of the layout of streets. No zoning was allied to it.

SENATOR RYAN: Has that policy been generally followed by your Department in your planning and survey work in relation to housing areas?

MR. McLAREN: Yes, there is provision made for public recreation areas. Mr. Gibson will tell you about that.

SENATOR RYAN: I did not notice any recreation grounds in either the O'Connor or Yarralumla area.

MR. McLAREN: There is a very large one in the Yarralumla area. There is actually an oval operating there now.

SENATOR RYAN: There is none at O'Connor?

MR. McLAREN: Mr. Gibson will tell you about that.

SENATOR RYAN: What is the practice in regard to the planning by your department of its housing policy? Do you survey an area for housing development?

MR. McLAREN: The practice is that Mr. Gibson would work out a design of sub-division for a new section about to be developed with all its roads and so on and would discuss that with the National Capital Planning and Development Committee which makes quite a critical analysis of those propositions. On many occasions it will send the sub-division back for further study but the approved sub-division, when adopted, is conveyed to the authorities concerned in the Department of Works and the Department of the Interior, and the survey people compute the whole area, peg it out and mark out the blocks. The Department of Works then develops the area and the services and the types of houses are agreed upon and the work starts usually on a contract basis.

SENATOR RYAN: Is the policy of the department to use day-labour or to work on contract?

MR. McLAREN: It is done in both ways, but largely by contract. Parts of the services development are done by day labour, but it is dwindling. The Minister's policy is to use contract as much as possible.

(Mr. McLaren continuing). - Maintenance work is always done by day labour.

SENATOR RYAN. - You have already stated that recreation areas have been provided for in the plan for the development of Canberra?

MR. McLAREN. - Yes.

SENATOR RYAN. - Would you say that it is essential to provide recreation grounds?

MR. McLAREN. - Definitely.

SENATOR RYAN. - Has the area which would have been covered by the East Lake been surveyed for any other purpose by your Department?

MR. McLAREN. - It has not been surveyed but blocks of land there are being used for dairying and, I think, a certain amount of vegetable growing.

SENATOR RYAN. - Would that land have any value as building sites for houses or factories?

MR. McLAREN. - No. A good deal of the land is subject to inundation in time of flood.

SENATOR RYAN. - Could that be prevented?

MR. McLAREN. - I have examined the problem of flood control many times. I think that answers the question.

SENATOR RYAN. - If the rest of the lakes scheme were proceeded with, would that prevent the inundation of this area?

MR. McLAREN. - I have always been afraid that if the level of water were raised to 1825 feet, the surcharge from a flood would go somewhat higher than 1825 feet. I think that 1825 feet has been the highest limit of any flood, up to date.

SENATOR RYAN. - But you stated previously that this area is higher than the rest of the Lakes?

MR. McLAREN. - I thought that you were referring to the West Lake.

SENATOR RYAN. - No - to the East Lake.

MR. McLAREN. - East Lake would also receive a surcharge of water because it would come through there first. There would be no control over it.

SENATOR RYAN. - Yesterday, you stated that it was the policy of the Government to provide free land for the construction of buildings by the churches. Does that policy also apply to other units of community life such as the Chamber of Manufactures and the Trades Hall?

MR. McLAREN. - Yes. There is a big Trades Hall site.

SENATOR RYAN. - Have you examined the traffic problem that is developing around the Kingston shopping area?

MR. McLAREN. - Many times.

SENATOR RYAN. - Is there any plan to relieve the congestion?

MR. McLAREN. - Yes. A couple of the streets are to be widened. I do not know when that work will commence but the requisitions for it have been put in. Giles Street, the street through which the bus runs, is the main street concerned.

SENATOR RYAN. - Would it be possible to resume a part of the front gardens of the houses on that street in order to widen it?

MR. McLAREN. - That would not be necessary because the street could be extended across lawns that exist on one side of it and across an angle parking area on the other side. We shall have to remove that parking area altogether. Some of the parking areas are cluttered up all day by the vehicles of the shop-keepers themselves.

SENATOR RYAN. - Will the "ribbon of water" scheme effect the race-course?

MR. McLAREN. - No.

SENATOR RYAN. - In the event of another 40 years passing before that project is finally abandoned, would it be possible for the race-course to be utilised by the University for sporting purposes?

MR. McLAREN. - It is not in the University area. I do not know why the University needs any sporting facilities because all the people<sup>there</sup> are post-graduates and I do not suppose that there would be 100 in the place when the University has been fully developed.

THE CHAIRMAN. - There is a possibility of the National University taking over the University College.

MR. McLAREN. - We should be pleased if a decision were made on that matter.

SENATOR RYAN. - You say that the railway station site is under consideration?

MR. McLAREN. - I think that the railway station will remain where it is.

SENATOR RYAN. - But what about the improvement of the building?

MR. McLAREN. - Well, it is not a particularly busy place.

SENATOR RYAN. - But it may be availed of to a greater extent in future.

MR. McLAREN. - That is a matter of conjecture.

SENATOR RYAN. - Are there any plans for the establishment of other public institutions in Canberra, such as a gaol and a mint?

MR. McLAREN. - There is no plan for a gaol. I think that the New South Wales Government has always been accommodating in that respect. We have paid New South Wales the cost of the incarceration of prisoners from the Australian Capital Territory.

SENATOR BENN. - If local government were granted to Canberra, would the Government not also have to grant it to Darwin and Port Moresby?

MR. McLAREN. - There would be a strong case for granting it to those towns. This is the only Seat of Government, of course,

SENATOR BENN. - Is it not a fact that persons who rent Commonwealth Government premises in Canberra pay rates?

MR. McLAREN. - Yes. The rent is calculated at five percent of the cost of the structure. An amount is also charged for the rent of the ground. In addition, the occupier of the premises pays rates equivalent to those that would be paid by the owner or lessee of a property.

SENATOR VINCENT. - Where does that money go?

MR. McLAREN. - Into Consolidated Revenue.

SENATOR VINCENT. - It is not ear-marked for specific expenditure?

MR. McLAREN. - No. All collections of Government money in Canberra are paid into Consolidated Revenue.



SENATOR VINCENT. - Could you express an opinion as to whether it would be practicable to have some form of local government in Canberra?

MR. McLAREN. - In establishing a municipal authority which, normally, would construct roads, kerbing and guttering and provide ordinary municipal services, it would be necessary to decide to what extent that authority should be responsible for collecting taxation from the local people in order to pay for those services. That is a difficult matter to determine. We have been influenced by experience in Washington. There, local government was abandoned after some years and the city reverted to the District Commissioner system. I think that the main objection to that system in Washington is that the local people have no representation whatsoever.

SENATOR VINCENT. - Would you accept the proposition that a citizen of Canberra, having no representation on a local government body, has a certain disadvantage as a citizen?

MR. McLAREN. - The people of Canberra have representation in the House of Representatives, of course. Their representative does not have full voting power but that position may be altered as the electorate grows.

SENATOR VINCENT. - But local government is not discussed in the House very much?

MR. McLAREN. - No. I think that finance would be the main obstacle to the provision of local government for Canberra.

SENATOR VINCENT. - But you would agree that the citizen of Canberra is, in fact, disfranchised?

MR. McLAREN. - Yes. I support the idea that there should be some acceptance of responsibility by the local people.

SENATOR VINCENT. - Will there be sufficient houses to accommodate all the public servants who will be brought to Canberra to work in the new Administrative block?

MR. McLAREN. - I do not know. We hope so. We have practically a blank cheque in relation to housing to carry out the directions of the Government, but I do not know whether it will be possible to provide housing for all, immediately. The building situation throughout eastern Australia is acute.

SENATE CANTONRA COMMITTEE

SENATOR VINCENT - I am attracted by the tree planting scheme but I think I am correct in saying that the newer suburbs are lacking in trees?

MR. McLAREN - That is mainly because they have only recently been taken out of rural use. The areas being developed on the outskirts today were, a year ago, parts of grazing properties. But planting is going on in them. I think it would be advisable for the Committee to consult the Superintendent of Parks and Gardens on that matter.

SENATOR VINCENT - It seems to me that there are many vacant areas in some of the older suburbs of Canberra. Why were those areas not built on before new suburbs were developed?

MR. McLAREN - I cannot answer that one because the failure to develop certain areas in existing suburbs has been a mystery to me. Our present policy is to fill them in. I know that one difficulty has been the provision of water, sewerage and other services. The easier areas were taken first.

SENATOR VINCENT - The scattered nature of the city would tend to increase the cost of services?

MR. McLAREN - Tremendously.

SENATOR VINCENT - I am concerned with that aspect and I am wondering why the inner suburbs are not being built up?

MR. McLAREN - That is the policy at the moment. There are examples of what you have in mind everywhere. For instance, there is a large area extending from Capital Hill right across to the Presbyterian Church. It is a fine area for building. I do not know why that has been hold out for so long. Possibly there are service difficulties.

SENATOR VINCENT - Whose responsibility is it to ensure that those areas shall be built on?

MR. McLAREN - The Department of the Interior.

SENATOR VINCENT - What authority determines the adequacy of such things as shops, theatres, hotels and so on?

MR. McLAREN - It is left to the Department of the Interior.

If we are approached about a particular thing - and people do approach us - we generally have a look at it and try to meet the situation. For instance, we are very conscious of the fact that there are not enough hotels in Canberra. We had two new hotel blocks leased but the interests concerned reckoned that to provide the fifty bedrooms required would not be an economic proposition. That was one of the conditions of the leases. There were special conditions for those leases. The ordinance lays down 25 bedrooms as a minimum. The interests concerned with the two leases to which I have referred considered that the proposition would be too expensive. It would cost £250,000 or more to put the buildings up.

SENATOR VINCENT - Do you agree that there are insufficient hotels?

MR. McLAREN - Yes.

SENATOR VINCENT - Can you express any view as to how you could overcome the difficulty?

MR. McLAREN - We are about to offer the two leases again publicly, throughout Australia, to anybody who is willing to take them on.

SENATOR VINCENT - It might be desirable to modify the requirement with regard to bedrooms?

MR. McLAREN - We might bring that down to 25.

SENATOR VINCENT - Canberra is badly catered for in regard to theatres. Is there any restriction on the number of theatres?

MR. McLAREN - No.

SENATOR VINCENT - It is a matter for any private entrepreneur?

MR. McLAREN - The Minister has recently confirmed an undertaking given many years ago to a picture show crowd to extend their premises for a larger theatre. We will be offering another site at the same time as the hotel leases. That will probably be this week. There are plenty of people who will put up a shed or a barn and there are plenty of people who will put up a bar. But if you want a really decent hotel, it is another matter.

SENATOR VINCENT - Am I correct in saying that the cost of building in Canberra is much higher than it is in the other capital

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

cities?

MR. McLAREN - I have always thought so, but I am surprised to learn that it is much on a par with Sydney.

SENATOR VINCENT - Forgetting about Sydney, how does it compare with Adelaide or Melbourne?

MR. McLAREN - We are slightly cheaper than Melbourne in some respects, particularly cement work.

SENATOR VINCENT - Does that apply to dwellings?

MR. McLAREN - Yes. I found it hard to believe the figures. We got the figures out some time ago.

SENATOR VINCENT - It takes a long time to build anything in this city. Can you explain why?

MR. McLAREN - I think it is mainly the labour shortage.

SENATOR VINCENT - I am rather appalled at the time it has taken to build the new administrative block.

MR. McLAREN - I suggest that members of the committee should have a look at that building. It is a huge undertaking. The amount of work under the ground is terrific. The project will cost the best part of £4,000,000. It is the biggest building in Australia.

THE CHAIRMAN - It goes below the ground?

MR. McLAREN - There is a lower ground floor, a basement and a sub-basement.

SENATOR VINCENT - I think I am right in saying that building work generally takes somewhat longer here than in the other cities.

MR. McLAREN - Yes, that may be true. It is mainly the labour market.

SENATOR HAMILFORD - They did not take long to put up the new Chamber of Manufactures building.

MR. McLAREN - That is true.

SENATOR BENN - The Chamber of Manufactures building is a tin-pot building compared with the office block.

MR. McLAREN - Yes.

SENATOR TANGNEY - The dates that you have given concerning the gazettal of the alteration of the lakes scheme seem to be rather significant. For instance, the 30 days notice expired on the 11th

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

July. Parliament was in recess during that period and the Coronation celebrations were going on. The fact that no objection was taken to the gazettal could have been due to the fact that everybody's attention was on something else. I feel rather strongly on this matter because of the modifications of the University plan that have been consequent upon the alteration.

MR. McLAREN - Do you believe that? The only building so far as I know that faces the lake is the Vice Chancellor's residence.

SENATOR TANGNEY - But research work is being carried out at the National University at a very high level.

THE CHAIRMAN - The point is that the buildings were placed there because of the assumption that there would be a lake. The abandonment of the lake does not mean that the buildings will have to be altered?

MR. McLAREN - That is so. In the explanatory memorandum that Griffin gave, he did mark roughly that area as a University area but what the lake has to do with it I have not the faintest notion.

THE CHAIRMAN - The statement was made by the Vice Chancellor.

MR. McLAREN - I do not accept it. I think it is absurd. From the bulk of the university area, you could not see the lake anyway.

SENATOR TANGNEY - It is not a question of seeing the lake so much as having quiet surroundings. You do not think that is a valid objection?

MR. McLAREN - I think it is a lot of baloney. I cannot see what difference it makes whether you have wheat or oats growing or a lake.

SENATOR TANGNEY - The point I was making is that the gazettal of the alteration seems to have taken place at a time when people's minds were on other matters.

MR. McLAREN - That is possible.

THE CHAIRMAN - Thank you for your evidence, Mr. McLaren.

The witness withdrew.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

MR. TREVOR RICHARD STEPHEN GIBSON, sworn and examined.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your official position?

MR. GIBSON: I am the Chief Town Planner, Department of the Interior, Canberra.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your profession?

MR. GIBSON: I am an architect.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you a prepared statement?

MR. GIBSON: I have not a prepared statement. I have merely a few notes which might be of assistance to the Committee. I am aware that there is in front of you a copy of a talk ~~that~~ <sup>which</sup> I ~~gave~~ <sup>delivered</sup> to the first Federal Congress of the Town and Country Planning Institute held in Canberra in 1951. Perhaps you will have some questions to ask ~~of me~~ arising from ~~that~~ <sup>this</sup>.

I note that this Committee has fairly wide terms of reference. <sup>and</sup> ~~It~~ has been ~~established~~ <sup>set up</sup> for the purpose of enabling you to advise yourselves and, in turn, the Government in office of the ~~various~~ <sup>various</sup> vicissitudes, ~~if such be the word~~, <sup>amendments</sup> of the Canberra Plan since its acceptance in 1925. I can assure you that there has been a very good reason for every variation of the plan that has occurred since I arrived and took up my duties in Canberra. <sup>I</sup> We have not adopted the attitude of deliberately ~~varying~~ <sup>departing from</sup> the accepted plan simply for the purpose of super-imposing ~~our~~ <sup>my</sup> own ideas on ~~something~~ <sup>a plan</sup> that ~~was~~ designed over forty years ago. <sup>I</sup> We have maintained, and are maintaining, to the utmost the framework of the plan. Within that framework, <sup>I</sup> we have varied the plan to the extent ~~we have~~ considered necessary in the interest of communications, zoning and the efficient use of land. The variations have ~~gone~~ <sup>been adopted</sup> through the official channels.

The step ~~we~~ take <sup>each</sup> is to survey ~~the~~ area. I do not use the word "survey" in the manner in which a surveyor would use it. <sup>I</sup> We ~~have~~ considered <sup>each</sup> the topography of ~~the~~ area, land use and how prominent features will line up with surrounding areas. From other information ~~that has been~~ <sup>is</sup> compiled, ~~we~~ <sup>is</sup> assess <sup>ed</sup> the needs of each separate area, having in mind the overall pattern. ~~Once~~ again I say that there is no deliberate attempt to vary the plan.

R.I

If we have an opportunity to go round Canberra or even to take a closer look <sup>at</sup> ~~of~~ the plan itself, I can explain the reason for each variation.

From the information that Mr. Griffin left behind, we do not know precisely what he intended to ~~do~~ <sup>do</sup> with each area. In ~~my~~ <sup>my</sup> the "talk that I gave in 1951, I said that, in my opinion, the ornamental and somewhat geometrical pattern of Canberra had been carried to excess in the residential areas. Let me give one instance: ~~of that. We have found that,~~ with the increase of population coupled with the increasing use of the motor vehicle as a means of conveyance to places of occupation and places of entertainment, ~~we have~~ <sup>we have experienced</sup> peak periods, <sup>where</sup> during which the traffic is reasonably intense.

(Continued on page 73)

(Mr. Gibson continuing). - We also ~~know~~ <sup>to</sup> From the records of accidents, not necessarily major accidents, but minor accidents in the majority of cases, ~~that it might~~ <sup>be</sup> reasonable to take steps to minimise one of the causes of such accidents. It is a physical cause, namely, the multitude of inter-sections in Canberra. So when ~~we~~ <sup>I</sup> came to develop ~~or~~ lay out the areas on the western side and the northern side ~~we have~~ <sup>they were reduced</sup> minimised by as much as 75 percent these intersections with the main traffic routes, ~~of the future~~. In conjunction with that ~~we also~~ <sup>I</sup> adopted a later ~~system~~ <sup>principle</sup> of planning in which ~~we tried to designate within Canberra itself~~ certain areas ~~which we call~~ <sup>designated as</sup> "neighbourhood units". The angle from which I looked at ~~that was not so much~~ <sup>each</sup> fronting ~~and~~ these neighbourhoods ~~can~~ <sup>to</sup> main lines of communication, ~~but~~ to enable ~~that~~ <sup>each</sup> ~~one or~~ neighbourhood to feel that it had contact with the main line of communication but did not necessarily have to face it. In other words ~~we~~ turned inwards ~~these neighbourhoods~~ from the main traffic routes and centred ~~them~~ <sup>I</sup> around what ~~we hope~~ <sup>we</sup> in ~~future~~ will be the centre of community life, ~~in that area~~. I do not want to confuse that with the term "community centre" because ~~we have~~ <sup>there are</sup> none as such. When ~~we~~ <sup>I</sup> came to lay out ~~the area of~~ Yarralumla ~~we had~~ a line of connection into Yarralumla ~~taken by~~ <sup>was taken from</sup> Hopetoun Circuit, ~~we turned~~ <sup>we</sup> north, ~~at Hopetoun Circuit~~ then turned west along Weston Street, ~~that was~~ <sup>as</sup> one of our lines of distribution into Yarralumla. There is another line of distribution, ~~known as~~ <sup>as</sup> Schlich Street, ~~which is~~ further north ~~and~~ <sup>the</sup> at the moment appears to go nowhere because the northern area of Yarralumla will not be available to the Department for development purposes until after the 30th June, 1958. ~~We adopted a~~ <sup>principle is followed</sup> similar ~~line~~ in the Turner-O'Connor area and ~~as we are laying out~~ <sup>likewise for</sup> the new areas ~~in~~ <sup>of</sup> Lyman and Dickson, ~~we are adopting the same~~ principle. That occasioned certain variations which were not in keeping with the geometrical pattern laid down by Griffin. ~~We~~ <sup>I</sup> adopted ~~exactly~~ <sup>next</sup> the same principle in ~~the~~ <sup>that</sup> Duntroon for which ~~we~~ <sup>there is now</sup> have an approved scheme. Red Hill, and ~~part of~~ <sup>I</sup> Red Hill-Narrabundah will follow the same principle by which means the avenues themselves ~~in our estimation~~ will perform their function of being main internal routes for traffic. It may interest you to know that we have carried



out several surveys relative to traffic. We carried one out on five consecutive days and five consecutive nights with ~~the~~ special permission of the Department, and ~~we~~ found where the traffic came from and where it went to and its intensity. From that we were able to judge, together with ~~our~~ other assessments and ~~counts~~ ~~and surveys~~ taken at various bridge crossings, what ~~we~~ could ~~be~~ anticipated in the future. We know from our surveys how many people travel to offices each day and what is the ratio between the population travelling and the number of cars used. It is rather amazing. At the moment there is one car to every 3.6 persons travelling to offices and we have allowed for one to every three in the future. ~~The amount of~~ Car registration in Canberra is also ~~increasing~~ <sup>A.C.T.</sup> ~~pretty heavy~~. At present ~~it is~~ <sup>private</sup> ~~about~~ one car to every ~~5.6~~ <sup>6.1</sup> persons. It has increased to that ratio since ~~1949~~ <sup>1949</sup> when it was one to 7.3. We are allowing on the average, for the future, one car to every house which is equivalent to one car to every four persons. The ~~figure~~ <sup>ratio</sup> might even ~~improve~~ <sup>exceed</sup> on that. There is a practice, which is only normal I suppose, for people to travel to their place of business at the latest time possible and in the shortest time possible. That is common everywhere. So ~~we~~ <sup>I</sup> have taken ~~what we~~ ~~call~~ the "20 minute peak" and from that ~~we have been able to assess~~ <sup>per hour</sup> what is the equivalent rate of traffic using an avenue or main line of communication ~~per hour~~. In one case it staggered ~~us~~ <sup>even</sup> and the engineers: ~~It is~~ <sup>it</sup> ~~between~~ <sup>the equivalent of</sup> 6000 and 8000 vehicles ~~an~~ <sup>per</sup> hour. When ~~you~~ begin to ~~Analyse~~ <sup>analyse</sup> that in traffic laneways and potentiality of carrying capacity of those laneways you begin to see what we ~~are~~ <sup>may</sup> ~~need~~ <sup>need</sup> ~~up against~~ in the future. In consequence ~~we~~ <sup>I</sup> feel justified in having varied the principle of layout so that you do not have all these intersections on to main avenues, with everybody crossing ad lib but ~~are really~~ <sup>preferably channelled</sup> ~~sent~~ <sup>can join</sup> to ~~points~~ at which they will ~~communicate~~ with the main lines of communication. They can move freely within their own area and touch the main line of communication at one point and go straight through. That is how ~~we~~ <sup>I</sup> have dealt with the problem. That principle of layout is instrumental in ~~our~~ <sup>my</sup> ~~recommendations~~ for the major variations in the plan, not for all

the variations because, of course, not all variations affect residential development or the framework of the plan. The framework was laid down, as you have probably read in the Griffin ~~Report~~ <sup>Report</sup> Explanatory, on certain principles. We have not departed from them. Mr. McLaren was asked a question about the density of development and said that I might possibly answer it. I have gone into that fairly closely and from ~~our~~ survey ~~we~~ found that the average density <sup>of</sup> is ten persons per acre nett. The definition of "persons per acre nett" is that when you calculate the area you <sup>include</sup> half ~~calculate~~ the width of the fronting roads. When we come to avenues, ~~of course, it upsets~~ ~~it~~ we only allow a quarter. ~~But we have found~~ in certain circumstances ~~that~~ the amount of ground devoted to lines of communication is as much as 38 percent, ~~which is pretty extensive~~. The prevalence in the plan was for 100 feet wide streets and you will notice that in some of the older areas there has been no departure from that.

SENATOR WOOD. - Is that in the residential areas?

MR. GIBSON. - <sup>Yes</sup> In <sup>which</sup> case you would have a road which is obviously a main line of communication within the area being 100 feet wide and also a street with probably as few as two actual frontages, one on either side, being also 100 feet wide and doing absolutely no work at all, as Mr. McLaren <sup>has</sup> said. You could stand in some streets and not count even 50 cars using them in the whole day. So ~~we~~ <sup>I</sup> looked into the matter and on ~~our~~ new layout schemes ~~we have~~ <sup>the</sup> a wide road <sup>no</sup> for <sup>the</sup> the main line of communication within and between areas which is 100 feet wide and the internal roads 70 feet wide and, where it does not cause any inconvenience to services, 60 foot wide. The 50 feet wide street is not commonly used in Canberra, except in what is known as the "Penountable Area" in Narrabundah, in which case the Department agreed to ~~accept~~ a revision of the standard ~~street~~ cross-section. Under the new system of layout, the road which will carry the most traffic ~~throughout the whole time~~ is obvious and ~~that~~ is the one which is ~~not~~ 100 feet wide. <sup>I</sup> We made a thorough investigation into density of population and submitted a report, <sup>in 1952</sup> to the Department which was endorsed in principle by the National Planning and Development Committee. The recommendations contained

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

therein were approved by the Minister on the 12th August, 1952. The main point ~~of the~~ recommendations <sup>for</sup> was the increase of residential density from 10 persons per acre nett to an average of 25 to 30. That does not mean that every part of Canberra is going to have a density of 25 to 30 because ~~we~~ <sup>this</sup> obviously cannot <sup>include</sup> touch the areas ~~that are~~ <sup>which</sup> already developed and <sup>will</sup> probably have a long life. What it has done ~~in effect~~ is to suggest the inclusion in ~~the~~ Canberra development of a reasonable number of flats. Steps are being taken today to develop ~~these~~ areas for flats.

SENATOR VINCENT - The density may only go as high as 25?

MR. GIBSON <sup>Yes.</sup> The density might average out at 20 to 25 but ~~was~~ <sup>recommended</sup> ~~suggested~~ 25 to 30 and pointed out <sup>how</sup> ~~that~~ it could be done.

SENATOR VINCENT - That policy has been accepted?

MR. GIBSON - <sup>Yes.</sup> The question of recreation areas has been raised. When ~~we~~ <sup>I</sup> submit a lay-out ~~we~~ <sup>vision is made</sup> provide for ~~the~~ inclusion of recreation areas in each and ~~every~~ neighbourhood. Yarralunla was mentioned. There is an oval partly constructed ~~there~~ and there are tennis courts. There is also provision in the scheme for hockey fields and ~~there will be~~ further provision north of Schlich Street which will not become available until later. There is an oval at Ainslie and there is duplication allowed for when ~~we build~~ <sup>as developed.</sup> the area in South Dickson and West Ainslie. In ~~the~~ north Braddon ~~area~~ <sup>is very close to the Ainslie designation or Ainslie sub-division.</sup> which ~~is very close to the Ainslie designation or Ainslie sub-division.~~ there is <sup>provision</sup> provisional use of some areas for recreation. We ~~obviously~~ <sup>these</sup> will not ~~delete~~ <sup>be abolished</sup> these without making some alternative provision. When Duntroon is developed, there will also be recreation areas provided. Narrabundah and Griffith have recreation areas now. Red Hill will have its own provision ~~also.~~

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

SENATOR WOOD - What is your view of the plan of Canberra? Do you like the geometrical design?

MR. GIBSON - I think that the ornamental lay-out and the geometrical pattern was carried to excess in the residential areas. ~~Of course~~ The fact that Canberra was intended as an administrative capital made it desirable to include in the plan ornamental features which probably would not be found in most cities.

SENATOR WOOD - The roads which are shown as radiating in geometrical pattern from the future Parliament House have been designed in accordance with an old style of planning which is now out of date?

MR. GIBSON - Yes. Most of the traffic now enters Canberra from the north side. In earlier days, before the construction of the road from Collector, most of the traffic entered Canberra from Queanbeyan. Now, on entering the city, one meets a fair-sized roundabout ~~which is~~ known as London Circuit from which it is possible to distribute; one then crosses to the south side and meets another roundabout ~~which is~~ known as State Circle and distribution also takes place from that. Personally, I have found no difficulty in going around Canberra. There are many landmarks such as Black Mountain, Ainslie and Red Hill.

SENATOR WILKINSON - But they cannot be seen at night.

MR. GIBSON - Ainslie has a beacon on it. I think that some of the difficulty may arise from the fact that some of the <sup>main</sup> lines of communication are not complete.

SENATOR WOOD - Do you think that it would be better to design Canberra on the grid system, following the contours?

MR. GIBSON - Yes - provided that the main theme and the main lines of communication are maintained. It is no use simply constructing a series of roads which follow contours. Our main objective now is to have geometrical main lines in which we "in-fill" on the contours.

SENATOR WOOD - It seems to me that the original design would have been more suitable if Canberra had been a level piece of land.

MR. GIBSON - I think that you will find that most of the main

lines have a focus at the end, for a purpose.

SENATOR WOOD - Presumably, an effort has been made to follow the design of Washington a little. But in view of the proportion of the dimensions of the Mall to the height of the buildings in Washington, don't you think that the length of the Mall and the other avenues is too long and that there is a prospect of the buildings being too low?

MR. GIBSON - Definitely. The <sup>Plan</sup> ~~Sketch~~ of Canberra on paper and its realisation in the third dimension are two different things.

SENATOR WOOD - There appears to be no provision for a ring road in the plan of Canberra?

MR. GIBSON - <sup>g</sup> We have provided for a ring road. Portions of it have already been constructed, although <sup>the significance is</sup> ~~they are~~ not yet discernable. It is not shown <sup>as complete</sup> on ~~any~~ of the plans with which the committee has been furnished. I shall provide the committee with a plan showing the outer roads.

SENATOR WOOD - Do you consider that 200 feet is too wide for the avenues?

MR. GIBSON - No. One has to bear in mind the manner in which the avenues can be used. The centre plantations down the avenues will not have to be retained when traffic increases.

SENATOR WOOD - In other words, you can utilise the greater part of the avenues for beautification at present, and then reduce the width of the plantations when traffic increases?

MR. GIBSON - Yes.

SENATOR WOOD - Then that explanation overcomes Mr. McLaren's objection to the width of the avenues?

MR. GIBSON - Yes. Griffin made sketches showing how the avenues could be used. The scheme that has been adopted allows for all services to be underneath the verge on either side and not underneath the carriageway. An avenue, uninterrupted by intersections or junctions, provides free movement. By reducing the number of intersections the efficiency of the avenue can be increased.

SENATOR WOOD - Your objective is to eliminate as many intersections as possible?

MR. GIBSON - Yes.

SENATOR WOOD - You mentioned 100 ft. frontages for homes. Have you considered adopting 66 ft. frontages?

MR. GIBSON - I do not know that I referred to 100 ft. frontages. I mentioned a width of 100 feet in relation to streets. Our subdivisions range from 50 ft. frontages to 80 ft. frontages. In the survey that ~~was~~<sup>was</sup> conducted, we found that a building block of 6,000 square feet was not adequate for all requirements but was adequate for many requirements. We have a percentage of 6,000 sq. ft. blocks with 50 ft. frontages. We have other blocks of 7,200 sq. ft. and others of 7,500, 8,500 and 9,000 sq. ft. In 19<sup>4</sup>~~17~~ the average building block in Canberra was about 12,5<sup>375</sup>~~00~~ sq. ft. The average block is now about 8,000 sq. ft.

SENATOR WOOD - And the frontages range from 50 ft. to 80 ft.?

MR. GIBSON - Yes. ~~The only~~ <sup>frontages</sup> developed 100 ft. frontages are along Northbourne Avenue.

SENATOR WOOD - I have noticed some flats near Reid.

MR. GIBSON - They are suburban-type, two-storey flats.

SENATOR WOOD - Instead of having, say, 20 residences on a five acre block, have you considered erecting a central block of flats and using all the ground as a recreation garden?

MR. GIBSON - No. But we have provided areas for suburban-type flats at O'Connor, Duntroon, Yarralumla, Deakin and Red Hill.

(MR. GIBSON) continuing

We do not exactly <sup>plan</sup> ~~see~~ recreation areas immediately alongside the buildings.

SENATOR WOOD: I do not mean tennis courts and so on. I mean areas where children can play and be off the road?

MR. GIBSON: We have found that only one of the areas in Canberra ~~that have been~~ set aside as children's playgrounds is used to any degree. That is the one near the Griffith shopping centre. You will find around that area ~~that some of the houses are~~ of two stories and ~~that there is~~ also some "group" development. But where playgrounds are in areas predominantly occupied by single storey ~~single~~ unit dwellings, they are not being used.

SENATOR WOOD: That is because there are back yards?

MR. GIBSON: Yes. It is also something that you cannot control. Children do not always like to play in one place.

SENATOR VINCENT: There is a fascination in playing in the streets?

MR. GIBSON: Yes.

SENATOR WOOD: I find that where there are reasonably level backyards there is a tendency for children to play in them and not to go to the community playgrounds. That probably accounts for it to a great extent?

MR. GIBSON: Yes.

SENATOR WOOD: What is your own feeling about the lakes scheme?

MR. GIBSON: May I preface my remarks by saying that I was not asked at any time my opinion of the lake deletions. I think the elimination of East Lake is no loss. It is a very extensive area and as Mr. McLaren has said, it is being used for agricultural and other purposes at the moment. There is nothing wrong with that. It could not be used for much else. It cannot be built on unless there is some engineering miracle to hold back the water. I am not an engineer and I would not like to express an opinion on that. The deletion of West Lake was ~~what~~

~~you might call~~ de facto when I first knew about it. I suggest it could be used for other purposes such as recreation. It would also be an extensive area. I think if we have ~~one~~ three ornamental basins in the centre as a complementary feature to the formal layout fronting them, in other words the Parliamentary "triangle" ~~and areas on either side~~, we will be doing pretty well. The overall distance from the eastern edge of east basin to the western edge of west basin will be something like ~~2.34~~<sup>2.4</sup> miles.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is the total area of those basins?

MR. GIBSON: I could find that out for you. It would run into thousands of acres.

SENATOR WOOD: The proposed lakes are really the only piece of ornamental organic planning in the whole of the plan. You are in favour of the dropping of the major portion of this scheme, leaving only what you call the three basins?

MR. GIBSON: I think that would satisfy the formality of the Canberra Plan.

SENATOR WOOD: Recognising the fact that what Canberra needs is a water feature?

MR. GIBSON: Quite, and also bearing in mind that we could not use the areas <sup>previously</sup> designated as East Lake and West Lake for building purposes.

SENATOR WOOD: Let me put it this way: If the lakes scheme were established as Burley Griffin envisaged it do you not agree that it would be an outstanding feature of Canberra?

MR. GIBSON: It would be a feature but I think it would also throw everything else out of scale.

SENATOR WOOD: Even in a city of 300,000 people?

MR. GIBSON: It is not population that is going to enhance these features. It is physical surroundings. You could have the entire population of Australia in Canberra but that would still not justify the existence of the lakes. Consider for instance Sydney Harbour. It has great length and is wide. But it also has ~~very~~ steeply rising hills on each side of it which give a third dimension, ~~if I may use that term~~, to the expanse of water.



We have not that dimension here with the exception of Black Mountain. Anywhere else there are gentle slopes. There is no relationship as you might have for instance in Norwegian fjords. There is no balance.

SENATOR WOOD: What about the recreational aspect of the lakes? If we are to expect people to come to live in Canberra the city must be made attractive to them. Do you not think that the establishment of the lakes would be a great asset to the community life?

MR. GIBSON: Do you mean boating?

SENATOR WOOD: And fishing?

MR. GIBSON: I think the fishing aspect would have to be qualified to some extent although it is true that the lakes could be stocked. I point out however that the suggested 120 yard wide ribbon of water would be as wide as the <sup>River</sup> Yarra at certain parts.

SENATOR WOOD: You would not think of the Yarra from the National Capital point of view. I am trying to envisage the National Capital and I believe that it must have a water frontage. The scheme would have to be in keeping with the layout of this city and its buildings?

MR. GIBSON: If you envisage buildings on the foreshores I still maintain that those buildings would have to be of sufficient proportions to be set off by the lake, and to set off the lake.

SENATOR WOOD: Would you not envisage a drive-way around the lakes?

MR. GIBSON: Yes, even Burley Griffin envisaged an hundred-foot drive-way around the ~~lake~~ foreshores.

SENATOR WOOD: The lakes could be quite a feature of Canberra life. This city is far from the coast and we have to attract people from the coast to work and live in Canberra.

THE CLAIRMAN: The point is whether the water will be disproportionate.

MR. GIBSON: That is what I feel. There will still be a large expanse of water in the three central basins. I am certainly not worried about the deletion of East Lake. West Lake is still

open to question.

THE CHAIRMAN: You think that the ribbon of water along with the three central basins will be sufficient?

MR. GIBSON: I think Canberra would have a very good aquatic surrounding.

THE CHAIRMAN. - I do not think there is much dispute about the deletion of East Lake.

SENATOR WOOD. - I do not know about that. After all the Lakes scheme was a feature of the original plan. It is, as I have said, the only piece of ornamental organic planning in the city. We are now seeing it whittled away.

SENATOR VINCENT. - It might look all right from an aeroplane, but East Lake would hardly be seen from the city itself. It would be like a salt lake.

THE CHAIRMAN. - We have been given Mr. Gibson's opinion, we can ask similar questions of other witnesses who have opinions to offer on this matter.

MR. GIBSON. - It might be appropriate if I let the Committee have some photographs of Canberra during flood periods.

THE CHAIRMAN. - We would be glad to have them.

SENATOR WOOD. - There seems to be a big vacuum in the centre of Canberra consisting of undeveloped land. Has any thought been given recently to filling in those areas?

MR. GIBSON. - ~~I said in my talk to the Town Planning Conference that, in my opinion, it was wasteful and uneconomic in layout and socially starved.~~ We have given some thought to the planning of the internal areas. I put it this way: Should we <sup>build</sup> ~~continue with~~ little houses in the centre of the city until such time as we are prepared to do what I consider to be the right thing in those areas? I think it is a vacuum which we must put up with until somebody is prepared to come along in perhaps 15, or 20 years' time and build the internal areas up for us. We have certainly given thought to the matter.

SENATOR WOOD. - Is there some regulation which compels the erection of squat looking buildings or is that a matter of economy?

MR. GIBSON. - The height limit on buildings is two storeys above ground level, <sup>which only</sup> ~~that can~~ be increased with the <sup>permission</sup> ~~approval~~ of the Minister.

SENATOR WOOD. -- When was that restriction imposed?

MR. GIBSON. - I should say ~~quite a long time ago.~~ <sup>in 1924.</sup>

SENATOR WOOD. - Has any move been made to have that altered?

MR. GIBSON. - None.

SENATOR WOOD. - Unless that limit is raised it will not be possible to develop the features necessary to extract any worth from the plan. Is that correct?

MR. GIBSON. - At the cost of building today even two storeys is a burden on some private developers.

SENATOR WOOD. - You compel them to go to two storeys?

MR. GIBSON. - Two storeys is the maximum <sup>height</sup> ~~limit~~ permitted <sup>by regulation</sup>. In ~~some~~ <sup>the</sup> commercial areas, ~~particularly~~ around City in the 'new' Brisbane Buildings and Newcastle Buildings the stipulation on the lease ~~is both a maximum and minimum height of two storeys.~~ <sup>is that</sup> In other words lessees are obliged to build two-storeys buildings. <sup>in height.</sup>

SENATOR WOOD. - I think it is wrong to have a minimum. I think Canberra needs more height in its buildings. I have in mind particularly Government buildings.

MR. GIBSON. - The new Administrative Building is five storeys above ground level. It is possible that any new hotels may be three storeys.

(continued on page 86)

SENATOR WOOD. - There is a street at the back of the "Canberra Times" office in which the trees are all of the same type. The effect is very striking.

MR. GIBSON. - That is Torrens Street, Braddon. They are pin oaks.

SENATOR WOOD. - Do not you think that, instead of alternating or mixing the trees in an avenue, it would be better to have only one type of tree in one avenue, so that you could get a better mass effect? The effect in Torrens Street is particularly striking.

MR. GIBSON. - The view along that street is most interesting all through the year. The pin-oak is peculiar in that it retains its old leaves until they are pushed off by the new growth.

SENATOR WOOD. - The striking effect in Torrens Street is due to the fact that all the trees are of the same kind?

MR. GIBSON. - It is the unified effect that is striking. You will find that many streets are planted with trees of only one type and that in other streets there is, for instance, a mixture of plum and pine. However, I think the matter of tree-planting in streets is the <sup>concern</sup> prerogative of the Superintendent of Parks & Gardens. ~~We~~ I have no control over it.

THE CHAIRMAN. - I should like to get a final opinion about this plan and what we can do about it. Do you think that, the plan being there, we have got to accept it and allow modification by the officers concerned with it; or do you think it would be worth while to ask a planner, possibly one of world-wide repute, to look at it and say whether it is good enough or whether it should be profoundly modified?

MR. GIBSON. - My own view is that we should leave the framework as it stands - it is a functional framework - and modify in the light of experience, as we are doing, the lines of communication on to that framework.

THE CHAIRMAN. - This is a very important matter on which we shall have to make up our minds at some stage. You do not think it will be worth while to try to break the framework by getting another planner in?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

MR. GIBSON - No, I do not think so.

THE CHAIRMAN. - What is your own opinion of Walter Burley Griffin? I have read a great deal about him. The impression I have gained is that some of the basic ideas on which he based his plan were rather personal, rather subjective. They did not seem to have much to do with the interests of this city.

MR. GIBSON. - I have read his analysis of what he conceived to be the principal functions <sup>of Canberra.</sup> To me, his split-up seems fairly sound. I think we shall see it happen in the sense that ~~at any time~~ we shall have some form of authoritative control dealing with Canberra only. It may be significant that various sections of the Department of the Interior are ~~not going to be housed in the new administrative building.~~ <sup>being transferred to</sup> I should like to leave the question of the possible future administration of Canberra to someone who can give you further information on it, but ~~as a matter of fact~~ I have been asked by the Assistant Secretary, Planning and Development, ~~who is my immediate chief,~~ to consider an area around Civic or City for the provision of, ~~say,~~ office space for those departments concerned principally with Canberra. I think you will find in the analysis of Griffin's functions that he ~~did~~ provides for that. When I first came to Canberra, I was somewhat more critical of the Griffin lay-out than I am today, after I have had ~~five or~~ <sup>nearly</sup> six years opportunity to study it intimately. My own conclusion is that we should leave the frame-work as it is and modify where necessary.

THE CHAIRMAN. - What modifications do you consider are necessary to prevent through traffic, main road traffic, from disturbing the city?

MR. GIBSON. - <sup>I recommended amendments</sup> We have ~~taken~~ certain steps in relation to the main avenue entrance into Canberra. Moving from the north southwards, there is an intersection <sup>known as</sup> which ~~we call~~ the MacArthur-Northbourne intersection. In the original Griffin plan, it was <sup>formed</sup> by David Street, MacArthur Avenue, Wattle Street, Northbourne Avenue, Majura Avenue, Limestone Avenue and again Northbourne Avenue. That was a star-shaped intersection. <sup>It has been</sup> ~~We have modified that~~ and the intersection ~~is~~ reduced to MacArthur and Northbourne Avenues.

The remaining four are turned into MacArthur Avenue before meeting the main avenue, so we have minimised the hazard <sup>to reduced</sup> at that point. ~~We~~ <sup>g</sup> have found on analysis that although Griffin may have conceived it as an important intersection, not only for vehicular traffic but also for commercial purposes, there is no valid reason today to have a commercial centre at that point, having regard to present modes of transport and transit. It is only a mile and a <sup>quarter</sup> ~~half~~ from Civic, and there is no point in trying to duplicate.

Between MacArthur Avenue and Girrawheen Street, which is south of Haig Park, ~~we have again reduced~~ the number of intersections <sup>is</sup> ~~we have~~ <sup>by</sup> eliminated <sup>ing</sup> Honty Street, <sup>McLemon</sup> Caspary Street, Tjong Street, Karuah <sup>Lowanna street.</sup> and another street the name of which I forget. We have ~~reduced~~ <sup>reduced</sup> the number of intersections ~~there~~ <sup>on the same principle that I</sup> mentioned earlier.

<sup>At</sup> ~~Coming to~~ Civic itself, ~~we have zoned~~ the commercial area <sup>is zoned to one side of</sup> away from the main avenue: <sup>it</sup> ~~it~~ was originally astride the <sup>this</sup> ~~main~~ avenue. ~~We have now zoned~~ <sup>is zoned</sup> the eastern side for predominantly commercial purposes. ~~There~~ <sup>is</sup> the new Brisbane Building, and the new Newcastle Building and possibly we shall get Perth Building later. ~~As I say,~~ <sup>is</sup> we have ~~zoned~~ the eastern side for predominantly commercial purposes. The western side is predominantly professional, clubs, societies, etc. ~~That is the step we have taken there.~~

The main line of communication, ~~as I say,~~ <sup>at Mullum Avenue</sup> is that ~~one~~. At the moment it carries both heavy and light traffic. With the <sup>remember</sup> ~~know~~ growth of the city, heavy traffic is increasing. I do not know the exact figures for what comes in by rail and what comes in by road, but I do know that road transport is increasing. Since the industrial area was zoned on the southern side, in contrast with Griffin's original conception of it, <sup>in Dickson</sup> on the northern side, ~~we~~ <sup>g</sup> have suggested to the Department that ultimate provision should be made for a road which would leave the Federal Highway at a point about four or five miles north of Civic, <sup>traverse</sup> ~~move on~~ the western <sup>side</sup> ~~side~~ of the <sup>mountain</sup> ~~slopes~~, the western <sup>side</sup> ~~side~~ of Ainslie <sup>mountain</sup> ~~slopes~~, eventually <sup>passing</sup> ~~come~~ through ~~the eastern side of~~ Duntroon and <sup>thence</sup> ~~go straight through to the~~ industrial area, or alongside the industrial area, with a connection

across Canberra ~~Avenue~~ <sup>via</sup> to join Jerrabombie Avenue and the road to Cooma. That is what ~~we~~ <sup>I</sup> call ~~an~~ <sup>a</sup> future internal by-pass. That is on the city side of Ainslie, but on the eastern side of the city. That is included in ~~any~~ forward planning.

On the western side, ~~we~~ <sup>I</sup> do not ~~expect~~ <sup>force</sup> quite so much traffic from the Yass-Wagga district, but should that wish to go south, it could pass ~~over~~ from the Yass road, above the area ~~set~~ <sup>leased</sup> aside for the Ywani Golf Club, and join the ~~road I have~~ <sup>the pass</sup> mentioned. There is another ~~one~~ <sup>provision for</sup> on the western side, branching off from the Yass road, which would travel ~~on~~ <sup>using</sup> the eastern slopes of Black Mountain and the ridge to the north ~~of it~~ and eventually ~~drop down into~~ <sup>reaching</sup> the city. We are making provision for ~~these alternative routes~~ <sup>via University Avenue</sup> which, in their turn, in future could ~~receive~~ <sup>provide for</sup> heavier traffic and minimise its effect on the centre of the city.

THE CHAIRMAN. - How far has the introduction of an aerodrome interfered with the original plan? Going to and from the aerodrome, I have the feeling that the roads could easily become inadequate.

MR. GIBSON. - At present there are two means of access to the aerodrome from the city. One is what we call the "back road," which passes the Australian War Memorial, travels <sup>north of the AMC</sup> over the back, eventually comes down <sup>to</sup> near Woolshed Creek and from there goes to the aerodrome. That is by far the easiest road. The other road, which was in use before that one, goes through the ~~Dunroon~~ <sup>Royal</sup> Military College. Contrary to some opinions that have been expressed that ~~road~~ <sup>to</sup> is not a private road. I gave the following evidence to the Public Works Committee on the point -

On the 7th November, 1935, scheduled commercial flights first used the aerodrome constructed at Pillago. The most used road of access is through land occupied by the Royal Military College, Dunroon, being the shortest and most convenient route of 3.1 miles, via King's Avenue to Parliament House. Although certain steps were taken in 1952 and instructions issued to departmental truck drivers to use the newly sealed road via the Australian War Memorial, the road via the Royal Military College is not a private road".

I am asked how the aerodrome affects the plan. We have envisaged that in future we may be able to . . . by-pass the Royal Military College and ~~set~~ <sup>cross</sup> to the south side, which would give a fairly direct route to Parliament House and the southern side of Canberra.

MR. GIBSON (continuing) - The one at the moment via the "back road" gives you a very direct ~~line of~~ access into Civic Centre and other parts of the northern side. We do not visualise that it will create any difficulties in the future.

THE CHAIRMAN - Is the provision of buildings within the college grounds entirely the function of the Commandant and the Military authorities or do you come into it?

MR. GIBSON - ~~I do not come into~~ Anything that deals with the provision of buildings ~~anywhere~~ *is not my function*.

THE CHAIRMAN - But does the National Planning and Development Committee or the Advisory Council come into it?

MR. GIBSON - We do not do any planning within the ~~Military~~ College area.

THE CHAIRMAN - It is exclusively the function of the college?

MR. GIBSON - I should not like to say. Other witnesses may be able to help you there.

SENATOR BENN - You have mentioned the intensity of traffic in Canberra at certain points at certain times. Have you anything in mind that would assist in obviating that intensity? My own opinion is that that would be local traffic proceeding to a certain place to carry out a certain purpose and that after that traffic had passed the intensity would fall away.

MR. GIBSON - Quite. The obviating of it is a matter of design and methods of traffic control. We have not found it necessary, so far, to ~~include~~ *provide* traffic control lights in Canberra. You will find that the greatest intensity of traffic is to and from the various places of work, namely the Barton Offices, East Block, West Block and sometimes Parliament House. There are sufficient means of disposing of that traffic on the southern side and we envisage in future that the Commonwealth Bridge in the form in which it is to be constructed will be adequate in width, supplemented by a bridge at Kings Avenue and a bridge at Acton to distribute the traffic northwards. There is no necessity for bridges as far as the southern side is concerned but there is a necessity for the completion of State Circle. As regards traffic moving to the west, we envisage at least three lines of



communication in lieu of the present one. <sup>o</sup> To visualise distribution rather than canalization into one route.

The Committee adjourned.

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT  
OF CANBERRA.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

Taken at Canberra

THURSDAY, 9th December, 1954.

PRESENT:

The Chairman (Senator McCallum)

Senator Benn Senator Tangney

Senator Hannaford Senator Vincent

Senator Ryan

TREVOR RICHARD STEPHEN GIBSON, Chief Town Planner, Department of the Interior, Canberra, further examined.

THE CHAIRMAN. - When our proceedings concluded yesterday we were questioning you about Duntroon. We were asking who was responsible for the buildings there and whether the area was within the city. We looked at Duntroon this morning and we came to the conclusion that it was within the city boundaries but completely under the control of the Commandant except for the road that goes through it. Is that the position?

MR. GIBSON. - I think in reply to a similar question yesterday I said it might be well to refer that matter to another witness, probably Mr. Rogers. I do not have anything to do with development matters.

THE CHAIRMAN. - We will make certain about it later. There is one point, however, on which you might be able to help us. Are any of the matters concerned with the Duntroon buildings ever referred to you?

MR. GIBSON. - No.

THE CHAIRMAN. - We spoke yesterday of playgrounds and parklands. I understand that no such areas are reserved in perpetuity, and that it is open to the Administration to alienate any of the lands at present used as parks?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

MR. GIBSON. - I suggest that you might refer that question also to Mr. Rogers, <sup>who</sup> ~~he~~ is Assistant Secretary, Planning and Development.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Do you know what is intended to be done eventually with the Causeway and Westlake areas that we looked at this morning?

MR. GIBSON. - I do not know the fate of the buildings, in other words, the time <sup>when</sup> ~~at which~~ they will be demolished. Bearing in mind that there is a shortage of houses I do not think it is the time to demolish houses. As regards the area occupied by the Causeway houses, ~~we~~ <sup>we</sup> have considered that in our zoning plan for Canberra's expansion as probably a warehouse area or minor industrial area. We regard the Westlake cottage area as a potential residential area of better quality.

THE CHAIRMAN. - There was some discussion this morning about the size of allotments. Do you think that, in general, the size of building allotments in the residential areas is too large?

MR. GIBSON. - I mentioned yesterday that, in the past, the sub-divisions had been governed by a reluctance to change any of the sections as laid down by the road pattern of the original <sup>accepted</sup> ~~City~~ plan. <sup>we</sup> ~~We found that~~ <sup>280-485</sup> Some of those sections had a depth of ~~over 300~~ feet from one street to the other. ~~In some cases it was as much as 350 feet.~~ <sup>we</sup> ~~The~~ <sup>developed</sup> Frontages that had been ~~allowed~~ <sup>varied</sup> somewhere between <sup>100</sup> ~~80~~ feet and <sup>2</sup> ~~300~~ feet. <sup>12,375</sup> In ~~about~~ <sup>4</sup> 1917 the average block area was ~~about 12,750~~ square feet. <sup>3</sup> ~~We~~ reviewed that in 1952 and suggested a reduction. I could summarise the position by giving the Committee a list of sub-divisions done between 1951 and the middle of 1953. A total of 1,405 sites were taken. Of those, two percent, or 30, had 50ft frontages and an area of 6,000 square ft; 4 percent, or 156, had 55 ft frontages and an area of 6,400 square ft; 20 percent or 289 had 60ft frontages and an area of 7,200 square ft; 48 percent or 678, had 65 ft frontages and an area of 7,700 square ft; 16 percent or 204, had 70 ft frontages and an area of 8,650 square ft and three percent, or 48 had 75 ft frontages and an area of 8,650 square ft. In other words the mean, the 48 percent, had <sup>5</sup> 65 ft frontages and an average area of 7,700 square ft per block.

MR. GIBSON - I consider 60 feet to be a reasonable frontage. It enables a person to design a reasonable house. I <sup>prefer</sup> 60 feet in preference <sup>to</sup> ~~to the prevailing~~ shall I say? 50 foot, which does constrict it a bit. ~~But~~ Although I have suggested 60 feet, we are not getting too many of those; <sup>it</sup> is more like 65 feet. That seems to be more common today - a 65 ft. frontage where the topography permits. ~~We~~ take all those things into account.

THE CHAIRMAN - You could probably tell us a few things about the administrative triangle. What is to be the immediate view in front of the existing Parliament House?

MR. GIBSON - You can ~~pick up~~ <sup>see</sup> the Australian War Memorial in the distance, forming the terminal of Griffin's "Land Axis." There will be no obstructions between those two points.

THE CHAIRMAN - What do you think of ~~that~~ <sup>the King George V</sup> Memorial? Do you think it is put in the right place?

MR. GIBSON - Having regard to the siting of the ~~future~~ <sup>parliament</sup> Parliament House, I think ~~so~~ <sup>yes</sup>.

THE CHAIRMAN - Was that taken into consideration?

MR. GIBSON - I would not know.

THE CHAIRMAN - I suppose you would not like to express any opinion on the Memorial itself?

MR. GIBSON - No. That is ~~a little bit of~~ professional etiquette that I should like to observe.

THE CHAIRMAN - I presume that would be a matter for a sculptor to determine?

MR. GIBSON - ~~It was designed by a fairly well known sculptor, and a fairly well known architect. I think it was designed by the late Raynor Hoff; the monument itself being to a design won in competition by a fairly well known architect, Harry Baskett, of Sydney.~~ <sup>The sculpture was executed by a</sup>

SENATOR VINCENT - An artist of no mean ability.

THE CHAIRMAN - I would not for one instant deride him. I know he has done some magnificent work. It may be that I am prejudiced against the Memorial, largely because of its position. What other administrative buildings can we expect to have?

MR. GIBSON - I visualise another Administrative Building, diametrically opposite the present one, relative to the "Land Axis".

SENATE CANCELLER COMMITTEE

THE CHAIRMAN - Probably it would be of roughly the same size?

MR. GIBSON - I <sup>would think</sup> ~~gather~~ so.

THE CHAIRMAN - If you had two such buildings, roughly how many public servants would you get in them?

MR. GIBSON - The present building is designed for an initial population of 2,090 and an ultimate population of, <sup>about</sup> ~~I think,~~ 3,000.

THE CHAIRMAN - That is in one building?

MR. GIBSON - Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN - Do you think this building, Parliament House, would be suitable for an administrative building?

MR. GIBSON - I imagine so, with internal alterations. It is a pretty big financial asset at the moment.

THE CHAIRMAN - I understand that most public servants in Canberra travel by car?

MR. GIBSON - Most.

THE CHAIRMAN - Is there in hand a plan for the provision of sufficient parking arrangements for the public servants who will use those buildings?

MR. GIBSON - Yes. <sup>g</sup> We have ~~prepared~~ submitted to the department and have had approved in principle by the Planning Committee, a design for ground level parking around the new <sup>Building</sup> Administrative ~~Block~~. As I mentioned before, <sup>it is</sup> we ~~have~~ estimated that, when the building is filled to capacity, we ~~shall need~~ one thousand spaces <sup>will be needed</sup>.

THE CHAIRMAN - You might have more cars than.

MR. GIBSON - That <sup>estimation</sup> calculation allows for a <sup>an</sup> ~~steady~~ increase from one car to every 3.6 office people to one car to every 3, and also, above that, for a 20% increase over the years.

THE CHAIRMAN - The space between those two buildings will remain as lawn; is that the present intention?

MR. GIBSON - I imagine so. We are regarding that as the central mall for Canberra. <sup>1/2</sup> We have some sketch designs which <sup>we'll</sup> ~~we have~~ discussed with the Planning Committee for the whole of the Parliamentary "triangle."

THE CHAIRMAN - When the water basins are created, will the central water basin be between this building and the War Memorial?

MR. GIBSON - Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN - From here to the War Memorial there will be nothing but such streets as are necessary, lawns and the water basin?

MR. GIBSON - Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN - There is a hill near Civic Centre. What did Griffin plan to do with that?

MR. GIBSON - That hill is called City Hill ~~today~~, but ~~it~~ is actually Vernon "trig", named after one of the early surveyors. The hill itself is called Vernon.

SENATOR HANNAFORD - Trig, did you say?

MR. GIBSON - Yes, "trig station." <sup>As far as we can figure from Griffin's writings, he did imagine ~~that~~ <sup>the hill</sup> as a site for a City Hall, but we do not know whether ~~that City Hall is going~~ <sup>the Hall would</sup> to be purely ceremonial, or functional from the point of view of city management.</sup>

THE CHAIRMAN - That will depend on whether we alter the method of government of the city?

MR. GIBSON - Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN - There is no proposal to cut a road through the hill or do anything like that with it?

MR. GIBSON - The ~~Town~~ <sup>Town</sup> Planning Section has considered a means of reaching Commonwealth Avenue from Northbourne Avenue by the shortest route. There are two means: One is to travel slightly to the west, and the other is to carve into the hill. When I say "carve into", I mean tunnel through.

THE CHAIRMAN - To the north again, separating O'Connor and Turner, there is a big line of trees.

MR. GIBSON - Haig Park.

THE CHAIRMAN - Is there any intention to alter it?

MR. GIBSON - I have no knowledge of any intention to alter it. It is a wind break. It is most useful for that purpose. I suggest that when you take evidence from the Superintendent of Parks and Gardens, you ask him to tell you the percentage by which wind pressures in Canberra have been reduced through planting. It is a considerable reduction.

THE CHAIRMAN - Coming to the question of tourist attractions, has your department any relationship with the arrangements for the

Tourist Camp at <sup>O'boon</sup> ~~Dunbar~~?

MR. GIBSON - From an advertisement I saw recently, I believe ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> present tourist camp at Black Mountain has been leased, ~~but~~ <sup>but</sup> for what ~~duration I do not know.~~ <sup>twenty-five years from 1st October, 1954.</sup> Mr. Rogers could tell you the terms of the lease of the camp.

THE CHAIRMAN - Under whom do tourist arrangements come?

MR. GIBSON - There is a Canberra Tourist Bureau, the Director of which is Mr. Dunbar. You will see some statistics of the Bureau's activities in the little booklet that I have handed to the <sup>Committee</sup> Secretary.

THE CHAIRMAN - Do you think satisfactory arrangements have been made in respect of the places within the city area that attract tourists? I refer in particular to access roads and things like that. Tourists like to go to Red Hill, Mount Pleasant and Mount Ainslie.

MR. GIBSON - There is a scheme in mind for having a <sup>one-way</sup> road down from Red Hill. At the present time, all traffic goes up and down on one road. There is an idea in mind for an outlet at the southern end, probably <sup>connecting with</sup> ~~delivering on to~~ Flinders Way or thereabouts. That would make things much easier. As for Russell <sup>"trig"</sup> ~~Hill~~ or (Mount Pleasant), <sup>there is</sup> ~~we have~~ a scheme in mind, in the development of Duntroon, of providing access from Constitution Avenue ~~straight up~~ to that point. These are the two main look-outs. To date, nobody has considered the peak of Black Mountain as a look-out point because, except at certain times of the day, when the sun is ~~absolutely~~ behind you, it would not be of much value.

THE CHAIRMAN - The value of those mountains I have mentioned is mainly scenic. There is no proposal to cut the timber or to alter them in any way, is there?

SENATE CAMBERLA COMMITTEE

MR. GIBSON: Not to my knowledge: As a matter of fact, I ~~think that the Superintendent of Parks and Gardens would tell you whether or not that a lot of it was specially planted.~~

THE CHAIRMAN: The original plan provides for an aquarium and zoological gardens. Has any step been taken regarding provision of them?

MR. GIBSON: ~~Understand that~~ <sup>was in May, 1951</sup> A request has been made to the Department of Works to investigate the establishment of an aquarium. <sup>pond.</sup> ~~The aquarium pond is to be at the north western end of the Molonglo Basin near Constitution Avenue.~~

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there actually a patch of water there now?

MR. GIBSON: No, there <sup>only</sup> is a physical depression ~~there~~. It is <sup>near</sup> not very far distant from the olympic standard swimming pool ~~that is now under construction.~~ <sup>layout was prepared and</sup> We have prepared designs and a lot of planning is <sup>proceeding in</sup> ~~going on~~ for Central Park to the west ~~of that~~.

THE CHAIRMAN: How big is Central Park to be?

MR. GIBSON: <sup>about forty acres</sup> I cannot give you the acreage off hand.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will it have water on three sides when the plan is carried out?

MR. GIBSON: I <sup>we</sup> should say on two sides ~~at least~~.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you any ideas on the ultimate government of this city?

MR. GIBSON: I <sup>we</sup> should ~~leave~~ <sup>like to</sup> leave that to some other witness.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do the powers of the National Capital Planning and Development Committee and the Advisory Council come within your scope?

MR. GIBSON: There are two bodies. As Mr. McLaren has already told you the National Capital Planning and Development Committee is an advisory body set up <sup>in pursuance of provisions of the National Capital Development Ordinance 1938-</sup> ~~by ordinance.~~ As ~~you have probably heard,~~ the Chairman is Mr. B. J. Waterhouse of Sydney.

THE CHAIRMAN: I should like to ask you some questions about the general architecture of this city and how we may be able to get information regarding architecture.



Would you like to volunteer any opinion of your own on architecture before I ask you some definite questions?

MR. GIBSON: Not from a professional point of view. I have my own personal views on some of the buildings in Canberra. In England before the war an attempt was made to set up an ~~an~~ <sup>appointed by</sup> Advisory Committee of the Royal Institute of British Architects ~~more or less as a panel of judges~~ <sup>to</sup> ~~to~~ <sup>as</sup> plans submitted to the London County Council and in the end it became rather vicious in the sense that one architect might have been sitting on the panel judging his friends' designs. My thought about the matter is that provided the building, of whatever class it may be, is reasonably harmonious with its surroundings and has a neighbourly atmosphere towards other buildings in the immediate surroundings it is satisfactory as far as we can go unless we become completely dictatorial in our approach.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you allow bodies unconnected with the Government reasonable freedom in relation to the design of large buildings and similar freedom in connection with domestic architecture?

MR. GIBSON: Up to the point that I have suggested, provided that such a building is harmonious with its surroundings and is neighbourly - in other words, provided it does not try to outstrip the building next door.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: Or come into conflict with it?

MR. GIBSON: That is so.

THE CHAIRMAN: You do not think that we should lay down rules that the architecture must be either modern architecture or period architecture?

MR. GIBSON: No. Some people like a certain kind of building and other people do not. It has been that way from the time that <sup>of</sup> the various architectural styles began to ~~tail-out~~ <sup>class</sup> in the early 1900's, when the average person began to build a house for himself and the baronial type of house began to disappear. I think you will find that the individual likes to have a say in the kind of house <sup>in which</sup> he would like to spend his money.

THE CHAIRMAN: Technical advice must be taken in regard to the design of great public buildings. Suppose a good architect is commissioned to design a building and none of the people entrusted with making the final decision on it like the design. What are they to do? Do you think a world wide competition for a really great public building is desirable?

MR. GIBSON: I do not think it is necessary. We have some ~~pretty~~ *very* competent architects in Australia.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you say there is a variety of types of architects in Australia and that they are not all cast in the one mould?

MR. GIBSON: They are definitely not all in the one **pattern**.

THE CHAIRMAN: But who is to judge the judges themselves? That is a real and not a fanciful problem. I was a member of a committee which had to make a decision about a building. I hated the sight of the plan as did some other members of the committee, but some people took me to task and said that I was not an architect and should merely accept the expert's advice. I said I was not prepared to do it because I was a consumer of architecture in that I was one of the people who had to look at the completed building. Suppose you have an architect who is an apostle of some drastic new change? I have read of the famous architect, Frank Lloyd Wright, some of whose buildings I admire tremendously, from pictures, but he is obviously a zealot and I do not accept all of his opinions about architecture.

MR. GIBSON: I have read about Frank Lloyd Wright. Only recently he designed <sup>*the Gibson Wax Tower at Racine, Wisconsin*</sup> a building in New York, which is not a skyscraper by any means, <sup>*being less than 140 ft high.*</sup> It has a different technique and I venture to say that it is the forerunner of something else. No matter what one may think about Frank Lloyd Wright he is a pioneer, and somebody has to do the pioneering work.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is quite right, but there is a risk that if we had an architectural pioneer at large in this city we might find ourselves saddled with a fashion in architecture which might fail and make us the laughing stock of the world.

MR. GIBSON: That is so. As I mentioned ~~in a~~ <sup>my</sup> talk ~~that I~~ <sup>delivered</sup> ~~gave~~ in 1951, safe architecture is more likely to win approval than is radical architecture. By the same token, however, never venture ~~not~~ win.

THE CHAIRMAN: Could you suggest any way in which we could be sure of having a great public building designed in such a way as to be accepted by most people as a really fine building?

MR. GIBSON: The usual procedure ~~at the moment~~ is to approach <sup>Royal Australian</sup> the Institute of Architects and ask <sup>this body</sup> ~~it~~ to appoint a ~~board of~~ assessors to conduct a competition in accordance with its ~~code of ethics~~ <sup>governing regulations</sup>. I am afraid you have no other resort. Otherwise you would <sup>have</sup> get a limited competition. I am afraid it is very difficult to ~~say that~~ <sup>find</sup> there is a water-tight system whereby you can be sure of getting precisely what you as an individual might like, and that would also please everybody else.

SENATOR VINCENT: I cannot think of any system that would do that.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, but I think we want a system which gives us some change of getting buildings that will be generally acceptable to people.

MR. GIBSON: There was a <sup>breakaway</sup> ~~breakaway~~ in the Chicago <sup>World's Columbian</sup> Exposition, <sup>as Chicago in 1893</sup> ~~I think in 1893~~, when <sup>Daniel H</sup> Burnham set out to design <sup>the architect of Chicago</sup> that exhibition. Out of that there arose <sup>the free classical style of many came</sup> ~~a lot of the type of~~ buildings that you have in America today. Previously they were nondescript. We have not reached that stage here.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Would you say there was not a distinctive Australian type of architecture.

MR. GIBSON. - There is not.

THE CHAIRMAN. - The ~~Early~~ Colonial architecture is a variation of the Georgian. Do you consider that a good style?

MR. GIBSON. - Good of its period.

THE CHAIRMAN. - But because it belongs to that period you would not altogether rule it out for Canberra?

MR. GIBSON. - No. In our tour this morning we saw one building which I would say was early colonial in style and it was quite happy in its surroundings.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - Is it utilitarian?

MR. GIBSON. - I presume the plan had been adapted to the style. That is the point. It is only logical that the internal lay-out of a building usually dictates the design as a whole. You cannot disregard both.

THE CHAIRMAN. - You mentioned in an article that I read of yours the necessity for breaking the sky-line. That suggestion appealed to me very much. Would you say that spires, domes, towers and so on would do that for a city?

MR. GIBSON. - That is my own feeling because in a sense Canberra is in a plain although it is surrounded by hills and I think you have to relieve the flatness. Some of the houses I pointed out today were two-storey ~~houses~~ <sup>in height</sup> and even two-storey buildings relieve the flat feeling that we have all round.

SENATOR RYAN. - Is there amongst the departments, particularly amongst the officers of your Department, a consciousness to develop the original plan of Canberra?

MR. GIBSON. - I will put it this way. You might say that the Town Planning Section, of which I am the chief initiates not so much <sup>the</sup> variations but proposes <sup>a</sup> plan for the <sup>layout</sup> development of a new area. We bear in mind all the main lines of communication ~~we~~ ~~have~~ into that area, the <sup>topo</sup> ~~geo~~graphy of the area, and ~~any~~ existing features, ~~and~~ take all these into account and propose what we consider to be a logical design within the main framework.

SENATOR RYAN. - That is dependent upon modern developments.

(continued on page 104)

MR. GIBSON. - Yes. We do not necessarily rigidly follow the Griffin plan.

SENATOR RYAN. - That accounts for a number of variations which you stated that you could justify?

MR. GIBSON. - Yes. Our proposals go through the usual channel. They are submitted to the head of the Planning and Development Branch who submits them to the National Capital Planning and Development Committee.

SENATOR RYAN. - Once that body approves of a project do you proceed with all expedition to implement it?

MR. GIBSON. - My Section has nothing to do with implementation. We have nothing to do with deciding when the services or necessary money will be provided and when the houses will be built.

SENATOR RYAN. - Is there any unified control of implementation?

MR. GIBSON. - The Assistant Secretary (Planning and Development) is the control for the Branch which is divided into seven sections with the following duties:-

Town Planning Section: Formulation of town planning proposals for submission to the Minister and/or the National Capital Planning and Development Committee.

Development Section: Development matters following on approved town planning schemes. Liaison with Works Department. Preparation of Works programme. Investigation and submissions for Minister and/or Cabinet Committee on A.C.T. Works. Formal requirements to vary city plan and matters connected with National Memorials Ordinance. Consulting agency in department for development projects, valuations for City Area Leases.

Parks and Gardens Section: Design, construction and maintenance of parks, gardens, reserves and recreation areas.

Agriculture and Stock Section: Dealing with all A.C.T. agricultural matters including inspection and supervision of rural lease conditions, advice to lessees on agricultural matters and general extension work. Stock control and inspections. Fruit and vegetable inspections. Soil conservation.

Building Section: Supervision of private enterprise building and "proper authority" under Building and Services Ordinance and Building Regulations. Valuation of buildings. Inspection of scaffolding and lifts and of machinery under relevant ordinances.

Clerical section: Provision of clerical service to the Branch including submissions and correspondence on matters relating to current leases, applications for leases and matters connected with leases ordinance. Agency for the disposal of leases.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

Survey Section: Land, engineering and topographical surveys for Commonwealth purposes in the A.C.T. and elsewhere. Includes Survey Drawing Office and Computing Staff.

SENATOR RYAN. - Is the surveying and development being implemented along planned and approved lines?

MR. GIBSON. - Yes.

SENATOR RYAN. - You are planning for some years ahead?

MR. GIBSON. - Yes.

SENATOR RYAN. - Have you taken into account the influx of public servants and their families next year?

MR. GIBSON. - Yes. But again, that is development in the sense of the provision of accommodation. In 1949 I <sup>prepared</sup> ~~produced~~ a report ~~intimating~~ <sup>indicating</sup> the rate of development required for Canberra. Another report was produced in 1952 and a further one in 1953 on the same subject. Since then, knowing the facts ~~ourselves~~, we have planned ahead and if building does not progress at a rate higher than its present rate ~~we~~ <sup>we</sup> shall have planned sufficiently for the next ten years. In what ~~we~~ <sup>we</sup> call ~~our~~ <sup>our</sup> advance planning, ~~we~~ <sup>we</sup> have zoned out areas sufficient for between 100,000 and 130,000 people, based on the Minister's approval to increase residential density.

SENATOR RYAN. - What is the expected influx of public servants next year?

MR. GIBSON. - I do not know. It may be 2,500. ~~we~~ <sup>we</sup> have estimated the total movement into ~~the~~ office accommodation under <sup>broader</sup> ~~consideration~~, together with outside personnel necessary to keep the city running, at 12,500 people over whatever period it pleases the Government to bring them here.

SENATOR RYAN. - Have you any ideas on what bridges would be adequate to cope with the present traffic?

MR. GIBSON. - We estimate that, ultimately, there will be seven bridge crossings in Canberra. In the beginning, there may be two, three, or four. In answer to a question yesterday afternoon, I suggested that the distribution of traffic was better than trying to run it all across one bridge.

SENATOR RYAN. - Is it true that there is no definite aim to

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

erect bridges to cater for the expected increase in road traffic?

MR. GIBSON. - I could not say. I would presume that there is a definite objective.

SENATOR RYAN. - Have you integrated more modern schemes in the lay-out of new areas such as <sup>Lynne</sup>~~Lynne~~ and <sup>Cham</sup>~~Lynne~~ Dickson?

MR. GIBSON. - <sup>Cham</sup>~~Lynne~~ and Dickson are not yet developed. The Town Planning Section was not set up in Canberra until 1947 and it began to deal with the <sup>Planning</sup>~~development~~ of O'Connor at a reasonably late stage. I did not come to Canberra until 1949. <sup>we</sup>~~we~~ consider ~~that~~ we have done more in Yarralumla than anywhere else and we have also done a good deal in Duntroon which has not yet been opened up. We are trying to give the residents of these areas some feeling that they really belong to that area and have an appointed focus in a reasonable centre. We make the necessary land reservations for facilities ~~that we recommend~~. As I have said, the implementation of the scheme is outside of ~~our~~ <sup>my</sup> control.

SENATOR RYAN. - Have you any ideas on building construction? Do you think that marble should be used in the construction of administrative buildings?

MR. GIBSON. - Whilst the <sup>Building</sup>~~Administrative~~ Block at present under construction is of a monumental type and will be faced with sandstone and granite, I do not think that it is necessary to follow that pattern in the construction of another administrative block although the next one may also be monumental. But there are different building techniques which I think could be utilised to advantage.

SENATOR RYAN. - Would marble facing give a better appearance?

MR. GIBSON. - It may give a more valuable appearance. But it is possible to obtain many good finishes in anodised metals which are very durable and lasting.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - Is that anodised metal on the new Memorial?

MR. GIBSON. - No. That is sheet aluminium which has been sand blasted to reduce reflection on incoming planes.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

SENATOR RYAN. - The value of marble is controversial?

MR. GIBSON. - There is plenty of Australian marble and provided that it is not subject to acids in the air it will last.

SENATOR RYAN. - There are deposits accessible from the Australian Capital Territory?

MR. GIBSON. - Yes. We do not get the best marble in the world in Australia but it is pretty good.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - Do you try to minimise the excess of ornamental and geometrical design which you mentioned in residential areas?

MR. GIBSON. - We do not try to vary plans for the sake of varying them.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - But you try to minimise the excess of geometrical design?

MR. GIBSON. - When the land is relatively flat our design may be more geometric than it would be on contour land. Parts of O'Connor north are geometrical because it is relatively flat. But we adopt contour planning on the upper slopes and consequently, that is not geometrical.

SENATOR HANNAFORD - Would that apply to the new Duntroon area?

MR. GIBSON - Definitely. It would apply there more than anywhere else. <sup>There is</sup> ~~We had~~ an approved plan for West Duntroon. Having an overall plan for Duntroon, ~~we~~ <sup>we</sup> then set about designing East Duntroon, knowing that West Duntroon and East Duntroon would form the whole pattern. West Duntroon gave ~~us~~ the greatest trouble.



MR. GIBSON (continuing) - For a small area it is one of the most difficult ~~we have had to do~~ in relation to hills and hollows and also from the point of view that it is very visible from the Parliament House area. ~~We~~<sup>g</sup> have made certain recommendations for its development so that it will not look obtrusive on the landscape, But definitely you will find very little geometrical pattern in that area.

SENATOR HANNAFORD - One question that has not been answered satisfactory - certainly not by Mr. McLaren - is why undeveloped inner areas are not being utilised. Take for instance the area in front of the Hotel Kurrajong. It is a large expanse of untouched country. Is there any reason why it has never been utilised?

MR. GIBSON - Some areas, particularly ~~that~~ in front of and around the Hotel Kurrajong, ~~I understand~~<sup>reserves</sup>, have been leased. One ~~site~~<sup>site</sup> ~~lease I know is~~<sup>for</sup> the A.B.C.. We feel that around the centre of administration some reservations should be made for allied functions. For instance, Industry House has recently been built by the Associated Chambers of Manufactures. I would not like to ~~say~~<sup>know exactly</sup> how long that piece of land has been held ~~by~~<sup>set aside for</sup> that body. I do not know, but it may have been ~~30 years~~<sup>since 1940</sup>. The A.B.C. has ~~held its lease~~<sup>had development papers</sup> for a long time. The Postal Department has developed its area within the last couple of years. ~~We~~<sup>partly</sup> believe ~~that~~ some land should be held in such areas for unforeseen allied activities.

SENATOR HANNAFORD - In other words, it is not encouraged?

MR. GIBSON - I do not think you can force the issue. You cannot force people to come to Canberra. I have found over the years that more interest is being focussed on Canberra. People are coming here to see ~~Members of~~<sup>Members of</sup> Parliamentarians and not waiting for them to visit their constituency. Already there is a fair representation in Canberra of outside interests. You have only to look through some of the ~~notice~~<sup>directing boards</sup> outside office buildings at Civic Centre to see that. The representation may not be very great at the moment but it is there and undoubtedly, as time goes by, more people will be approaching the Department for land. Although areas such as that in front of the Hotel Kurrajong have not been specifically set aside.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

we feel that they are particularly suitable for the purposes that I have mentioned. We cannot foresee when that development will take place but, bearing in mind the fact that leases are for 99 years, you just cannot give it away. Back in 1950 a sub-division was approved for the area lying between Adelaide Avenue, State Circle, National Circuit, and Hobart Avenue, to the east of the Prime Minister's Lodge. I do not doubt that this area will be developed within the next few years by the provision of fair-sized residences probably for Permanent Heads and senior officials who will come to Canberra in the near future. Nobody seems to know what should be done inside State Circle. Obviously we cannot just go and build another Parliament House or erect a Capitol building tomorrow. We are not financially prepared to do it yet. However, as <sup>the Government</sup> we own all these <sup>areas</sup> ~~leases~~, it is no hardship to <sup>retain</sup> ~~hang on to~~ the land.

SENATOR HANNAFORD - Is there any danger of even the central basins of the Griffin lake scheme being abandoned? The scheme is an integral part of the plan?

MR. GIBSON - I agree that it is an integral part of the plan.

SENATOR HANNAFORD - Do you consider that there would be great public objection to the suggestion that the basins should be abandoned?

MR. GIBSON - It is a long wanted and long awaited feature.

SENATOR HANNAFORD - You have mentioned the volume of traffic. Have you any statistics of the accident rate in Canberra? Is the accident rate any higher than it is in cities where thoroughfares are straight?

MR. GIBSON - I would refer you there to the Canberra Services Branch which could furnish you with that information. I tried to summarise the position in my talk in 1951 by saying that whilst accidents were numerous, they were only of a minor character.

SENATOR HANNAFORD - The tendency would be for traffic to move slower than it might do if the highways were straight?

MR. GIBSON - When you come to the question of highways, it is almost like defining the limbs of a tree. There is a main trunk distributing into the major limbs and so on. In this case <sup>there is</sup> ~~we have~~ a main avenue leading right into the heart of the city. You may not

BB.2.

find that in other laid out cities, particularly the new towns of England. As I have said, the Griffin plan had a great multitude of intersections. We have reduced them. In regard to traffic accidents I have found in discussions with the Canberra Police and ~~in~~ <sup>from</sup> statistics that most of the accidents are due to failure to give way to traffic on the right, which is the rule of the road in ~~Canberra~~ <sup>the A.C.T.</sup>. Some interstate motorists coming into Canberra imagine that thoroughfares such as Northbourne Avenue are main roads and that traffic on them has the right of way. In Canberra there are no main roads as such. They all have the same classification.

SENATOR HANNAFORD - Does Commonwealth Avenue carry more traffic than perhaps any other thoroughfare in Canberra?

MR. GIBSON - I should say so.

SENATOR HANNAFORD - You mentioned this morning that parking at Kingston presented a difficult problem?

MR. GIBSON - It certainly does. I may qualify that by saying that the Minister has approved a recommendation by the A.C.T. Road Safety Council progressively prohibiting angle parking in the main streets. So we are faced at Kingston and probably Manuka with providing either ~~straight~~ <sup>parallel kerbside</sup> parking or adequate indented kerbside parking. Kingston does present a problem because the more <sup>increases</sup> ~~is~~ <sup>commercial</sup> construction that goes on there, the greater will be the ratio of retail floor space to parking space. Saturday morning is the worst time.

SENATOR HANNAFORD - Kingston would be the worst part of Canberra for traffic congestion?

MR. GIBSON - Yes. <sup>I am</sup> ~~We are~~ not worried about ~~Civic Centre~~ <sup>City</sup> to the same extent. It is more spread out. In ~~our~~ <sup>our</sup> schemes for future shopping in the commercial area at ~~Civic Centre~~ <sup>City</sup> we have allowed for as many as 1,450 cars to be parked at one time within 100 yards of the shops.

SENATOR LANGNEY - I am interested in school architecture in Canberra and I am wondering whether the architecture of the Turner Infants School which we saw this morning is to be regarded as standard for schools in the new areas.

SENATE CHAMBER. COMMITTEE

MR. GIBSON - I can answer that first by saying that ~~we~~ we have nothing to do with that matter. Secondly, from my own knowledge of what is going on, I can say that the new Infants' School at Griffith which you also saw today, is not of the same design as the Turner Infants' School. But the new Primary School for Turner will be repeated at Griffith and the Narrabundah Infants' School will be adapted for Yarralulla. However, that is more a matter for the architects of the Department of Works.

SENATOR LANGNEY - I am thinking of the long corridors which seem to be to be rather wasteful. Surely something better could be done in the placing of administrative officers and so on to save so much walking?

MR. GIBSON - That is so

SENATOR LANGNEY - Have you any idea of how many more infants, primary and high schools will be required in Canberra to meet the projected development?

MR. GIBSON - ~~We~~ We have gone into that matter with the Canberra Services Branch which is the Branch of the Department of the Interior responsible for the management of schools. Provision is made in every new neighbourhood for an Infants' School and a Primary School. In every new District provision will be made for both privately controlled and publicly controlled Secondary Schools.

SENATOR LANGNEY - Dealing with the aspect of types of architecture used in Canberra for permanent buildings, what I had in mind was whether what is known as modern architecture or classical architecture would be more suitable for schools?

MR. GIBSON - I think you will find that throughout the world the design of schools has evolved considerably over the past twenty years.

SENATOR LANGNEY - I was wondering about the maintenance cost of all this brilliant paint work and so on?

MR. GIBSON - There is no paint on the aluminium.

SENATOR LANGNEY - But there are coloured bits and pieces such as doors?

MR. GIBSON - A lot of these resin bonded paints are much in

advance of the ~~old~~ lead paints.

SENATOR TANGNEY - What proportion of homes in Canberra are privately owned compared with Government rented homes?

MR. GIBSON - I cannot say, but I could get the figures.

SENATOR TANGNEY: Is the Department of the Interior responsible for the maintenance and upkeep of the poorer types of home that we saw today at Westlake?

MR. GIBSON: I should say so.

SENATOR TANGNEY: Would it cost very much to brighten them up with decent paint? The dark green paint used on them must have been bought from disposals after the first world war. Is any encouragement given to the tenants to paint their homes, by providing them with the materials?

MR. GIBSON: Not that I know of. There is a maintenance *Section in the* Department <sup>of Works</sup> in Canberra.

SENATOR TANGNEY: Is it just because these houses are out of sight that they are out of mind?

MR. GIBSON: I <sup>w</sup>ould not say that. I think the Director of Works could give you this ~~kind of~~ information. It is a ~~bit~~ outside my scope.

SENATOR TANGNEY: In some of the newer suburbs you will see a terrific lot of money being spent on public buildings, schools, roads and footpaths, and then you go into an older area like Westlake and you find there is nothing.

MR. GIBSON: I do not know the original purpose of the Westlake cottages.

SENATOR TANGNEY: I am wondering whether anything can be done, or is contemplated. I know that while there is a shortage of houses, it would not be advisable to pull these houses down. But could something be done to give the people a bit more pride in them? They cannot be expected to have much pride in places that are cut of the way and for which nothing is done. I have been making representations on this matter for a long time. There is difficulty for the children in getting to school, because there are no bus services.

MR. GIBSON: There is a bus shed ~~right~~ at the end of Perth Avenue. The children walk from there down to the houses.

SENATOR TANGNEY: And get drenched if it is raining. Women coming home from shopping have a fair way to carry their parcels.

MR. GIBSON: There is a short cut to these cottages from behind the Hotel Canberra but I agree they are distant from the shops.

SENATOR TANGNEY: We are talking about the development of other areas, but when we have an area such as Westlake I think something should be done there first. There are people resident there already.

MR. GIBSON: It is somewhat incongruous on the landscape of Canberra. That is the most I would say about it.

SENATOR TANGNEY: It would not cost a great deal to do something about it, to paint the houses, put in a few roads and footpaths and supply a bus service. However, those matters probably are not within your province.

SENATOR VINCENT: Is there any scheme in existence for the demolition of sub-standard houses at Westlake, the Causeway and Narrabundah?

MR. GIBSON: That I would not know.

SENATOR VINCENT: Do you know if it is anybody's responsibility to do something about the planning in respect of the demolition of those houses?

MR. GIBSON: Mr. Rogers may be able to throw some light on that matter.

SENATOR VINCENT: You will not say there is no such plan in existence?

MR. GIBSON: No, but I do not know of any.

SENATOR VINCENT: Who is responsible for determining the location and number of shops, garages, theatres and hotels?

MR. GIBSON: As regards shops, we ~~work usually~~ <sup>of estimate</sup> on a square foot basis per thousand population retail selling <sup>floor</sup> space for the smaller suburban areas, related to the potential in the larger areas. That formula is based on quite a bit of research.

SENATOR VINCENT: Are the shops actually in existence?

MR. GIBSON: Yes, they are.

SENATOR VINCENT: Could you indicate how many shops there are per 100 population?

MR. GIBSON: I <sup>will obtain</sup> ~~should have to get~~ those sort of figures out for you.

SENATOR VINCENT: Would you say that the shops are situated in the most convenient places for the housewives of this city?

MR. GIBSON: In respect of the suburban shops, ~~we~~<sup>we</sup> have tried to place them in the most convenient positions.

SENATOR VINCENT: What would be the objection to having a few more shops in more convenient situations?

MR. GIBSON: When you say more convenient, are you referring to shops like corner shops?

SENATOR VINCENT: Closer to the women. I have gained the impression, rightly or wrongly, that, almost without exception, the shopping areas are a long way from many houses.

MR. GIBSON: They are quite a long way from many houses, for the simple reason that you have a low density scheme of development here. ~~We~~<sup>we</sup> had to take that into consideration ~~and we had~~ either ~~to~~ distribute the shops more than ~~we have~~<sup>is</sup> done and anticipate that those who were prepared to develop the shops would not have such a big "catchment" for their <sup>sales</sup> goods, or concentrate them so that they had a larger "catchment." The problem of the locations of shops and the number of shops is a very difficult one. ~~We~~<sup>we</sup> have found from ~~our~~ research that it is somewhat difficult to say precisely how many shops you should have per thousand. It depends on the character of the shops. ~~What we do~~<sup>the</sup> in principle is to cater for "day-to-day" needs within the residential areas and to cater for luxury types of goods or the larger types of household goods in the main shopping areas.

SENATOR VINCENT: Would you say that, generally speaking, the people of Canberra are happy about the plan for the provision of shops?

MR. GIBSON: At one period there was an outcry about the lack of shops. During the past five years, ~~we~~<sup>sites</sup> have ~~been~~<sup>been</sup> provided ~~sites~~ for shops and most of these ~~sites~~ have been developed. Since then, ~~there~~<sup>there</sup> we have ceased to ~~hear~~ any outcry.

SENATOR VINCENT: You do not consider that now there is a popular demand for more shops or for shops in more convenient



situations?

MR. GIBSON: ~~We~~<sup>g</sup> have heard nothing.

SENATOR VINCENT: Would you say that this city is adequately catered for in respect of motor garages?

MR. GIBSON: I ~~sh~~<sup>h</sup>ould say so.

SENATOR VINCENT: You do not hear any criticisms about that service?

MR. GIBSON: No, ~~we do not~~, despite the increase in car sales.

SENATOR VINCENT: Would you say the city is well catered for in respect of picture theatres?

MR. GIBSON: There is inadequate provision, ~~there~~.

SENATOR VINCENT: How many cinemas would you say the city requires?

MR. GIBSON: At the moment I should say two more.

SENATOR VINCENT: Is it proposed to provide them?

MR. GIBSON: The sites ~~could~~ be made available.

SENATOR VINCENT: When is that going to be done?

MR. GIBSON: With regard to picture theatres, ~~we~~<sup>g</sup> prefer to see them in what we call District Centres. In other words, what ~~is regarded as comprising~~ ~~we put in~~ a District Centre is a reasonable number of shops to cater for the District and also facilities such as cinemas, service stations and, on the recreation side, a swimming pool and recreation areas. You really have an example of that at Manuka. If you analyse Manuka, you will find ~~that you have your~~ shops, ~~your~~ cinema, service stations, churches, recreation and everything.

SENATOR VINCENT: It is not very happily situated for people three miles away.

MR. GIBSON: If you are going to the cinema, I do not think you exactly want it on your doorstep, ~~every time~~.

SENATOR VINCENT: Would I be right in saying that the cinema people are happy about the present position with regard to cinemas?

MR. GIBSON, I think that ~~comes back to~~<sup>governed by</sup> the film renters combine. If another cinema were started, the owner would, as far as I can see, first have to secure the rental of ~~the~~ films and he would have

T.R.S.GIBSON

to compete with existing renters. It is not as simple as it looks on paper. You just cannot say to somebody, "Put up a cinema".

SENATOR VINCENT: I suggest there are ways and means to overcome the difficulty.

MR. GIBSON: I presume there must be.

SENATOR VINCENT: Do you consult with representatives of the industries in regard to the position of services such as shops, cinemas, garages and so on?

MR. GIBSON: Do you mean do we consult, say, the Chamber of Commerce?

Yes,  
SENATOR VINCENT: About shopping sites.

MR. GIBSON: Personally, I do not. What other sections do I do not know, but I certainly do not.

SENATOR VINCENT: What about hotels?

MR. GIBSON: As you heard from Mr. McLaren, two more sites for hotels will be made available shortly.

SENATOR VINCENT: Do you think that is enough?

MR. GIBSON: No.

SENATOR VINCENT: How many more do you think are needed?

MR. GIBSON: We might even need four more to start with. ~~When we are looking for a hotel site, or~~ <sup>if</sup> when a hotel site is required, a request may come down to me from the Assistant Secretary, Planning and Development, "Re the attached memo, could you suggest a suitable site?" In any scheme of layout, ~~that we have,~~ <sup>we</sup> do not specifically denote a site for a hotel, but we ~~do~~ <sup>only</sup> have a zone which is known as a commercial zone.

SENATOR VINCENT: It is, up to a point, <sup>an</sup> ad hoc decision?

MR. GIBSON: Yes, in the sense that ~~we have~~ <sup>there is</sup> an area set aside for commercial purposes.

SENATOR VINCENT: Let me deal with the matter of the wide open spaces referred to by Senator Mannaford. I appreciate your explanation in regard to those areas which you have mentioned, but I do suggest, however, that there are a number of spaces in the built up area that it would be both

appropriate and desirable to use for domestic buildings, with ut going further afield. Has the Department taken any steps to try to fill those gaps?

MR. GIBSON: Yes.

SENATOR VINCENT: The problem is related to the density of population problem?

MR. GIBSON: Yes. It is particularly noticeable along both sides of Ainslie Avonue. I showed you one part this morning where ~~we are undertaking~~ development <sup>is proceeding</sup> already. You saw blocks of flats along Ainslie Avonue. ~~We have~~ <sup>There are</sup> at least five areas along Ainslie Avonue that are under review for early development.

SENATOR VINCENT: Would I be right in sayin<sub>g</sub> that that aspect of the development of Canberra, the filling up of those gaps with houses or flats, is receiving priority?

MR. GIBSON: Yes.

SENATOR VINCENT: I take it that it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that ultimately we shall have here a city of 100,000, 200,000 or 300,000 people. From the plan, it looks to me that we have virtually only two major built up areas, one north and one south of this famous lake. You have mentioned the matter of planning bridges, which, of course, are absolutely vital to enable the people to go from the north to the south or vice versa. Can you set my mind at rest in regard to one problem? It seems to me there is a possibility that most of the north south and south north traffic will inevitably flow along Commonwealth Avonue, over the one bridge.

MR. GIBSON: I should not say ~~that~~ that was impossible. In ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> layout of bridges, we are trying to distribute the traffic north, north east and north west into the northern side of Canberra. You have the King's Avonue Bridge of the future, Commonwealth Avonue Bridge reconstructed and a bridge at Acton.

SENATOR VINCENT: I do not think I have made my point clear. Notwithstanding that you have bridges planned for those sites, what guarantee is there that the traffic will not continue to

flow over only one bridge and thus create a serious bottleneck?

MR. GIBSON: It certainly could do so, but I think the reverse is shown by experience. If you find that you are being held up at one bridge and you know there is another bridge half a mile away with very little traffic, you will ~~move over~~<sup>use</sup> that bridge and relieve the pressure on the other one. I think that is only human instinct.

SENATOR VINCENT: That is not borne out by experience in Melbourne, where nearly everybody tries to get over the Princes Bridge although there are plenty of other bridges that could be used. I am concerned lest the bulk of the population will be immediately north of Commonwealth Avenue and will use the Commonwealth Avenue Bridge in preference to all the other bridges. Would I be right in suggesting that that is a possibility?

MR. GIBSON: We consider Commonwealth Avenue Bridge as the principal bridge ~~of the future~~. It may have six traffic lanes. King's Avenue may have four, and Acton two. I am only saying what might be done. ~~We~~<sup>we</sup> still visualise Commonwealth Avenue as taking the major part of the traffic.

SENATOR VINCENT: For a population of, say, 250,000?

MR. GIBSON: If ~~you got your~~<sup>we have</sup> population up to 250,000 you would have some of it on the west of Canberra, some of it on the south and some of it on the east. In that way you would distribute the traffic.

SENATOR VINCENT: You do not think my fear is well founded?

MR. GIBSON: Unless we bring 10,000 people to the area immediately around Civic by housing them in multi-storey flats or skyscraper flats I do not think we shall get that trouble. If you got to that stage you would need more than one bridge.

SENATOR VINCENT: You are contemplating the erection of an eight-storey block of flats at Braddon?

MR. GIBSON: Yes.

(Senator Vincent continuing). - Will that be an isolated building or will it be in consonance with the area in regard to high buildings elsewhere?

MR. GIBSON. - That is known as Section 52 Braddon on which, I think, there will be something like 350 flats for a population of about 900 people. Another block is contemplated on Section 7, Reid, which is on the opposite side of Ainslie Avenue. Those are the only two areas contemplated on the north side at the moment. We have another site set aside. You will remember remarking on the additions to St Paul's church near Manuka. That is known as Sections 39 and 43 Griffith. We are contemplating more flats there the height of which I cannot tell you. That is near a District Centre. We have other areas <sup>are</sup> set aside throughout the various zones of Canberra for the suburban type two-storey flats. *fourth*

SENATOR VINCENT. - Is the eight-storey flat building an innovation for Canberra?

MR. GIBSON. - It certainly is.

SENATOR ~~GIBSON~~ <sup>VINCENT</sup>. - Having regard to your proposition that the architecture of this city must have harmonious relationship with its surroundings, would you consider that an 8-storey block of flats is in harmony with the remainder of the city's buildings?

MR. GIBSON. - The remainder are two-storey buildings but there is nothing to say that reconstruction may not take them higher. You will get that conflict anywhere. You are even getting it down at Manuka at the moment where people are building in front of the houses. Some have built two-storeys and some have built only one. In time they might all go to two storeys.

SENATOR VINCENT. - Would you agree with me that an eight-storey block of flats on the site proposed would have an unnecessary prominence out of all proportion to the importance, nature or purpose of the building, having regard to the other important buildings in the city?

MR. GIBSON. - I think it is sufficiently distant from all those other buildings. It will not dwarf them, if that is what you have in mind.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

SENATOR VINCENT. - I suggest that although there might be some justification for an eight-storey public building, an eight-storey flat building would be unnecessarily prominent, whereas architecturally and artistically the focus should be on the major buildings of the city. Would you agree?

MR. GIBSON. - I cannot say that I agree. I think that we can have all classes of buildings of varying heights.

SENATOR VINCENT. - But should a block of flats be the most prominent building?

MR. GIBSON. - It is prominent at present because of the absence of similarly prominent buildings in the locality. I have nothing against a block of flats being eight storeys high because my hope is that it may encourage somebody else to get on with something.

SENATOR VINCENT. - There is no plan for the construction of other eight storey buildings? . . .

MR. GIBSON. - No.

SENATOR VINCENT. - Then it is possible that this may be the only eight storey block in the city?

MR. GIBSON. - It may be for a time. I know that when ~~we were~~ suggesting <sup>ed</sup> principles of design for the new Brisbane <sup>g</sup> Building now going up ~~our suggestion~~ <sup>it</sup> was for at least three storeys.

SENATOR VINCENT. - Would you agree that the architectural styles of the buildings in Lonsdale Street are in harmony with other buildings in the city?

MR. GIBSON. - No.

SENATOR VINCENT. - Then the plan has broken down in that respect?

MR. GIBSON. - ~~We~~ <sup>g</sup> did not have any control over the external appearance of any of these buildings. The Town Planning <sup>s</sup> Section has nothing to do with it.

SENATOR VINCENT. - Is there an authority that could stop such departures?

MR. GIBSON. - There is a building authority which ~~is~~ known as the <sup>P</sup>roper <sup>A</sup>uthority. That is also under the control of the Assistant Secretary, Planning and Development.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

SENATOR VINCENT. - Would you say that it is desirable to encourage secondary industry in this city apart from what is required for the purposes of the development or maintenance of the city?

MR. GIBSON. - My own feeling is that you will not get heavy industry here. You may get light secondary industry.

SENATOR VINCENT. - Would you consider that desirable?

MR. GIBSON. - I would from the point of view that it would provide an alternative form of employment not to the detriment of the principle form of employment. I think it is a matter that must be regarded with caution.

SENATOR VINCENT. - You are not envisaging Canberra becoming a manufacturing city?

MR. GIBSON. - Not at all.

SENATOR VINCENT. - You are considering it from the standpoint that it would provide alternative employment for the children of public servants, for instance.

MR. GIBSON. - Yes, they may not all wish to join the Public Service.

SENATOR VINCENT. - What type of industry do you suggest is desirable or practicable?

MR. GIBSON. - I do not know a great deal about that sort of thing, but I should imagine that you might get industries like machine tool making, glove and bag manufacture and such light textile manufacture as the Jeldi Chenille firm was engaged in at Yass until it moved to Goulburn recently.

SENATOR VINCENT. - I take it that you do not agree that this capital city should be solely concerned with government?

MR. GIBSON. - No, I think we can have a small percentage of the population in alternative forms of employment.

SENATOR VINCENT. - Mr. McLaren informed us that there was no overall programme of development of Canberra.

MR. GIBSON. - I am afraid that also is not in my sphere.

SENATOR VINCENT. - Mr. McLaren was not able to tell us whether or not there would be adequate housing for the additional

population associated with the new Administrative Building now

nearing completion. Can you say anything about that?

MR. GIBSON. - I know of what is known throughout our Department as "Operation Admin". That was forwarded to me at a very early stage and in consequence I advised the department at that time, April 1954, of approximately how many sites ~~we~~ <sup>have</sup> had passed through for the purposes of development and I think that I mentioned that if the rate of development, as at present, was not altered we had enough for ten years but I am not in a position to say when, even with an accelerated building programme, they can provide sufficient housing.

SENATOR VINCENT. - Will it not be somewhat calamitous if we bring all these people here and have not sufficient houses for them?

MR. GIBSON. - I agree with that point of view but it is not one of my functions. You may have learned from the press that the Department itself has set up an additional section to deal exclusively with that. I think it is called the Secretariat for Co-ordination ~~and~~ Development and its principal officer is Mr. W. McGregor of the Department of the Interior.

SENATOR VINCENT. - I take it that his responsibility is to co-ordinate the problems?

MR. GIBSON. - It is to co-ordinate everything, including the building trades, the trade unions and so on. It is a most responsible job.

SENATOR VINCENT. - Can you give us any information in relation to the ultimate housing of all Commonwealth Departments in Canberra?

MR. GIBSON. - I do not know about any policy regarding that. I only know that I submitted a report in 1949 relevant to the movement of 7027 civil servants to Canberra.

SENATOR VINCENT. - To be moved when?

MR. GIBSON. - To be moved as and when accommodation, both office and housing was available.

SENATOR VINCENT. - How many Commonwealth public servants would that leave in the State capitals?



SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

MR. GIBSON. - I think that was the total.

SENATOR VINCENT. - So there must be some scheme of further development?

MR. GIBSON. - I presume so.

SENATOR VINCENT. - Do you know whether the present Administrative block and the corresponding block on the western section will be adequate to accommodate all the Commonwealth public servants now working in the State capitals?

MR. GIBSON. - Based on the present Commonwealth Public Service and the present population of Australia in <sup>relation</sup> ~~ratio~~ to that service, they probably would be but any increase in the population of Australia may reflect itself in the Public Service.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Do you know how many these buildings will actually accommodate?

MR. GIBSON. - A maximum of 3,000.

SENATOR VINCENT. - Would you say that it is desirable to have all the administrative buildings in the one geographical locality.

(continued on page 122)

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

MR. GIBSON - For Commonwealth administration, yes. The authorities in Washington, having reviewed the situation there, have decided to disperse the population. We examined that position. But it is necessary to bear in mind that the Pentagon Building alone in Washington houses 30,000 workers and we do not visualise having 30,000 in the Parliamentary Triangle.

SENATOR VINCENT - I suggest that the more you concentrate public servants in the one locality, the greater becomes the road and transport problem.

MR. GIBSON - I agree. That is why the 200 ft. avenues may be necessary in the future although it is not necessary to use their full-width at present.

SENATOR VINCENT - Every other city in the world is trying to disperse its workers. I am concerned that we are trying to concentrate them. We may have 250,000 people in Canberra eventually.

MR. GIBSON - If the population of Canberra exceeds 250,000 and the density of the present areas and the immediate future development is not increased above what I have recommended, then the areas of future population will be further removed from the centre of the city. They could either be made completely dormitory suburbs or they could also have departmental offices in them. If they were purely dormitory suburbs, the workers would have to go to another suburb to work but if they were not purely dormitory, some of the workers would work within their own suburb.

SENATOR VINCENT - Do you consider some form of local government to be either practicable or desirable for Canberra?

MR. GIBSON - My opinion is that the functions of Canberra should be carried out in Canberra. When the Department of the Interior requests the Department of Works to construct a building the cost of which exceeds £5,000, the matter is referred by the Director of Works in Canberra to his Head Office in Melbourne. Whether that procedure is warning a few seats for people in Melbourne or not, I do not know. But the subject of local government is being examined by the Australian Capital Territory Advisory Council, and

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

the Chairman of that body may be able to give you some opinions on it. I should not care to express a personal opinion.

The witness withdrew.

The Committee adjourned.

*Re*

*minutes*  
*of*

Senate Select Committee on  
the Development of Canberra

*Pages 124-271*

<i>Page</i>	<i>Name</i>
124 - 137	T.K.S. Gibson
138 - 179	A.T. Shakespeare
180 - 216	G. Reddick, F.L. McKay.
217 - 249	M.J. Moor
250 - 271	R.M.C.

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT  
OF CANBERRA.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

Taken at Canberra.

WEDNESDAY, 9th FEBRUARY, 1955.

PRESENT:

The Chairman (Senator McCallum)

Senator Benn

Senator Vincent

Senator Hannaford

Senator Wood.

Senator Ryan

TREVOR RICHARD STEPLIN GIBSON, Chief Town Planner, Department of the Interior, Canberra, further examined.

SENATOR BENN. - You will recall that, when you took us to several places in Canberra in December, the area at Lonsdale Street near Civic Centre did not appeal to some members of the committee. The architectural features of the area, they thought, were not in keeping with other parts of the city. Is the style of building that we saw in Lonsdale Street likely to be repeated in other parts of Canberra - say at Kingston or at Manuka?

MR. GIBSON. - ~~I~~<sup>I</sup> had nothing to do with that. You might question Mr. Rogers on this subject when he gives evidence: ~~soon~~  
~~he~~ is in charge of Planning and Development, ~~and~~ controls the Section which receives plans for ~~various~~ development proposals. The question might also be suitably addressed to the Chairman of the National Capital Planning and Development Committee. That Committee, on occasions, reviews plans that ~~are~~ submitted to the Department. I am ~~not~~ in a ~~no~~ position to say whether ~~any~~ steps will be taken to ~~see~~ that the ~~same~~ <sup>errors</sup> ~~thing~~ you saw <sup>in</sup> at Lonsdale Street <sup>will</sup> ~~shall~~ not be repeated. Personally, apart from Departmental considerations, my impression is that the area is a disappointment.

SENATOR BENN. - That is your opinion?

MR. GIBSON. - That is my personal opinion.

SENATOR BENN. - Your opinion is an expert opinion and your opinion is evidence.

MR. GIBSON. - Exactly.

SENATOR BENN. - Your opinion is that it is not satisfactory?

MR. GIBSON. - Yes.

SENATOR BENN. - You will recall that, during our tour of inspection, we passed along a road beside which there was an enclosure with a white rail around it. It had no name on it, but Senator Hannaford said that it was a race course. In the general design of Canberra what is really proposed for that area?

MR. GIBSON. - You may recall that Mr. McLaren intimate d in his evidence that steps had been taken, through the proper channels, to delete from the Canberra plan the area known as West Lake. The photograph that you have before you does not include the entire area of West Lake, but it shows the majority of the area. On the assumption that the area will not be inundated, my *verbal* recommendation to the Department has been that Canberra could suitably have there a domain and national recreation area to be developed by landscaping, ornamentation and the provision of facilities for active and passive recreation fitting to the national capital.

SENATOR BENN. - To your mind it would be an ideal area for that purpose?

MR. GIBSON. - I have looked into it from the planning aspect but not from the engineering aspect.

SENATOR BENN. - It is true that there is a race course at Queanbeyan on the outskirts of the Australian Capital Territory?

MR. GIBSON. - Yes.

SENATOR BENN. - Is there a race club functioning there?

MR. GIBSON. - Yes.

SENATOR BENN. - Physically, it would be possible for the Canberra club to merge with the Queanbeyan club and for the two to have one race course?

MR. GIBSON. - Yes. I have not looked into that aspect, of course.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

SENATOR BENN. - With your knowledge of town planning and towns generally, are you aware of any area with a population slightly in excess of 30,000 that has two racecourses?

MR. GIBSON. - No.

SENATOR BENN. - You have suggested the establishment of a domain and a recreation ground. The recreation ground, I assume, would be distinct from the domain portion of the area?

MR. GIBSON. - Yes. I am thinking on the lines of Sydney, which has a domain and the Botanic Garden side by side. In this case, my suggestion is that facilities for active recreation and passive recreation be suitably designed in juxtaposition.

SENATOR BENN. - You would like to have a band rotunda there, for example, for certain occasions?

MR. GIBSON. - <sup>There is</sup> ~~We have~~ an area, to which I referred in previous evidence, known as Central Park. That is on the north side of Canberra. The scheme ~~that we have~~ prepared and submitted to the department contains provision for an open-air band shell ~~there~~. That is not to say that the band shell could not be duplicated in the area ~~that we are now considering~~ <sup>discussing</sup>.

SENATOR BENN. - If your ideas were put into practical effect, you believe you could beautify the area sufficiently with trees to make it comparable with the effect that would be created by a lake there?

MR. GIBSON. - I think the two functions are different. In the case of the lake you would have aquatic sports; in the other case you would have land sports.

SENATOR BENN. - Let us forget the sports for the moment and think of the appearance of the site. Do you think that the place could be adequately beautified by the growing of trees?

MR. GIBSON. - Yes. My opinion is that you would get a definite asset to Canberra by the provision of a combination of active and passive recreation areas in the form of a domain and gardens, together with the Ribbon of Water, which would provide for aquatic sports. ~~I think~~ I mentioned previously that the ribbon of water would be as wide as the River Yarra in that section. You would

have the two effects. I remind the Committee that I am speaking only from a planning point of view and not from an engineering point of view.

SENATOR BENN. - If that idea were put into operation, would the present golf course be left intact?

MR. GIBSON. - As far as I know, ~~over~~ the Ribbon of Water will cover a part of the present golf course.

SENATOR BENN. - Would it affect one hole or two holes?

MR. GIBSON. - It might affect two holes or even more.

SENATOR BENN. - Could the club get sufficient space elsewhere to make good the loss?

MR. GIBSON. - I should say so. I have not studied that point. I am not an expert on the laying out of golf courses.

SENATOR BENN. - You have had a good deal to do with the Canberra plan and you probably have more knowledge of the plan than any other person in Canberra from a town planner's point of view. The plan necessarily must have some faults as well as good features. You must be conscious of those. If you were commissioned to prepare a new plan for Canberra, would that plan differ largely from the present one?

MR. GIBSON. - I have given this some thought; ~~As you have said,~~ I have studied the Canberra plan over a series of years: The main lines of communication I would retain, with certain modifications. The principal amendment that I would suggest would affect the manner in which those main lines of communication are treated today.

To give one example: The main line of road communication into Canberra, running from the north towards the south, passes through the potential main commercial area of the city. ~~I~~ have studied that and, as I have stated in earlier evidence, have zoned towards the east for commercial purposes, the principal objective being to allow the traffic which has no need to stop in that area to pass by without interfering with other activities.

If I were commissioned to re-design Canberra, I ~~think~~ my main approach would be to treat zoning and communications together



and to present a plan which, to the best of my knowledge, would be brought up to date in relation to those two items. Provision would be made to enable anybody to get from one point to another without interfering with anything en route.

The same consideration would apply to the residential areas, which are the areas most developed in Canberra today. I would take care to see that the main lines of communication were not encumbered by residential development all the way along their frontage. That is not known as ribbon development because ribbon development is a definition applicable to development occurring all the way along roads with no "infill" in between them. Here the position is quite different, but, visualising that ~~we have~~ <sup>there is</sup> an avenue ~~that~~ <sup>reaching</sup> from two and a half to three miles from the time you begin to enter the city until you reach the commercial centre from the northern approach, that will be one of the difficulties of the future.

~~We also find that,~~ <sup>With</sup> an approach from the west, from an area yet to be developed, into areas of daily employment, there ~~are~~ <sup>will be</sup> periodic surges of traffic; I would take care of that. ~~We~~ <sup>3</sup> have investigated these problems, and ~~we~~ find that ~~we have~~ <sup>it is necessary</sup> to adapt the Canberra plan to modern conditions. Owing to the fact that, ~~a lot~~ <sup>most</sup> of the main avenues have already been established, ~~we are~~ <sup>it is only possible</sup> obliged to modify within the framework of the Canberra plan. I would not throw the principles of the plan overboard.

(Continued on page 129)

SENATOR BENN . - If you heard somebody say that Canberra was socially starved what would you consider that they meant?

MR. GIBSON . - I ~~have~~ made that statement myself <sup>in 1951.</sup> My impression would be that certain facilities for the benefit of community life were lacking and that there was also a lack of feeling of community activity within the city as a whole. That is what I meant to convey when I said that Canberra was socially starved.

SENATOR BENN . - Would Canberra differ largely from Sydney in that respect?

MR. GIBSON . - Definitely. Some of the newer areas in Sydney may lack some social amenities but if people are prepared to travel some distance ~~from them~~ by ~~the~~ reasonably quick transport that is available they can obtain a variety of social amenities which are not yet obtainable in Canberra.

SENATOR BENN . - What are the chief deficiencies in Canberra?

MR. GIBSON . - Very few communities in Canberra have any focal centre. By "focal centre" I mean a District Centre such as Manuka which has churches, a cinema, which can be converted to a theatre, shopping facilities, facilities for servicing cars and recreation facilities close at hand. Civic Centre is the only other part of Canberra that has those facilities. There is no hotel at Manuka but the Hotel Kingston and the Hotel Wellington are not far away. Yarralumla has only a Mothercraft Centre and a Pre-School Centre which are widely separated; and a few shops at one ~~end~~ <sup>side</sup> of the area. ~~Schools have~~ <sup>Schools have</sup> yet to be erected; ~~there~~ and the oval is not <sup>fully</sup> developed. If the people of Yarralumla want community ~~activities~~ <sup>facilities</sup> such as ~~take place at~~ a cinema or hotel they have to travel to some other part of Canberra

SENATOR BENN . - If that is a shortcoming it can be corrected easily?

MR. GIBSON . - ~~We have made~~ <sup>is made in forward</sup> Provision ~~in all our~~ planning of residential neighbourhoods for those facilities to be provided in the future.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

SENATOR BENN . - Have you provided for dance halls, too?

MR. GIBSON . - That is ~~another~~ <sup>2</sup> aspect that we have considered.

In or about 1950 there was ~~a lot of~~ discussion concerning Community Centres. Certain towns in England have what is known as a "community hall" which has facilities for ~~Committee~~ meetings, hobbies and other activities which bring the people together and give a sense of community spirit. The establishment of such halls was discussed in the ~~Department for some time~~ but no development of that kind <sup>yet</sup> ~~has~~ occurred. ~~We~~ <sup>we</sup> examined the possibility of incorporating community halls in the design of future schools. There was a projected scheme for shops, ~~a~~ community hall, ~~and~~ ~~an~~ infants ~~school~~ and ~~a~~ primary schools at Griffith. When the sketch plans for those schools were prepared a community hall was suggested in addition to dining and assembly ~~facilities~~ <sup>plan</sup> facilities which would have meant five large ~~for~~ ~~assembly~~ ~~facilities~~. I suggested that an economy might be affected by placing the assembly hall and dining facilities towards one end of the school, separated from the class rooms by a series of doors. These could then be used by the public when not occupied by the school children. This was a scheme which I had seen used in England. That recommendation was officially ~~accepted~~ <sup>approved</sup> <sup>it is</sup> <sup>the principle is good</sup> ~~accepted~~. ~~We~~ <sup>we</sup> hope to embody ~~it in~~ Turner and Griffith public schools. It is intended that ~~that~~ <sup>the</sup> part of the schools that will be made available to the public will ~~be used~~ to provide facilities for a library and ~~of~~ visual education, ~~group~~. But Canberra does lack buildings which would enable the people to come together instead of disappearing into their homes after 5 o'clock.

SENATOR BENN . - That position is still rectifiable?

MR. GIBSON . - Yes. ~~We have made~~ <sup>is made</sup> Provision for rectification in ~~our~~ <sup>future planning</sup> schemes.

SENATOR BENN . - You think that the trouble will be remedied?

MR. GIBSON . - I can only hope so.

SENATOR BENN . - You have already stated in evidence that the lay-out of the city is wasteful. In which way,

in particular, is it wasteful?

MR. GIBSON . - I have already informed the <sup>that</sup> Committee, /in some areas, as much as 38% of the land has been devoted to roads. Not only were large sums of money required to lay down those roads but considerable expenditure is required for their continued maintenance. The perpetuation of individual houses has also used up a good deal of land. In 1951, single houses comprised 74% of Canberra accommodation; <sup>about</sup> 95% of the population was living in single houses. Because of the area that was devoted to individual houses, the area of the city was continuing to expand.

SENATOR HENN . - The average Australian prefers a house.

MR. GIBSON . - I do not deny that. ~~But~~ <sup>I</sup> examined this subject at length ~~in the department~~ and came to certain conclusions. In a report ~~that I made~~ <sup>submitted</sup> in 1952 I pointed out that expansion between 1945 and 1952 had resulted in no appreciable increase in density of population. In 1945 it was assessed that Canberra was covered by 2.2 dwelling units per acre net. In 1952 that figure was 2.55, which was not an appreciable increase. I pointed out in my report that continuation of that low density expansion would require up to 12,800 acres to accommodate 100,000 people; but if expansion proceeded at an average rate of from 20 to 30 persons per acre net, which I recommended, an additional area of only 4,000 acres would be required. But I do not suggest that we should suddenly increase the density so that we shall only use another 4,000 acres. My report simply represented an attempt to make ~~persons~~ <sup>the Department</sup> aware that if expansion of population continued <sup>at</sup> the present low density rate, there would be <sup>increasing</sup> very long extensions of services, roads and maintenance costs.

SENATOR HENN . - Would you suggest a correction?

MR. GIBSON . - I have suggested a correction. I mentioned that, on the 12th August 1952, the Minister approved of my recommendation to increase the net residential density by such

means as the Department saw fit. That would mean the provision of more flats and a reduction in the average size of the allotments devoted to single houses. At the same time, I recommended a reduction in road widths but that recommendation was applicable only to residential streets, not to main streets or main avenues. I would not reduce their size.

SENATOR BENN . - Have you in mind any fixed density of population?

MR. GIBSON . - No. The figure of from 20 to 30 persons per net acre which I mentioned was quoted as a firm basis for future development since it is known that planners overseas are finding <sup>that is</sup> ~~these rates~~ a practical index on which to base proposals for neighbourhoods, permitting development of residential areas with convenience and economy.

SENATOR RYAN . - What is the present density of population in Canberra?

MR. GIBSON . - In 1951-52 the average was 10 persons per acre net. My proposal of 20 to 30 persons per acre net is an average rate. It is not intended to obtain in all parts of the city. Some of the flats that are being erected at Braddon will result in a density of 70 persons per acre net. Another area might be developed at the rate of only 15 persons per acre net.

SENATOR BENN . - Do you think that Canberra should have a local Government authority?

MR. GIBSON . - That is a very vexed question which I am not in a position to answer. Investigations are proceeding in connection with it.

SENATOR BENN . - Do householders who own and service their own properties pay rates?

MR. GIBSON . - Yes. The person who rents a house also pays rates as a part of his rent.

THE CHAIRMAN . - Have you furnished the Committee with a map showing the ring of outer roads around Canberra which you mentioned in your previous evidence?

MR. GIBSON . - Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Also flood photographs?

MR. GIBSON.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Statistics about the areas of various lakes?

MR. GIBSON.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The quantity of goods entering Canberra?

MR. GIBSON.- <sup>2</sup> We have had some difficulty in getting that but ~~to~~ <sup>proposed</sup> have some graphs available. We did a traffic survey for five consecutive days and nights in 1951 and ~~we~~ have based these figures on that survey. The graphs show the total year's traffic into and out of Canberra and the interstate total year's traffic into and out of Canberra. They also show the passengers into and out of Canberra. That was as much as ~~we~~ <sup>2</sup> could obtain for you because it is almost impossible to get the figures for goods, and so on.

THE CHAIRMAN.- We also require information about shops?

MR. GIBSON.- Yes, ~~we did~~ <sup>is done</sup> a survey in 1952, and ~~we are~~ <sup>is being</sup> ~~bringing that~~ <sup>brought</sup> up to date. It is not easy to obtain in a matter of days, but it will be submitted.

THE CHAIRMAN.- We have not covered the point as to whether there is any overall policy about the development of Canberra in the years to come?

MR. GIBSON.- It will be noted ~~that~~ <sup>on</sup> page 35 of the evidence of Mr. McLaren the witness was asked about that matter and gave certain evidence. I would direct the Committee's attention to that evidence. I would not go so far as to say what the maximum population of Canberra will be although 130,000 has been mentioned. With regard to the overall planning of Canberra I had a discussion with the Secretary of the Department of the Interior in June 1950, and submitted a statement covering what I considered to be the several functions of town planning in Canberra. In this statement eight headings were covered, the first being the Outline Development Plan, so titled in lieu of "master plan". The purpose in that was to define development zones, communications and controlling features, and, as a working basis for detail, enabling flexibility within practical limits and intimating that the Griffin plan, undefined in

CANBERRA SENATE COMMITTEE.

many aspects of zoning, has spread without regard to cost and convenience. [In June 1951, a series of twelve drawings were discussed with the National <sup>Capital</sup> Planning and Development Committee, relating to proposals for roads in and around Canberra, with particular reference to residential neighbourhood and other zones. In March 1952, a further sketch was presented incorporating these opinions expressed by the Committee, which body, "agreed that these proposals, as outlined, provided a reasonable general basis for further study and development". [In May 1952 I submitted a "Canberra Development Review", which was in three parts. That evaluated, in my opinion, some aspects of the development which has occurred, and intimated that the paramount aim was "that the national capital of Australia must be exemplary of the best in modern development".

Later in May 1952, I submitted a memorandum concerning the future population of the city. In June 1952 followed a residential density review; and Ministerial approval was received ~~from~~ <sup>to</sup> my recommendation to increase the net residential density in the city. [In August 1953, I submitted recommendations for additional types of cross-sections of streets in residential areas, with the objective of reducing departmental maintenance costs in residential streets to be provided in the future, and to endeavour to create a better feeling of neighbourliness in future residential streets. [In October 1954 I presented drawings to the <sup>Indicatory</sup> Standing Committee on Public Works on the occasion of a public enquiry held to consider the question of the future Commonwealth Avenue Bridge. One of those drawings showed the ~~outline of~~ existing, approved and proposed principal roads in and around Canberra, being based on the proposals that I have already outlined. [Prior to the passing of the Town and Country Planning Act 1947, planning authorities in England were required to prepare planning schemes with a view to these becoming ultimately statutory in their provisions. That Act dispensed with the necessity for ~~these~~ planning schemes and provided, in lieu, for a framework or pattern of land use against which day to day development can be considered. The development plan is regarded as a more flexible successor to

the planning scheme.

I consider ~~the above~~ <sup>this</sup> to be sound reasoning, and have recommended that the term "master plan" be discarded both in title and implied rigidity, and the term "outline development plan", based on the accepted plan of road layout for Canberra, be substituted for it.

[ To date, detail plans prepared for further development of Canberra are co-related, together with assumed population potentials formulated on the Ministerial approval concerning the density of residential development.

That is the stage at which we are today in relation to outline development and forward planning. We co-relate whatever we ~~do~~ <sup>with</sup> have to the plan which has received the ~~approval~~ <sup>endorsement</sup> of the Planning Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do areas such as the Oaks Estate, Harman and Belconnen come into your plan?

MR. GIBSON.- ~~We~~ <sup>we</sup> made a submission to the Department in August 1952 <sup>concerning</sup> about ~~the~~ Oaks Estate, but ~~we~~ have not considered Belconnen or Harman.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The Town Planning <sup>Section</sup> ~~Organisation~~ was originally in the Department of Works, and was later transferred to the Department of the Interior?

MR. GIBSON.- That is ~~the~~ <sup>so</sup> ~~fact~~.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think that was a good thing?

MR. GIBSON.- Yes.

SENATOR WOOD.- What is the approximate area of the land that Senator Benn was asking you about?

MR. GIBSON.- That was the area previously known as Westlake and subsequently deleted ~~by~~ <sup>in</sup> the gazette. It covered ~~815~~ <sup>860</sup> acres.

SENATOR WOOD.- You spoke about using it for recreational purposes, and for a public domain?

MR. GIBSON.- Yes.

SENATOR WOOD.- What area did you have in mind for a domain?



MR. GIBSON.- That would depend on the layout scheme. Most of that area would be for domain purposes, mainly on the southern area near the river. The <sup>lower</sup> ~~upper~~ or northern area and the south-easterly section might be reasonably devoted to active recreation.

SENATOR WOOD.- What would the domain be used for?

MR. GIBSON.- Mainly for passive recreation, for perambulation, picnics and all sorts of things.

SENATOR WOOD.- Would it be a place at which functions could be held?

MR. GIBSON.- There could be dozens of activities, ~~no~~ none of which would interfere with any other.

SENATOR WOOD.- That was to be the primary purpose of the suggestion?

MR. GIBSON.- The primary purpose was for recreation, active and passive.

SENATOR WOOD.- There is already a civic centre, so the primary purpose was not for the holding of functions?

MR. GIBSON.- That is so, but there ~~is~~ <sup>is</sup> also a city square in the original plan.

SENATOR WOOD.- Does not that still exist?

MR. GIBSON.- Yes.

SENATOR WOOD.- That is equivalent to a civic centre in most other places?

MR. GIBSON.- Yes, that is a separate study.

SENATOR WOOD.- You spoke of a Ribbon of Water similar in width to the Yarra?

MR. GIBSON.- Yes.

SENATOR WOOD.- Do you consider that would be an impressive feature?

MR. GIBSON.- ~~He~~ <sup>She</sup> would also ~~have~~ <sup>be</sup> three central Ornamental Basins, which are not to be found in Melbourne, and they would extend for 2½ miles, which is <sup>quite a distance</sup> ~~rather an extensive area~~.

SENATOR WOOD.- Would that be a feature of the area or merely a stretch of water for people to use for boating?

CANBERRA SENATE COMMITTEE.

MR. GIBSON.- It is a feature that is complementary to the Ornamental Basins.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Is Lonsdale Street on the northern side of the city?

MR. GIBSON.- Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- What particular features do you find disappointing about that street?

MR. GIBSON.- There seems to be a lack of architectural control throughout the whole street. It was originally set aside as a minor industrial area.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The Committee thanks you for your evidence, Mr. Gibson.

THE WITNESS RETIRED.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

ARTHUR THOMAS SHAKESPEARE, Editor "Canberra Times", and a member of the Australian Capital Territory Advisory Council, sworn and examined:

THE CHAIRMAN.- I think that you would like to make a statement, Mr. Shakespeare, before we ask questions?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- Yes. By occupation I am a journalist. My interest in Canberra is primarily as a citizen, although I am a major owner of a newspaper enterprise here. It is our fixed policy that no person having any control<sup>of</sup>/policy of that newspaper shall have a financial interest in any other business in Canberra, so that we have complete financial independence. No vested interests can have anything to do with the policy of the newspaper. Also, we belong to no political party. I have lived in Canberra for 28 years and have studied its problems at first hand.

I see a remarkable parallel between the history of Canberra and the history of Washington in the U.S.A. I think we have to be indebted to the history of Washington for the warnings that it has given to us. We are also indebted to some Australians for the heed that they have taken of those warnings and for the safeguards that they have sought to apply for the preservation of Canberra and the maintenance of its development. But those safeguards have never been sufficient. I welcome very much the appointment of this Committee, because it is the first occasion on which either House of the Parliament has appointed a committee to interest itself in the affairs of Canberra. Many of the deficiencies that are to be found in Canberra and the Australian Capital Territory spring from traditional apathy and lack of interest by members of parliament in the seat of government, of which they are the trustees and custodians. I hope that this will be the forerunner of a standing committee, to which I shall refer later, of the Parliament which will always be studying the affairs of this territory. Washington owes all its beauty and grandeur, and the place that it occupies in American esteem, to a Senate committee which, in 1901, adopted something of the approach of this committee to stopping the drift in relation to the American capital. I do not know whether it would be helpful if I were to give a brief sketch

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

of the Washington background?

THE CHAIRMAN.- Yes, it would be helpful.

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- As the members of the Committee now, George Washington was an engineer, and he conceived the idea of their federal city. Incidentally, America was the first country in the world to initiate a federal capital exclusively for the purposes of a seat of government. He obtained the services of Charles L'Enfant who, in 1791, mapped out a plan for Washington. At that time, they thought that the city might grow to be a city of 200,000 people, and it was on that basis that L'Enfant developed his plan. The plan was adopted and then neglected. There was some ebb and flow in the American attitude to Washington. When the British captured the city in 1814 and burnt it down there was a surge of American sentiment towards the city. Incidentally, the White House derives its name from the fact that it was painted white to cover up the smoke stains which the British fires had made on its walls.

In 1825 the plan was practically in the discard. Congress, which had something the same responsibility towards the federal district as this parliament has, although in one respect it is more circumscribed, in 1822 appointed a Town Council for Washington. Through the years of neglect the swamps multiplied along the river, mud was in every street, there were no lights anywhere; indeed there were all kinds of marks of neglect. That state of affairs continued, and the plan was departed from more and more. Some of those who departed from it were Congressmen and cabinet ministers. For instance, Andrew Jackson went out one morning for a walk. He put his walking stick down at a certain point and said, "This is where the treasury building is going to be." And there it is today, right in the middle of the long expanse of <sup>Pennington's Avenue</sup> ~~road~~ that runs from the <sup>Capitol Building</sup> Lincoln Memorial to the White House. That is a monument to interference with plans.

The outlook of important Americans in the early years of the eighteenth century was such that they thought that Washington would never become a city of more than 10,000 people and that, for that reason, to allocate 100 square miles for a federal district

#### SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

was a complete dream. The people of Virginia, therefore, were able to have their portion of the federal district retroceded in about 1864. As a result, the great Pentagon building is not in the District of Columbia at all but in the State of Virginia. Similarly, naval headquarters are in the State of Maryland. About three fifths of the population of metropolitan Washington is not in Washington but is spread out in the States of Maryland and Virginia. Across the central features of Washington run railway tracks. Pressure from Congress overcame all the scruples of those who were devoted to making Washington an emblem of national life.

After the Civil War, a man named Alexander Shepherd, who became known as "Boss" Shepherd, decided that he was going to build Washington, and he did so. Regardless of the size of the appropriations by Congress, he set Washington going. In 1871 Congress decided to abolish the council, and in 1874 it set up the present commission. Washington is the best governed city in the United States today. It is free of debt and also free of graft. If you read Washington newspapers which have been published during the last decade you will find no reference to charges of graft against the administration. Nor will you find such references in newspapers published outside the city.

MR. SHAKESPEARE (Continuing). - But nevertheless the spoliation of Washington continued. In 1901 a Senate Committee headed by Senator McMillan began to listen to some patriotic Americans who wanted to save their capital. The chief of these was an architect called Daniel Burnham, and this Committee was encouraged to set about devising plans to develop Washington and preserve it from further spoliation. In 1910 President Taft set up the Fine Arts Commission, in Washington, which is a top level body and cannot be touched by any body, any Minister or any official in the District. They are people who are imbued with lofty ideals and the purpose of making Washington the most beautiful capital in the world. That Commission supervises the whole of the design of government buildings. It reports annually to Congress. Its members are not permitted to have anything to do with any professional work in or about Washington. Four of the original members of the advisers who worked for the Senate Committee in the early years of this century were appointed to the Fine Arts Commission when it was appointed. At that time it was composed of architects, painters, sculptors and writers. Sculptors, writers and painters were in the singular. I think there were three architects. They were men of that type. They were people who could work 24 hours a day devising schemes for Washington but never receive any payment for it. They are not allowed to be interested in any design, building, or anything like that. Their professional activities are far away from Washington. In 1926, when the effects of the neglect of the L'Enfant Plan were being shown up by contrast with the work of the Fine Arts Commission, the Government <sup>created</sup> a National Capital Parks and Planning Commission. It is a district body having charge of all the parks and the planning of Washington at the district, as distinct from the national, level. The Government also established

a Zoning Commission, which disentangled a lot of the departures from town planning that had taken place in the past. I might say that although it has cost hundreds of millions of dollars to repair all of these mistakes, they have never expunged, and can never expunge, all of them from the landscape. There are magnificent avenues that were designed by L'Enfant that have been destroyed or interrupted by development that should never have been permitted to take place.

If I might draw a lesson from this, all the members of the Congress who were responsible for these things were good Americans, and they believed that they were doing the right thing. But they were serving their time and they were not acting as trustees for the nation or for posterity. I feel that that is a problem that Canberra has today and has had ever since the Parliament was transferred here. The Trustees see their estate, but they know little about it. If I may say so, many comments on Canberra made in Parliament reveal an abysmal ignorance of matters that trustees of an estate should be most conversant with.

Perhaps I might now refer to Canberra development. I do not propose to go back beyond 1924. There is a standard history of Canberra - Watson's "History of Canberra" - which was published in 1927 and is a very good factual presentation of the history of Canberra, avoiding controversy. At the end of 1924 two decisions were implemented. First, the Parliament decided that the Government of Canberra must be vested in a Commission which would provide the Territory with unified administration at the Territory level and would have the capacity, as well as the responsibility, to carry out that development, subject to votes by Parliament. On the 10th December, 1924, the first leases were offered for sale in Canberra. They were

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

retail trading leases, residential leases and minor industrial leases. Before these leases were offered, advertisements appeared in all metropolitan newspapers in Australia under the Commonwealth coat of arms and over the signature of the then Minister, Senator George Pearce. The advertisements made certain representations. This is something like a loan prospectus in my view. They represented to prospective lessees that within 5 years the development of Canberra would be carried to the point where it would have a similar population to certain towns - Goulburn, Albury and others - which were mentioned. It looked as if that population would be about 15,000 persons. It was represented that by the end of 10 years the whole of the Commonwealth Departments then in Melbourne would be transferred to Canberra. The first transfer was completed in 1927. It had hardly been completed when the first breath of economic depression was felt. The first thing that the Cabinet decided to cut was the Canberra vote, which was reduced for the second half of the financial year 1927-28. So that Canberra had a depression before there was a general depression.

In September, 1927, the foundations were laid of the Commonwealth Offices, the first portion of which may be completed this year. In the ordinary course of events, that building should have been completed by 1934, to enable a substantial number of central staffs to be transferred from Melbourne. In 1928 a transfer of expediency from Melbourne took place. The Civic Centre shopping blocks had been completed. The prevailing depression had left substantial spaces there untenanted and the government was able to get cheap rents. It availed itself of those spaces and transferred additional staffs to Canberra. At the same time it demolished an old wooden building at Jolimot that had been erected during World War I. It re-erected it at Civic Centre and transferred with it the Department of Works. The Federal



SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

Capital Commission, when it was established, had intended to use the Department of Works and Railways, as it was then known, for some of the Canberra development work. It found that this was impossible, and so the Commission, very wisely in my view, set up its own establishment and was a complete administration in every respect. In 1930 the Commission was abolished. For a little while it was carried on as the Federal Capital Territory Branch of the Department of Home Affairs, and then there was a scramble and it was grabbed by this Department and that Department. Administratively the Capital has suffered ever since. In 1936, about 10 years after the National Capital Parks and Planning Commission had been established in Washington, it became evident that certain safeguards had to be applied to the Canberra Plan and to the control of Canberra development. It is true that the Seat of Government (Administration) Act provided that the plan could not be amended except in a certain manner; that is, by the presentation of a proposal for the amendment to Parliament, and with the right of disallowance by Parliament. But the Parliament knew nothing about what the gazettal or the presentation of an instrument meant, because there was no explanation.

Several things happened about that time - about 1936. There was a controversy about the siting of the High School. It was claimed that the proposed site was an invasion of the University site, and that if it was not an invasion, it was a limitation of the University site. The criticism, as indeed happens to much criticism, was strenuously opposed by both Ministers and officials, and the High School went where it now is. The result is that today the Universities in Canberra are looking for more land, because the High School stands in the way of their ultimate development. At the same time a less noticeable development occurred in the building of residences. It has always been an unwritten law

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

that the types of buildings to be erected along the main avenues - that is the 200 foot avenues - should be of better quality and higher architectural appeal than those elsewhere. But on what was then known as Fialligo Avenue and on Canberra Avenue the cheapest type of brick residences were erected, and there was no-one to do anything about it. In 1938 an ordinance to create the National Capital Planning and Development Committee was passed. That Committee has performed a very valuable service in safeguarding this City against expediency and all sorts of things that had wrecked Washington. But it is not enough.

(Mr. Shakespeare continuing). - The ordinance was so framed that difficulties could arise if pressures developed. Such pressures have developed, and they are very strong at the present time, to interfere with standards in this city. They are pressures that tend to force counsels of expediency to overcome principles that were visualised in the early days.

Section 6 of the ordinance provides that the Minister may refer to the committee any matter in relation to the planning and development of the city upon which he desires the advice of the committee, and that the committee shall inquire into and report to the Minister on the matter. Section 7 provides that the committee may, on its own initiative, make inquiries and make recommendations to the Minister in relation to about seven or eight matters which give it a wide charter. In other words, it can initiate inquiries into quite a lot of things that should be the concern of a planning committee.

It has power to take evidence or to request the attendance of officers of the Public Service, and it can request heads of Commonwealth departments to provide certain information. However, it has no power to request the attendance of any person who is not a member of the Commonwealth Public Service. Thus, whilst the ordinance states that it may make inquiries on its own initiative, it has not the means or the authority to conduct an inquiry in the way that an inquiry might have to be conducted to achieve its best purpose.

In Washington, the plan cannot be altered unless there is a report in favour of the amendment to Congress. The Fine Arts Commission presents a report to Congress every year, and a report of the activities of the National Planning and Development Committee goes to Congress in the report of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

In Canberra, there have been amendments to the city plan that have never been referred to the National Capital and Planning Development Committee by the Minister, and in respect of which an ageing committee has not sought to buy in. I should like to make it clear that I have the greatest respect and sense of thankfulness to  
P.I. 149.

A.T. SHAKESPEARE

the committee for what it has done, but it has been there too long and its members do not want trouble.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - How many members has the committee?

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - The chairman of the Parliamentary Public Works Committee is one. I do not say that he does not want trouble. The chairman of the Advisory Council is another member. The executive officer is the Assistant Secretary (Development) Department of the Interior. The other members are appointed, and they comprise two architects, an engineer and a town planner. The present town planner was only recently appointed, but the attitude of the committee is plainly to avoid trouble. It will not initiate inquiries. It is not required to report on matters that the Minister does not refer to it, and it does not do so.

SENATOR WOOD. - Who is the town planner recently appointed to the committee?

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - Mr. Heath, from Victoria.

In my view, the powers of the National Capital Planning and Development Committee should be enlarged. It should be mandatory for the committee to report on any proposal for the amendment of the city plan, and its report should go to Parliament so that Parliament can be informed of what lies behind the proposal. The Lonsdale Street development was never referred to the National Capital Planning and Development Committee.

SENATOR VINCENT. - Who started that monstrosity?

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - Departmental pressure started it. The area is on the route that had been laid down in the Griffin plan for the railway through the city to Yass. It was decided, wisely, that the railway, instead of running through the city, should go round it - if the railway was ever built. When that was taken out of the plan, there was a vacuum, which was filled by that development at Lonsdale Street.

There is a great deal to be said for the Lonsdale Street development. It can be amply justified, but the manner in which it was planned and the manner in which the development has been

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

neglected, so far as supervision is concerned, cannot be justified. The town planner, Mr. Gibson, has already referred to the complete absence of any architectural control, and inspection of the area will tell the committee more than Mr. Gibson could say in a week.

With regard to control of the plan, we have to agree that you cannot set up a plan as an idol that has to be worshipped. This plan is a very wonderful plan. It is criticised, but its critics are largely those who do not do something about interpreting it intelligently.

I should like to cite an example of the merit of the plan. When Burley Griffin drew his first plan, as you know, there was a land axis and a water axis in the central portion of the city. The land axis ran from the top of Mt Ainslie to the southernmost end of Red Hill. It came down through the site of the present National War Memorial, Anzac Park way, Parliament House, Capital Hill, and so on. Griffin knew where the Government triangle was going to be and that was all right. But up there under Mt Ainslie there was a very commanding site and he thought that something symbolic of Australian life should go there. Burley Griffin, with his brief knowledge of Australia from overseas, provisionally put down "Casino". Then came the war, and there was the site for the Australian National War Memorial.

That is a great plan. It was conceived in the horse and buggy days, but there is no reason why, with intelligent interpretation today, as Mr. Gibson intends, all the traffic problems of the city should not be solved without having recourse to the painful experiences of other cities.

You have to have a balance. You have to preserve standards. You have to protect posterity against the pressure of the current generation. You have to provide for intelligent and desirable development to meet modern requirements, and you still have to have some play. But what you have to do above all, I think, is preserve the interests of posterity against this generation, and that is a very high responsibility. It is a responsibility that can be discharged only if the freest, most independent and most highly qualified experts can advise an interested Parliament.

I broke off just now at 1936 because of the collision of planning aspects with the development of Canberra. I shall return briefly now to that period, when it was no longer possible to plead depression. There had been a budget speech which showed that every index in Australia was rising and that there was prosperity everywhere except in the pockets of the people. The Treasurer of the day announced in his budget speech that the development of Canberra was to be resumed, and a building programme was initiated and was carried on until about 1941. That is, its momentum carried it on until about 1941.

That programme was undertaken at the nadir of building cost. Building costs were down to the lowest point they had ever reached, and it was money very well worth spending if only from a commercial standpoint. They got very good value for their money.

The end of the war came and, in 1947, it was visualised that there would be a 10-year programme for Canberra to end in 1957. Within that period, all the central staffs then in Melbourne were to be transferred to Canberra. The projected transfer involved about 7,500 officers.

It was intended that 5,500 housing units should be constructed, both in attached and detached form, and that the remaining 2,000 officers, apart from those who wanted to build for themselves, would be catered for in hostels and so on. That meant that, over the ten years, there had to be an average housing construction of 550 houses annually for the transfer and for nothing else.

In the first five calendar years of that plan, 1,875 houses were built. There was a bonus in that total of 203 houses, which you might almost call substandard residences. They were built from scrap material brought from the air base at Tocumwal. Those air force cottages were demolished and the scrap was brought over here. The result was that we got 203 very much-needed houses. They are very comfortable houses, and some of them have four bedrooms. Nobody who lives in them is at all worried about living conditions, but architecturally they are below the standard we should have here.

MR. SHAKESPEARE . - speaking - Leaving those houses out of consideration, only about 1600 houses were built in the first five years of a 5,500 housing programme. Even that programme had not been intended to meet all housing requirements. It was intended only for transferred officers. Yet, in seven years, not one department of the Public Service has been transferred to Canberra. The housing provided has been inadequate to provide for the expansion of Commonwealth staff. About 2,000 people are now waiting for houses and it is necessary for an applicant to wait about two years for a home. The maximum rate of construction of houses was reached in 1952 when 652 houses were built. Since then, the rate of construction has fallen to about 400 houses a year.

The Committee will have read about "operation administration" the plan for the transfer of departments in order to fill the administrative building that is at present under construction. Some of the officers of the Department of the Interior are trying zealously to implement that plan. But it will not be implemented unless there is a very revolutionary change in the means of executing the developmental programme. The most essential requirement is that the Department of the Interior should be in a position to command that its developmental requirements shall be performed when it wants them to be performed. It has the necessary money. The weakness is that it has not a department of Works that will or can perform its commands. Of course, both departments are staffed by public servants and it is not considered to be good for public servants to make war on one another. And there is no war. There is no pressure. And there will not be pressure until Parliament exerts it. The Minister wants "operation administration" to be executed; the Department of the Interior wants it; but it will not be executed unless there is a change in the Department of Works. I suggest that it is essential to drag the whole of the central staff of the Department of Works to Canberra by the hairs of their heads. The deficiencies under

G.I. 149. A.T. SHAKESPEARE.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

which the Parliament, the administration, and the Territory at large suffers will be removed when those officers have to endure them.

I referred earlier to the provision in the U.S.A. Constitution regarding the federal district. As the Committee is aware, the Australian Constitution has been modelled very much along the same lines as the Constitution of the U.S.A., but one important word was left out of the section of the Australian Constitution regarding its federal district. That was the word "exclusively". Sub-section 17 of Section 8 of the American Constitution, in defining the powers of the Congress, says that it shall exercise exclusive legislative control of the district, which meant that it could not delegate that control. The Congress has managed to delegate some powers to the district authorities, but a fine distinction has been drawn between legislative and administrative acts. In Australia the Parliament has the power of delegation in relation to the Australian Capital Territory and has used it to the extreme. That is to say, the law making powers for the Australian Capital Territory have been delegated to the Governor-General, Parliament retaining the usual right of disallowance. In considering the formal administration of Canberra the balance of national interest against the democratic right of the residents has to be considered. When the Federal Capital Commission was abolished in 1930 an ordinance was made to create an Advisory Council composed of nominated and elected members which would advise the Minister of any matter in relation to which he asked advice or on which the Council wanted to give advice. A motion for disallowance of the ordinance was introduced in the Senate but was withdrawn on the undertaking of the Government that the whole subject of the administration of Canberra would be reviewed within twelve months. That was in 1930. In 1953 the Advisory Council recommended to the Minister that he should cause a select committee of Parliament to be



SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

appointed to inquire into and report on this matter. The Minister said that he would not worry Parliament with the appointment of a select committee so the Advisory Council itself undertook this inquiry. The Council is now completing its report which it intends to circulate to every member of Parliament. I do not think that the report will be available before this Senate Committee completes its inquiries. The inquiry has been a long process and we do not want to present the report that is not complete. I might say, without anticipating the report, that the Advisory Council is agreed on certain principles. One is that it is impossible at this stage of development to separate the national functions of Canberra from the local functions. It has found that the application to Canberra of local Government as it is understood in the States would be quite impracticable and nationally undesirable. The difficulties in Canberra do not arise from the lack of "say" by the citizen in municipal services. The municipal services are very well conducted. Nothing is to be gained by taking them out of the hands of experts and giving them into the hands of people who may be subordinate to the experts in their department. That is to say, the election of a municipal Council might result in junior clerks doing worse than which is now being done well by experts. In any case, we are in a transitional period and it would not be possible to strike a balance for the division of costs. However, few criticisms by the citizens of Canberra are made at the municipal level; they are made at the state level; that is, at the quasi-state functions such as education, land policy and housing. Those are not municipal matters. The Parliament could not lightly transfer those functions to a body composed of local citizens. After all, the democratic right is not for the citizen to run municipal services. It is for him to have a voice in the laws under which those services are conducted. The Council believes that the first need of Canberra is for a unified administration such as existed under the Federal Capital Commission, although it need not take that form, and for the people

G.3. 151. A.T.SHAKESPEARE.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

to have the right to make their own laws. All the laws of the Territory should be made by a legislative council. That is a constitutional responsibility of the Parliament. It is a matter in which the Australian people are vitally concerned and no Parliament could, in the initial stage, hand over the making of laws to the local residents. Therefore, the legislative Council should be a partnership, half its members being nominated by the Governor-General and half being elected by the citizens. The legislative Council should make the laws and the laws should come into effect upon being approved by whoever is the head of the unified administration with two important reservations; certain subjects of legislation should be reserved for assent by the Governor-General and no laws relating to finance should be introduced except by the finance member of the council who would be a Government appointee. Also, when a Premiers Conference has agreed on the introduction of uniform legislation throughout the Commonwealth and the Australian Governments requires that legislation to take effect in the Australian Capital Territory there would have to be some device such as a message from the Minister in order to enable such legislation to be dealt with. The procedure adopted might be something like that which has been adopted in connection with Appropriation Bills.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The unified authority is the legislative council with a government nominee. Should the government nominee be the chairman?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- I am anticipating now what will be placed in a later report of the Advisory Council. We are broadly in agreement on a half and half legislative council which would appoint the chairman and carry out details of that kind. In putting up such a plan we must show how it will work in all circumstances.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Who will be required to do the administration work which is now divided between a number of different departments under different ministers?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- The administration will be unified. We have not attempted to say whether there will be a separate department under a minister, with the administrator responsible to the minister, or whether there will be a board or commission. We want the control of all functions to be in the hands of one person, and if he is to be an administrator he should be a member of the legislative council - although not necessarily the chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you desire that the channel from that body to the federal executive shall go through one minister only?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- Yes, I do not exclude the possibility that a working arrangement could be made by the administrator with another department. For example, there are wheat farmers in this Territory, and certain things are done in regard to them by the Department of Commerce and Agriculture. We do not desire to set up a similar department within the Territory administration, nor do we want to duplicate the Department of Health, in which there are experts who can give the administrator advice even over the telephone. However, we must have the power to say, for example, that when we want a school built in 1955, it will not be built in 1965.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you consider that a Committee of the Senate, which might perhaps meet once a year, would be a desirable liaison with the Parliament?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- I visualise a standing committee of the Parliament, or of the Senate or House of Representatives. In

Washington there are two committees, a House committee of about 24 members, and a Senate committee of about 13 members. Those committees are continually meeting and examining all phases of administration in the District of Columbia.

THE CHAIRMAN.- That system works well in Washington?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- From the standpoint of the United States Government and the United States Congress, and also from the standpoint of the District, it does work well. The District always knows that Congressmen are aware of its problems, and very often a valuable lead is given by the Congress committees. Always in the Congress, or in our Parliament, there is an informed body of men, and that excludes the possibility of ministers being appointed to take charge of a territory when they know nothing about its problems.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you consider that the failure of the Department of Works to work in as well as it could with the Department of the Interior, is one of the reasons for the failure of Canberra to develop?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- For the failure of the programme to be implemented.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you wish to say anything else about the function and authority of the Australian Capital Territory Advisory Council?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- I am a member of that Council and I have no authority to give evidence on its behalf. However, the usefulness of the Advisory Council depends on its members, and on the willingness of the Minister to consider seriously the Council's advice. Ever since Mr. McLaren has been Secretary of the Department of Interior there has been a complete difference in the ministerial attitude, irrespective of the minister, towards the advice of the Council. I do not mean that all our advice is accepted, but it is at least considered, and the minutes are very closely scrutinised by the Minister - particularly the present Minister. That fact has given great heart to the citizens on the Advisory Council.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Who was the Minister in 1953 to whom you previously referred?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- That was the present Minister.

THE CHAIRMAN.- He turned down the matter that you mentioned?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Nobody should draw any inference from that about his attitude towards the Advisory Council?

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - No, it is the Minister's responsibility to make decisions. We may think he is right or wrong, but he has to make the decisions.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you consider that the Griffin plan is a good one, and do you believe that any modifications should be carried out while observing the general principles of the original plan?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- I would not go quite that far, because if you read the explanatory report on the plan by Burley Griffin, you will see that it is difficult to find out what he intended for the future. History indicates that he did not complete the filling in of detail on the plan, but the conception of the plan should not be spoiled. In particular, the original plan showed 200 ft. avenues leading out of Canberra, but those avenues are being made narrower. Two of them have become 100 ft. avenues on traffic counts and estimates made in 1954. However, I think everyone will agree that those estimates are bound to be wrong in the year 2054. If Melbourne and Adelaide can enjoy beautiful avenues that run considerable distances from the cities, surely Canberra can also afford them on economic grounds.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you consider that a body similar to the United States Fine Arts Commission would be suitable in Canberra?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- Yes, I believe that there should be two bodies, one at the highest level without any administration officer on it, completely independent and unfettered in its judgment. Then there should be a planning commission administrative body corresponding to our National Capital Planning and Development Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think that a fine arts commission should consist of architects, artists and other people whose idea is to safeguard the beauties of the city?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- I believe that the Washington conception of each committee answers that question. There are no engineers on

that body, although I do not know whether that is a good or a bad thing. Indeed, I do not know whether it is good or bad to have a writer on the committee, although probably he was also a very patriotic citizen.

SENATOR BENN.- In your early remarks you made use of the words "traditional apathy" to Canberra?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- Yes.

SENATOR BENN.- Why should there be any apathy about Canberra's development?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- I do not think there should be, I am deploring the fact that there has been. It has not been sufficiently impressed on the members of the Parliament that they are trustees in this city.

SENATOR BENN.- Is the apathy widespread?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- The members of the Parliament are the trustees, but the safeguarding of the city is being carried out by the citizen against whom the rest of the Commonwealth should have to be protected. The member of Parliament who comes from an electorate outside Canberra will have people in his electorate who say "so much is being spent in Canberra, why can't we get the same thing here?" If there were a committee continuously studying the affairs of the Australian Capital Territory, members of the Parliament might be able to look at the matter from a higher plane and realise that money properly spent on the seat of Government, and therefore to forward the cause of better government, is for the benefit of everybody in every electorate throughout the country.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- Only Parliament can take that to the electorate. I do not think that the electorate is ever going to bring it to Parliament.

SENATOR BENN.- You believe that the average Australian is apathetic towards the national capital?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- Not only that. His apathy springs from his lack of knowledge of Canberra.

SENATOR BENN.- Is your opinion that the real cause of his apathy is due to his own electoral interests?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- No, I am saying that that is a circumstance - that he has a conflict of interests. In my view, every member of parliament has to realise that he is a constitutional trustee of this place. He is responsible for it to the people of Australia.

SENATOR BENN.- You think that he must regard the national capital in a proper light?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- Yes. That is just as important as is his interest in, say, the budget.

SENATOR HANFORD.- Would you say that there is some hostility towards Canberra on the part of individual members?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- Members of parliament come here to represent electorates. If a member thinks that a certain thing is what his electorate demands of him, within certain limits, he will do that thing. Some of them do what they think will please their electors. I think that, fundamentally, there will be no hostility towards Canberra if members of parliament display a proper interest in it and an understanding of the position. We have an example of that in Washington. A member of the American House of Representatives or Senate would not be popular if he attempted to run down Washington in the parliament. Indeed, they would probably throw him out. The American people believe in Washington.

SENATOR VICENT.- Would you agree that somewhat the reverse state of affairs is correct in regard to the general attitude of mind

of the citizens of Australia regarding Canberra?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- I think that a profound change is taking place on the part of the people. Nearly everyone who comes here goes away a convert. The only people who go away unconverted are those whom the electors send here to represent them.

SENATOR VINCENT.- Have you any idea of how many people do not come here but still maintain what one might call an attitude of apathy or even antagonism towards our national capital?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- Antagonism to the national capital is also brought up in the widespread antagonism to anything commonwealth. If you go to any state of the Commonwealth, you will find a constant propaganda campaign being waged by state premiers.

SENATOR VINCENT.- Therefore, you do agree with me that there is some feeling in regard to Canberra on the part of a large proportion of our citizens?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- Yes, uninformed feeling.

SENATOR VINCENT.- Whether it is uninformed or not, it is there?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- Yes.

SENATOR VINCENT.- Will you agree that one of the ways to alter that unfortunate state of affairs would be to endeavour to build a national capital in which, despite that feeling, every Commonwealth citizen would take a pride?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- Yes, But of course you cannot build a federal capital on the cheap.

SENATOR VINCENT.- If we do try to erect a national capital which looks cheap, that will inculcate inevitably a feeling of disdain and antagonism in the hearts of our own people?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- Yes. You have to remember that in addition to its utilitarian purpose in relation to good government, a national capital also has to be a symbol.

SENATOR VINCENT.- It must have some spiritual and emotional appeal to the citizens of the nation?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- Yes. I saw the word "symbol" defined



SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

the other day as something which conveys one meaning to the eye and another to the understanding.

SENATOR VINCENT.- I am not quite clear on what you mean by this proposed legislative council. What function would that council perform?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- It would simply make the laws that are to operate in the territory as a territory.

SENATOR VINCENT.- At a municipal level?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- Yes, and at a state level.

SENATOR VINCENT.- It would, therefore, supplant any municipal body that might be set up hereafter?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- No. It would make it possible for such a municipal body to become practicable.

SENATOR VINCENT.- You would not require a municipal council as well as a legislative council, would you?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- I am in danger of spilling too much about what is happening in the Advisory Council. Might I explain that while we have reached the conclusion that there is no justification for a municipal council in Canberra, as it is understood elsewhere, we are not discarding the idea altogether. We have suggested that a little pilot plant be set up as part of the administration, which will be called "The Canberra Undertaking". It will be run by a committee in which the citizens will be represented. The first function which it might be given would be the running of the electricity undertaking, which is capable of being run on a profit and loss basis. You buy current and sell it to balance your budget. That is relatively simple. Then, as other things in the territory developed to the point where they were being capable of being administered in that way without becoming a charge on the budget, you might transfer them to the Canberra Undertaking, so that after a period of years you would have shown in practice how far a municipal administration, as in the states, would be possible without interfering with the national interests here.

S SENATOR VINCENT.- So you do envisage an ultimate form of

local government, not necessarily on all fours with what we now regard as local government, but nevertheless a form of it?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- What we in Australia regard as local government, but not what is regarded as local government in England. We envisage a form of territory administration at local government and state level. But you cannot do this sort of thing while you are in the midst of a developmental programme.

SENATOR VINCENT.- You would advocate, I take it, a gradual approach to this local government administration?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- A gradual approach, but no conviction that there should be one until we know what should be done. In the light of this little pilot plant we are not discarding the possibility of there being a municipal administration.

SENATOR VINCENT.- You mean, you are experimenting with it?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- We could conduct a safe experiment without prejudicing the national interests.

SENATOR VINCENT.- It is still a form of local government administration?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- It is.

SENATOR VINCENT.- So to that extent you agree that there should be some attempt to establish a local government administration?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- Yes. We cannot deny the established right of citizens of other British communities,

SENATOR VINCENT.- And would you integrate that form of administration with this legislative council organisation?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- The legislative council will not be administrative; it will be merely legislative. The administration will be done by the unified administration, whatever its form.

SENATOR VINCENT.- Would your unified administration be responsible to the legislative council?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- It would have to be responsible to the Minister and to the Parliament which would provide the finance.

SENATOR VINCENT.- The legislative council would be purely advisory.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- No. It would make laws.

SENATOR VINCENT.- I cannot understand that. You would give it authority without responsibility?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- Our constitutional system is to have an executive that is responsible to parliament, but the American system is different from that. Under the American system, the executive is not responsible to parliament. Congress makes the laws and the executive has to obey the laws that Congress makes. That would be the position here. The pattern on which administration would be carried out would be determined by the laws which were made in partnership between the Commonwealth and the people.

SENATOR VINCENT.- If you had an executive responsible to parliament and not responsible to the legislature, namely your council, surely you would end with a rather complicated and perhaps unfortunate system of administration?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- We have the American model.

SENATOR VINCENT.- With respect, I suggest that it is quite different from the American model.

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- The American system is much bigger.

SENATOR VINCENT.- It is a different plan, too, because after all, the executive there is responsible to the people.

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- Through the President, yes.

SENATOR VINCENT.- Would your legislative council have power to tax the population of the territory?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- I have said that all finance measures would have to be introduced only by the finance member, who would be a government member. That is already the system in the Northern Territory.

SENATOR VINCENT.- Would the legislative council rely on government grants as well?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- Yes. But the legislative council would not carry on the administration. The question of administration would be related directly to parliament, through the minister.

SENATOR VINCENT.- To take a hypothetical case, what would

happen if the legislative council enacted a series of legislative acts and your administration, which is not responsible to it, refused to carry them out?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- That could not happen unless the administration went to gaol or were dismissed.

SENATOR VINCENT.- If the administration were not responsible to the legislative council, it could do that?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- Yes, but the law that the legislative council would make would have as much effect as the laws of this parliament, because it would stem from power delegated by this parliament.

SENATOR VINCENT.- Then, in effect, you would be making the administration responsible to the council?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- No, the administration is responsible to the minister. It would depend on the kind of enactments the council made. If it went off the rails, either the parliament or the Governor-General would disallow the ordinance. It might come within the subjects which have to be reserved for assent by the Governor-General.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I think that the point Senator Vincent is making is very pertinent. While I can see what you are driving at, you must admit that it is a novel form of government and quite unfamiliar to anyone in Australia?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- We are conscious of that. Our concern is to see that the right of every person to have a voice in the making of the laws under which he lives is so exercised that it does not interfere with the Commonwealth interest in this territory. That is the problem.

SENATOR HARRISON.- Would it be a counterpart of the Northern Territory Legislative Council?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- Pretty well, with the exception that you would not have some of the difficulties that arise because of the isolation of the Northern Territory from the seat of government. This will all be done right under the eye of the minister and parliament. Without disparaging the Northern Territory elector, we have here a pretty well-educated type of elector.

(Luncheon adjournment)

SENATOR VINCENT. - Would the proposed Legislative Council be wholly advisory?

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - It is contemplated that instead of the Seat of Government (Administration) Act reading as at present, "The Governor-General may make ordinances having the force of law in the Territory....." it shall read, "The Legislative Council of the Australian Capital Territory may make ordinances having the force of law in the Territory....." It will then show how the Legislative Council shall be constituted and what limitations as to procedure, subjects of legislation and reservation for assent would be desirable.

SENATOR VINCENT. - Do you intend to give that body full sovereign power?

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - Not exclusively. The Parliament, under Sections 52 and 122, has the exclusive power and it delegates, in accordance with this Act, portion of the province of its legislation. It could legislate concurrently if necessary. It has not an exclusive power.

SENATOR VINCENT. - It would be subject to the power of Parliament to disallow?

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - Yes, and subject to inherent safeguards in the Act.

SENATOR VINCENT. - Would you give the Minister no power to disallow?

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - It would follow something on the lines of the procedure in the Northern Territory, where the ordinance is made by the Legislative Council for the Northern Territory, and is assented to by the Administrator. The Administrator is responsible to the Minister for the Interior. Whether the voice and the touch

are the same, I do not know. The Administrator would know the views of the Minister. Perhaps it might be helpful if I clarified the exact decisions that have been made by the Advisory Council, as far as it has gone, and left the other matter as just something that is under discussion. The Council has reached the following conclusions in principle, in open meeting:

- (1) It is not possible, in the present transitional stage of Canberra development, to make a clear distinction between all those activities and responsibilities which pertain to the Australian Capital Territory as a political subdivision and those which have to do with the Federal Government.
- (2) It is not practicable, therefore, immediately to vest in a form of local government the authority to control and administer local affairs.
- (3) It would not be practicable until a more mature stage in Canberra development to confer financial autonomy upon the form of local government comprehending an object independent of that of the government, and authority for the collection, custody and disbursement of local funds.
- (4) It would be both practical and desirable, however, to create a body which could discharge the legislative function within the proper limits of local jurisdiction.
- (5) It would be desirable to centralise in a single office the responsibility for the conduct of administrative affairs of the territory.

Those are the decisions in principle. How they are to be implemented is now the subject of sub-committee consideration.

SENATOR VINCENT. - That does not refer to the proposed Legislative Council.

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - Except that it would be "practical and desirable, however, to create a body which could discharge the legislative function within the proper limits of local jurisdiction."

SENATOR VINCENT. - Meaning jurisdiction other than local government, or appertaining to local government?

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - May I give you an example. The Legislative Council would not attempt to legislate, say, for the Australian National University, which is constituted under an act of the Commonwealth Parliament.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

SENATOR VINCENT. - Would it include the administration of justice in the Territory?

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - Yes. But again there, the Supreme Court is created by an act of Parliament. The general structure of the administration of justice would be the subject of law-making in the Territory.

SENATOR VINCENT. - I am not yet clear about the degree of autonomy that you propose to give the Legislative Council. Have you anything to add to what you have already said on that matter?

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - I am in two difficulties here. One is that I am a member of a sub-committee that is discussing this in the Advisory Council. I cannot speak yet for the other members, although their ideas are fairly well defined. The other difficulty is that we are striving to avoid any clash between the national and the local interests. We have a Legislative Council working in the Northern Territory, where the Administrator is its Chairman and there is no difficulty of a clash between the Administration, being responsible to the limited legislative body, or the body to whom Parliament has delegated some law-making functions, and the delegating Parliament.

SENATOR VINCENT. - Does your proposal not differ from the Northern Territory set-up in that the Administration there has a degree of responsibility to the Administrator, and hence to the Legislative Council for the Northern Territory?

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - We have not worked that out here.

SENATOR VINCENT. - I thought you had worked it out because you told me this morning that you envisaged a unified administration, I think you called it, directly responsible to the Minister.

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - Exactly. It must be. You have to have responsibility to Parliament for all executive acts.

SENATOR VINCENT. - Responsibility ultimately to Parliament.

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - Yes.

SENATOR VINCENT. - But Parliament cannot supervise the direction and control of an administration of Canberra.

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - No. Parliament supervises the administration, first of all, by making the laws under which the administration works, and secondly, by holding the purse strings.

SENATOR VINCENT. - Which Minister do you suggest should control the unified administration?

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - The Minister who is responsible to Parliament for the affairs of the Territory.

SENATOR VINCENT. - Which one is that?

THE CHAIRMAN. - There is more than one at present.

SENATOR VINCENT. - At present there is no such Minister.

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - Might I go back. When we had a unified administration, in two stages - in the days of the Federal Capital Commission and in the days following its abolition before Canberra reverted completely to departmental supervision - the Minister for Home Affairs was the Minister.

SENATOR VINCENT. - I take it that now it would be the Minister for the Interior. There is also another very important distinction between your proposal for a legislative council and the corresponding organisation in the Northern Territory, where the organisation has been planned in the ultimate for the establishment of a new State. Do you suggest that that should be the ultimate destiny of the Australian Capital Territory?

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - I do not think the Constitution ever contemplated that the territory for the Seat of Government would become a State; otherwise the Constitution would not have referred specifically in Section 52 to the Parliament --

SENATOR VINCENT. - I am aware of the Constitutional difficulties, but we can amend the Constitution. Do you envisage a separate State being formed in the Australian Capital Territory?

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - No. I do not think that the Australian Capital Territory should ever become a State. I do not think you could have a State of the Australian Capital Territory



under the Constitution. You have the machinery for the creation of new States, and it would not be practicable to make this Territory a new State. A State is made by a subdivision of the territory of the existing States.

SENATOR VINCENT. - Let us get away from this rather hypothetical argument and come back to reality. At various times this morning you referred to the desirability of preserving certain interests for posterity. Will you elaborate on that proposition. What do you consider as important here that should be preserved?

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - I think that first you have to preserve standards and resist pressures that are economic or administrative.

SENATOR VINCENT. - Can you be more specific? Standards in respect of what?

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - I shall give you an example. If the Committee has time to inspect Miller Street, O'Connor, it will see there a type of residential development that is very much like a construction camp. The residences there are quite good prefabricated houses, very livable and good units. Their siting is a reproach to every planning conception for this capital. But that was agreed to by the National Capital Planning and Development Committee, which points to the danger of letting an aging Committee that is not prepared to stand up to administrative pressures have the responsibility of advising the Minister.

SENATOR VINCENT. - I take it that you would agree with me if I suggested that standards with respect to architecture should be preserved?

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - And siting.

SENATOR VINCENT. - Do you know where there has been any continuity of policy with respect to architectural standards for both domestic architecture and architecture of public buildings?

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - As far as public buildings are concerned, there has been very little architecture because there are not as many permanent buildings as there ought to be for the amount of development that we have had. There was, in the early days, an understanding between the Commonwealth Government and the Institute of Architects that no permanent building would be erected within the Government triangle unless it had been the subject of an architectural competition.

That agreement has been a very valuable one. It has saved the Government triangle from destruction. At one period it was proposed to put the National Library alongside Parliament House. But for the public-spiritedness of a Canberra official who stood up against the proposal, the triangle would have been destroyed. The only thing he could quote to stop the project was the agreement I have mentioned.

SENATOR VINCENT. - Do you know if there is any unwritten agreement, or tradition, in relation to the architectural standards of public buildings designed to preserve what might be described as the pastoral atmosphere of this city? Do you know what I mean by that?

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - I know what a pastoral atmosphere would be like, but I do not know whether posterity will.

SENATOR VINCENT. - We have public buildings situated some distance away from each other with tree patterns in between. The buildings themselves, I suggest, lend themselves harmoniously to what I might describe as a pastoral flavour in architecture.

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - I think we are in danger of not seeing the wood for the trees. The trees came after the design. Burley Griffin laid out the design of Government terraces, and that has been fairly well followed although there is only one building erected strictly in conformity with it and that is the present administrative block which is not yet complete. The new administrative building is on the site of one of Griffin's terraces. By now we should have started to build its twin on the other side of Parliament House. The present Parliament House, of course, is only a temporary building and it is out of position on the plan. I think perhaps the answer lies in the fact that we have no Fine Arts Commission.

SENATOR VINCENT.- And no policy with respect to architectural standards? Would you consider an 8-storey block of flats erected near Civic Centre to be in consonance with our general architectural standards?

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - It would depend on whether the flats were an acquisition from an architectural standpoint. If the purpose of those flats was to increase density, I would strongly support it. I believe that the proposed flats development that you have in mind is a very good project and that, if posterity is ever able to see it, it will applaud those who support the proposal now.

SENATOR VINCENT. - You do not think that an 8-storey block of flats would be incongruous with regard to the general pattern of architecture?

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - It is not intended that it should be isolated. It is to be one of two blocks on either side of Ainslie Avenue which will create a very effective feature in the outlook from City Hill.

SENATOR VINCENT. - You criticised the Department of Works this morning. Can you elaborate on that criticism by stating why you consider that houses have not been completed or built here?

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - I simply say that the Department of Works has shown itself to be incapable of doing what it was set up to do.

SENATOR VINCENT. - You do not think it is a matter of finance, do you?

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - No. The money is there. I think it is an inefficiently organized department that deserves the very closest investigation either by a royal commission or by the Joint Public Accounts Committee. It has become the greatest factory of excuses that we have ever had in Commonwealth administration. I do not know one target it has ever set up that it has hit.

SENATOR VINCENT. - One reason that you gave earlier for not setting up a form of local government administration was the immaturity of the development of Canberra. Why do you consider immaturity to be a bar to the setting up of local government

administration?

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - First of all, because of the great financial difficulties that would exist. You would never get a formula that would be applicable for subsidy by Parliament of any local governing authority here. Today you have 5,000 houses. In five years time you should have 10,000 houses. You would have to more than double the number, because of the need for private enterprise, of the people who would receive municipal services apart from the Government. That means that you would have to have an elastic yardstick, which Parliament could not give to anybody.

SENATOR VINCENT. - I suggest that there are probably hundreds of towns in Australia much less developed than Canberra which have local government administration.

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - I do not think there is a comparison. This is a federal district set up for a specific purpose and the whole of the land here is always to be owned by the people. Even in Washington, where you have alienation of land, 41 percent of the property is owned by the federal government, and that is a very well developed city.

SENATOR RYAN. - This morning you expressed your own personal opinion regarding the failure of the 10-year plan to transfer Commonwealth officers to Canberra. You also said that, if another 10-year plan were proposed, the position at the end of that term would be much the same as it is now.

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - That is the inference. I said that I did not see in present circumstances how any plan could ever be carried out.

SENATOR RYAN. - Does not that signify to some degree a lack of co-ordination or of proper authority?

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - Exactly. The Department of the Interior, which is responsible for carrying out any such programme, has no power to command. It can requisition, but when it does requisition the dead hand in Melbourne comes in with its chilling touch.

SENATOR RYAN. - Until that position is altered, the development of Canberra will proceed much along its present course?

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - If you engage a builder and tell him what to do, and if he does it, you will get your houses. There is no other way.

SENATOR RYAN. - It is proposed to bring 2,500 public servants here some time this year in accordance with the plan.

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - I have heard that.

SENATOR RYAN. - And your comment is that they will not have the houses necessary to accommodate these people and their families?

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - I have termed what is called "operation administration" as "operation miracle". It could happen at a miracle, but it will not happen in present circumstances.

SENATOR RYAN. - The only way to alter that situation is to obtain labour and materials and administer the scheme with a dominant authority?

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - You command. You do not requisition.

SENATOR RYAN. - That is right. I refer now to another matter. Have you any opinions concerning the establishment of a national park or botanical gardens adjacent to the city?

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - The plan as it now stands has at least three features that might be classified as a national park. We have the area that is referred to as a domain, which will be on the southern side of the proposed lake or ribbon of water. We also have a tongue running north from Yarralumla. That reserve was put in the Griffin plan as a zoological park, and it has been planted with trees for that purpose. The plantings right back from that site through the Westbourne Woods all lend themselves to an extension of that area. Finally, on the other side of the river on the southern slopes of Black Mountain, coming right down on to the University area, is an area that has been reserved for botanical gardens and in which some preliminary plantings of trees have been made. I hope that those features of the plan will be inviolate.

SENATOR RYAN. - Would you agree that the race course area, which is to be preserved for a domain and recreation area, is appropriate for those purposes? Will it provide all the facilities needed for picnic parties? Is there not something missing in

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

Canberra to provide for the social enjoyment of families at weekends?

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - A great deal is lacking. I do not visualize the restriction of all picnic facilities to the city. There should be some development of alternatives to the very pleasant Cotter picnic area. Some years ago there was a proposal to establish one on the Murrumbidgee River in the vicinity of Pine Island, but that has been deferred because a bridge has not been built across the Murrumbidgee.

SENATOR RYAN. - Is not the Cotter out of reach of the majority of inhabitants? Should we not have something more central?

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - The over-taxing of the Cotter reserve suggests that it is not remote to people.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - You said earlier today that certain pressures that tended to interfere with the Burley Griffin plan had developed.

MR. SHAKESPEARE. - That is so.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - Are they departmental pressures or are they in another category? Can you outline exactly what you mean?

(Continued on page 173)

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

MR. SHAKESPEARE . - They are pressures of expediency. An example of that is as follows. In the early days of the Commission, two sites were reserved at the junction of National Circuit and Brisbane Avenue for what might be called institutional buildings. Industry House now stands on one of those sites. The other site is the block of land on the other side of Industry House. Industry House represents the type of development that was contemplated on those sites which are at the junction of a main avenue and an important circuit. Does it not seem logical that the twin site should be used for a purpose similar to that of Industry House ? But owing to pressure, it will be used for the construction of a hostel. The Planning Committee have agreed to that.

SENATOR HANNAFORD . - Then you say that failure to accelerate the development of Canberra has been due, in some degree, to the ageing National Capital Planning and Development Committee.

MR. SHAKESPEARE . - Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD . - Apparently that Committee is not doing its job?

MR. SHAKESPEARE . - We are very much indebted to the past services of all members of that Committee. They were well-chosen and have done a very good job but they are now too old to initiate or to resist.

SENATOR HANNAFORD . - How were the members of that Committee appointed?

MR. SHAKESPEARE . - They were appointed by the Governor-General.

SENATOR HANNAFORD . - Have the members any particular qualifications?

MR. SHAKESPEARE . - Yes. They were chosen on their qualifications. The Committee is modelled on the National Capital Parks and Planning Committee of Washington which has some ex-officio members and some who are appointed by the President because of their capacity to be of assistance. I am very appreciative of

what the members of the National Capital Planning and Development Committee have done. But the powers of the Committee are not adequate and its resistance to pressures is not sufficient for the needs of the present day.

SENATOR HANNAFORD . - Any modification of the original Bursleigh Griffin plan would have had to receive the concurrence of that Committee?

MR. SHAKESPEARE . - No. The original plan can be modified without reference to that Committee. Lonsdale Street is a case in point. The controversy about Lonsdale Street concerned a question of standards - of whether it was a desirable form of lay-out for a national capital. It would have been a lovely scheme for a town such as Goulburn or Wagga Wagga. It was discovered that the matter had never been referred to the National Capital Planning and Development Committee by the Minister. It was then asked whether the Committee would initiate an inquiry into the matter and an answer has not yet been received. Apparently the members of the Committee do not intend to buy into trouble. Yet they were appointed in order to consider matters such as this.

SENATOR HANNAFORD . - I judge from your evidence that there is a difference of opinion in the Advisory Council on the subject of a unified administration and the establishment of a legislative council for the Australian Capital Territory?

MR. SHAKESPEARE . - There is <sup>a</sup>99% agreement among members of the Council on the report that will be presented, as far as it has been prepared. A minority report might be made on some minor points.

SENATOR HANNAFORD . - Do you agree with the abandonment of the original Lakes project, and with the modifications that have been made to it?

MR. SHAKESPEARE . - Nature will attend to that matter. The Lakes, as originally marked on the Bursleigh Griffin plan, conform pretty well to the flood level. A decision by some committee  
M.2. 174. A.T. SHAKESPEARE.



to reduce the Lake to a ribbon of water will not stop the floods.

SENATOR HANNAFORD . - Perhaps a levee may be built for that purpose.

MR. SHAKESPEARE . - I do not think that Parliament would provide the necessary money. The margin between the ribbon of water and the flood level will not be available for use so I think that we shall have the protection of Providence.

SENATOR WOOD . - You stated in evidence that Parliamentarians have not evinced interest in Canberra. Do you think that any lack of interest may be due to the complexity of the plan of Canberra and the short time for which Parliamentarians remain in this city?

MR. SHAKESPEARE . - If I were a member of Parliament and the Constitution gave me the responsibility of being one of the trustees of a national capital I should learn about it.

SENATOR WOOD . - But do you think that Parliamentarians may lack an understanding of Canberra because it is not like an ordinary town and they are only here for a short time each year?

MR. SHAKESPEARE . - I think that that difficulty could be overcome by the administration preparing a booklet which would supply the information about Canberra that Parliamentarians require.

SENATOR WOOD . - If the plan of Canberra were a simple one don't you think that the average Parliamentarian would understand it much more clearly?

MR. SHAKESPEARE . - The Budget and the Public Accounts are difficult to understand but it is part of every Parliamentarian's duty to understand them.

SENATOR WOOD . - Do you think that the National Capital should be planned in such a way that visitors and many of those who live here cannot find their way around? Do you think that the planning should be as complex as that?

MR. SHAKESPEARE . - I do not think that it has been planned in a complex way. I could leave a person in places in Sydney

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

and Melbourne from which he would not find his way out.

THE CHAIRMAN . - I can find my way out of the main parts of Sydney and Melbourne but the planning of Canberra is much more complicated.

MR. SHAKESPEARE . - I suggest that we lack landmarks in Canberra. The American Memorial, if it had no other purpose, would be valuable as a landmark.

SENATOR WOOD . - In view of the fact that almost every city in Australia lacks amenities for its own people, do you think that public money should be used to enable the development of Canberra to progress at a rate in excess of that of other cities?

MR. SHAKESPEARE . - Delays and interruptions to the development of Canberra have never been economic. They have operated very much to the financial detriment of the taxpayers of Australia. Before the Cotter River Dam started to give water to one resident its capital cost had doubled, due to the delay in construction that was occasioned by the first world war.

CANBERRA SENATE COMMITTEE.

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- The interest had doubled before the dam was used for the city.

THE CHAIRMAN.- That was because of rising costs?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- In 1937 we were building houses here for less than £90 a square, but the cost is about four times that sum now for some houses.

THE CHAIRMAN.- People in other cities cannot get sufficient money for necessary buildings in their own cities?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- But the people own the land of Canberra. They have paid for it. Every time a house is built in Canberra the tenant of it pays rent for the land, rates and charges, and reduces the deficit on the Canberra services, including interest and sinking fund on everything that has gone into the land.

SENATOR WOOD.- Does not the same principle apply in other cities, so that there is no difference in principle between the people of Canberra and the people outside Canberra. Generally the people outside pay more in rates and general expenses than the people of Canberra?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- I should like to know how many millions of pounds it cost us to have a divided war administration here and in Melbourne during the last war, simply because we had not built 500 additional houses here?

MR. CHAIRMAN.- When the full administrative staff is located at Canberra, the building of Canberra could be slowed down, but there is an urgency until all the administrative personnel are brought to this city?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- I do not consider the phrase "slow Canberra down" to be a very happy choice of words. We do not have a federal capital until it has been built, and when it is finally built it is designed to service the government. Once it adequately services the government you do not continue to build it.

THE CHAIRMAN.- There is no analogy between Canberra and another town because other towns are already built, and their primary functions are being fulfilled. Until we have all our services

here, this is purely a federal capital city?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- There have been a number of deficiencies during the years in business services in Canberra, because of a complete lack of confidence in investors in the ability of the Commonwealth Government to redeem its undertakings. I do not think that any part of Australia suffered the acute economic distress suffered by Canberra during the depression, which was due to the fact that although the Commonwealth could have continued to build houses in Canberra, it chose to employ people on useless relief work, such as moving sand. It is due to a fundamental lack of purpose on the part of the Government and the Parliament in relation to this seat of government.

SENATOR VINCENT.- I much appreciate the manner in which you have given your evidence today, and the informative material that you have supplied to us. Evidence has been given by several witnesses that there are plans in existence for the introduction and development of secondary industries in this city. Do you consider that secondary industry should be encouraged, or do you consider that Canberra should be retained exclusively as a national capital?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- That is a very big question and has to be answered in several ways.

SENATOR VINCENT.- I do not refer to industry associated directly with the development or maintenance of Canberra.

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- I understand that. If you are to have a community at all, it must be a balanced one. Every person cannot be a member of the public service. If every person is such a member, the functions of government will be deficient in the things that are required outside the offices. Therefore, a certain amount of industry is necessary, and we have not faced up to that fact. I see no reason why there should not be a gasworks established to supply Canberra, but I do not want to see it put out in front of Parliament House. There is a proper place for it. A complete scheme for a gas works in the Australian Capital Territory has been worked out, but its completion depends on finance.

SENATOR RYAN.- And also the competition of electricity.

CANBERRA SENATE COMMITTEE.

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- Gas will beat electricity every time, because it is cheaper per thermal unit. Moreover, gas is badly needed in this city. Institutions like the Australian National University are importing gas in cylinders because we have no gasworks, and in some cases those institutions are considering establishing their own gas plants. It is hard to say when an industry is put here merely because there is land and labour and not necessarily to serve Canberra, and when it is essential for the city. It can be essential to provide diversity of employment for the on-coming generation.

SENATOR RYAN.- Let us exclude the essential industries required by a city of this size, and also industries which might be deemed to be desirable to absorb the surplus population which does not desire to enter, or for some reason cannot enter, the Public Service. What other industries would you consider desirable for establishment here?

MR. SHAKESPEARE.- I believe that within certain limits it would be desirable to encourage the development of industries here. There are economic limits, for instance we must have an industry where the cost of transport and raw materials and finished products is low in relation to the price of the finished goods. I think that it would be wise to encourage any industry that it is economically possible to have. Such an industry should be developed in the Territory but not necessarily in the city. For example, we have a unique industry here at present. Some years ago a young engineer investigated the wood flour industry. We import wood flour from abroad, and it is much used in synthetics, explosives and other products. He concluded that there was a market here, and instead of going to South Australia or some other state where there were plenty of raw materials in the shape of pine off-cuts, he established the industry in Canberra. It is not essential, but it is a desirable adjunct to our other activities. There is nothing objectionable in it and it rounds off the community.

THE WITNESS RETIRED.

## THE DEVELOPMENT OF CANBERRA.

The Canberra Area Committee of the Royal Australian Institute of Architects wish to put before the Senate Committee its views on the following aspects on the development of Canberra.

1. Administrative Machinery
2. Planning Principles
3. Architectural Control.

### INTRODUCTION

This generation is responsible for building the National Capital, a unique experience which will only occur once in the lifetime of the nation. The task calls for the highest degree of ability and enterprise that the nation can command.

In the past the development of most Australian cities has largely been left to chance. The effect of this policy is now becoming evident as Sydney, Melbourne, Perth and other capitals endeavour at great costs to face up to the solutions of traffic problems, slum clearance and other aspects of urban redevelopment. In the case of Canberra, if we are sufficiently far-sighted these difficulties can be avoided but only if we are prepared to recognise that the task is one of the most important the Government has undertaken.

Success or failure will depend largely on the extent to which the nature and complexity of the work is understood. The task is more complex, for example, than that of building a new oil refinery or a hydro-electric scheme. Ultimately, it will represent greater capital investment than works of this kind. It involves artistry as well as science and will exercise a far greater influence on the life of the Australians than any industrial project or public works. Why, then, should it not command the attention of the most competent and highly qualified persons who are available in Australia and when necessary, call on experts from abroad just as, for example, the Snowy Mountains Authorities call on the services of the Bureau of Reclamation from the United States.

The task of planning and constructing a city involves laying down of a framework or overall plan within which development can be undertaken by private and public bodies; working out programmes for development of areas in accordance with the overall plan; and, finally, executing these programmes quickly and efficiently to meet the demands for increased facilities as they arise.

How best to organise these operations is essentially a problem of organisation and management on a very large scale. As architects, we do not pretend to be experts in public administration and management but we have some knowledge of the organisation of large projects such as building groups and we are knowledgeable about the methods used to organise town planning and urban development.

### ADMINISTRATIVE MACHINERY

Looking at Canberra, it appears to us that it is not conducive to efficiency to separate the functions of planning and administration on the one hand and engineering and architectural design and construction on the other. The former are now the responsibilities of the Department of the Interior and the latter of the Department of Works. We are of the opinion that despite the fact that both Departments are responsible to one Minister this does not work satisfactorily. We believe that the only way of safeguarding the future development of Canberra is for the responsibilities for these various functions to be vested in a single authority.

If this is done two considerations are of great importance: firstly, the method of organising the various functions within a single authority and secondly, the relationship of the authority with the community generally.

Considerable thought has been given to these problems in the United Kingdom when towards the end of the war it was decided to embark on a programme of New Town building as a means of decentralising population from London and the other larger cities. We believe that some members of the Senate Committee should visit the New Towns and examine the application to Canberra of the methods adopted for planning and development. Briefly these consist of the establishment for each Town of a Development Corporation appointed by and responsible to the Minister of the Crown concerned with town and country planning. The Corporation is charged with the functions of planning and building the town and receives the finance required from the Treasury. When the task of developing the town to the agreed level has been completed, the Corporations are to hand over their assets and responsibilities to the local government in whose area they are operating.

The Corporation is essentially a policy making body. One of its most important functions is to maintain good public relations with the interests in the area concerned. The choice of a Chairman and the members of the Corporation reflects the functions they are expected to perform. All the Chairmen are prominent public spirited citizens, such as Lord Beveridge, Lord Keith and Sir Thomas Bennett.

The executive functions of the Corporation are performed by an Executive Officer and his staff. The former is a highly paid executive experienced in legal and technical aspects of urban administration. There is a good deal of variation of detail between the various Corporations but broadly speaking, the Executive Officer's staff consists of two sections, administrative and technical. The administrative section is responsible for finance, land tenure, estate management, legal matters and social problems. The technical or design section undertakes surveys of the site, planning and design of the Town, and supervision of the construction of the buildings and services. The merits of the Corporation method of town development as applied to Canberra would be -

- (1) The responsibility for the design and development of the town would be vested in one authority the appointment of which would be the responsibility of the Minister.
- (2) The personnel of this body should be varied from time to time as required to suit changing needs. Adequate representation should be given to private as well as public interests and when Canberra developed a structure of responsible local government, appointed members of the Corporation should be replaced by elected representatives.
- (3) The Corporation would have freedom to recruit the most competent staff and obtain the best expert advice that is available.

#### PLANNING PRINCIPLES

Various planning principles are being jeopardised by the present method of development of Canberra. As it would be impossible in the time to discuss them all, we have preferred to confine ourselves to some of the most important.

## 1. Canberra as a Region

Canberra is an isolated incident. It is not integrated into any regional pattern. Canberra is a seat of the Federal Government but there is no definition of its regional place and purpose. There are reasons why such a definition should be treated as an urgent matter:-

- (a) To guide in the assessment of future population targets without which the city planning will continue to lack long range and defined objectives.
- (b) To prevent the waste of a haphazard communications system with the surrounding districts and the rest of the country by road, rail and air, and to provide data for the planning of access roads and through ways.
- (c) To give a pointer towards future local employment expectations for a growing population, beyond the obvious but necessarily limited one of government service and service industry etc. This is closely related to the next point.
- (d) To indicate the character of the future development which will govern land use and zoning, internal access and road patterns.

## 2. Canberra and the Hinterland

A regional survey will disclose how Canberra may be integrated with its immediate surroundings. Some considerations which would be of importance today in the selection of a site for a new town were not obvious when the site for Canberra was chosen. It is instructive, for example, to compare our records of this event with the type of evidence assembled to determine the position of the English new towns. It is suggested that, with the present lack of any obvious economic function for Canberra, note should be taken of its tourist and sporting facilities. In spite of shortcomings, the city is already a major tourist centre and the political hub of Australia. A broader aspect is feasible. The surrounding topography calls up the idea of Canberra as the hub of a vast national park and tourist resort, such as have been so imaginatively developed in North America.

## 3. Land Use in the City Area

Future city development will be much influenced by the broader aspects such as are outlined above. Up to the present, the Griffin plan has dominated the growth of Canberra. It appears to have been looked on as a pattern drawn on a map, and the development of the city has consisted of a somewhat piecemeal infilling of that pattern. It is submitted that the social and economic functions of Canberra which are now becoming evident should govern the development of the Griffin plan. One obvious deficiency in the plan is the lack of planning of land use leading to land zoning. A land use pattern arises from the requirements and inter-relation of living, commerce, industry, transport, recreation and open space etc. The lack of long range planning and the necessary data to establish such a pattern has caused conditions, some of which are described as follows:-

- (a) The haphazard approach to population density and grouping in relation to transport routes, work places and service facilities, such as is seen in the erection of multi-storey flats at Reid.
- (b) The present lack of choice and variety in industrial and commercial sites creating artificial land and building values and site monopolies.
- (c) The policy of expediency, whereby parks and recreation grounds can be lost, apparently at any time. Experience in other large cities, e.g. Sydney, shows that the older open spaces of Hyde Park



the Domain and Centennial Park can be slowly frittered away, and that intermediate rings of housing development are devoid of breathing spots. Land use zoning makes firm provision for open areas by dedication or other means.

(d) Major deviations from the plan such as the elimination of West Lake have not been treated as matters of national importance. It is only the broad outline of the road pattern that has seemed to be sacrosanct.

(e) The hazards discussed below under the next heading.

#### 4. Roads and Communications.

Without the broader definitions of Canberra's future character and function, the number, direction and importance of the main routes of access from other places lack definition and may well cause ultimate waste of money and inconvenience.

Within the city, there is at present a lack of definition of through and feeder routes in relation to land use. From this arise the hazards that are shown, for instance, in the new Lonsdale Street light industrial area where there is no segregation of industrial traffic from that feeding the residential areas of Reid and Braddon, thus creating hazards at every street intersection and to pedestrians. Moreover, there is little, if any, off-street parking and loading for these industrial sites.

Again, on Sections 26 and 27 Forrest (near the Hotel Wellington) there has lately been the undesirable development of residential lots facing on to the important traffic route of Canberra Avenue.

#### 5. Housing and Communities

In addition to points mentioned above under Section 3, the following are submitted:-

- (a) If it has not already been done, estimates should be made of the constitution of Canberra's population in relation to flat and housing needs, i.e. the percentage of people needing flats and communal dwellings, homes for aged and infirm, future hospitals, etc. This should be made available to the public.
- (b) Estimates should be made available of future community needs in relation to population groupings, i.e. non-governmental works such as churches, private schools, shopping facilities, service industries.
- (c) The present method of development seems to be creating building sprawl without visual or social focus because of the above. Problems in social groupings have been created, as also architectural problems. The latter are referred to in the final sections of this submission which follow.

#### ARCHITECTURAL CONTROL

Architecture which has been defined as "fine building" as opposed to "mere building" should be an integral part of the structure of Canberra. Development should not proceed piece meal, but be approached with the aim of complete unity of the various components. The original conception of Canberra was based on this principle.

Examples such as Lonsdale Street, Kingston and Causeway minor industrial areas, the extension of Civic Centre and the Narrabundah prefabricated housing group illustrate an absence of cohesion and architectural unity with the plan of Canberra.

Unfortunately, other housing schemes are proceeding on similar lines. In Canberra, the architectural pattern should be ever foremost if the city is to achieve distinction. At present, there is a tendency towards dissociated effort akin to the resultant discord of an orchestra without a conductor.

Any form of control is regarded with suspicion but without it, there can be no discipline; while the lack persists, Canberra is deteriorating architecturally to a nondescript level. It will be conceded that discipline is necessary to ensure adequate structural performances in building and to this end statutory control through building regulations enforces the issue. But there is no architectural control to prevent the growth of the set for a "Western" film which is Lonsdale Street, the jurrard which lines Wentworth Avenue from Kingston to Causeway nor the "Rainbow Valley" settlement represented in the Narrabundah prefabricated housing. If it was necessary to erect a telephone exchange on the site at Barton, the present building is undoubtedly an architectural mistake in form and material.

Architecturally, neighbourhood units, precincts, civic, commercial and industrial centres should be complete in themselves and integral with the overall pattern. This is the task of the Town planner, Architect and Engineer in collaboration. The architectural component should be embryonic and flexible but with a definite principle established in respect of length, breadth, and height with the view to uniformity and constant scale of units. It should be incumbent upon architects, both private and governmental to conform to the broad lines laid down. The architectural character of the area or group would be suggested by functional requirements and should convey a common theme. This could be best effected through a procedure whereby architects singly, or in collaboration, were entrusted with the task of design, operating under the direction of an Architect-in-Chief who would be responsible for the unification of the master plan.

If Canberra is to become a fine city, it is submitted that architectural control is essential and to this end the following broad suggestions are put forward for consideration:

1. Architectural design control to be administered by an Architect-in-Chief who would co-ordinate the contributions of town planners, architects and engineers working in collaboration. Activities should be embraced within one authority, not split as at present.
2. Broad principles of architectural units in respect of grouping, massing and colour, i.e. third dimension, to be established simultaneously with all other aspects of the major plan and to form the basis of subsequent design. Conceptions to be flexible enough to meet changing demands and revised as the occasion arises.
3. All design prepared by architects, private or governmental to conform to the broad principles summarised under 2 above.

#### CONCLUSION

In this brief synopsis of our opinions, much has necessarily been omitted. But we believe the suggestions to be constructive ones.

To sum up, we submit: first, that a planning authority is necessary; secondly, that the planning of Canberra can be done effectively only against a broad background of National and Regional interests and towards a long range, defined objective; and thirdly, that the development of our National Capital should be an inspiration and example to all architects and town planners.

We thank you for the opportunity of presenting this evidence.

CANBERRA'S FUNCTION AS A REGIONAL CENTRE.

1. INTRODUCTION

For efficient economic life a region needs a centre of population where the services are sufficiently varied to enable it to function as a focus of the area. In the absence of such a centre the region needs to look for many services to towns or cities at distances which render such services too expensive, and otherwise unsatisfactory. Canberra is certainly the largest and next only to Cooma the fastest growing centre of population in south-eastern New South Wales. Between 1947 and 1954 the population of Canberra City increased by 15,121 or 87 per cent; Wagga Wagga, a rural and regional centre which serves most of the Riverina area, increased by 3,903 (25 per cent.). Similarly, Goulburn, the regional centre for the Southern Tablelands increased by 3,170 (20 per cent) over the same period. The large size and rapid growth of Canberra suggest that, despite its rather artificial and unbalanced development to date it will exert an increasingly wider regional influence over much of south-eastern New South Wales.

2. THE REGION AND ITS POPULATION

Having in mind the regions served by other large centres in southern New South Wales, it seems feasible that Canberra could conveniently serve a region in south-eastern New South Wales bounded by the following centres: Yass, Tumut, Cooma, Bega, Bateman's Bay, Braidwood and Bungendore.

The population of this region is now 104,000 of which the city of Canberra accounts for 28,277 or 27%. The A.C.T. population is 34,000. Estimates for 1960 and 1970 indicate the following populations:-

1960: Region 145,000 including A.C.T. 47,000 (32%)

1970: Region 190,000 including A.C.T. 74,000 (39%)

The estimates of the region outside the A.C.T. are based on Census figures.

The estimates for A.C.T. are from figures supplied by the Town Planning Section of the Department of the Interior. They are based on such factors as natural increase, transfer of public servants to Canberra, private enterprise expansion and the tendency of increased population to generate further increase.

There are of course a variety of developments, the scope of which it is hard to foresee, which could increase the population of Canberra, apart from the influx of Public Servants and the inevitable economic concomitants of such influx. One is tourism, mentioned below. Another is the trend, already noticeable, towards the adoption of Canberra as a national centre by non-Governmental organisations - educational, religious, and business. Another, of course is the development of Canberra as a regional centre which would be both the cause and the effect of an increased population. If the population of Canberra grew at the proportionate rate at which it has grown in recent years it would reach 77,000 by 1970. On the whole, we are inclined to regard the figures given by the Town Planning Section as on the conservative side, at least on the assumption that Canberra is developed as a regional centre. Canberra, in any case, looks like being in the years to come the largest town between Melbourne and Wollongong.

In what is written below we have nevertheless thought in terms of the figures of 47,000 for 1960 and 74,000 for 1970.

The existence of a city of this size would undoubtedly exert an influence on the development of a surrounding region. In the interests of national efficiency and co-ordinated development ~~such a centre should provide services for its surrounding region.~~

### 3. CANBERRA TO FUNCTION AS A REGIONAL CENTRE FOR SOUTH EASTERN NEW SOUTH WALES

The size, the capital investment, the variety of established services, and the rate of growth of Canberra make it logical that the city should serve as a regional centre for a wide range of functions.

To serve as a regional centre, a town should show some degree of balance in the distribution of its workforce. This does not imply that any region need be self sufficient in the supply of goods and services, nor that the distribution of the workforce need be the same in different regions. It does mean, however, that if in any town the proportion of the labour force occupied in any branch of industry is very much lower than the similar proportion in regional centres in similar geographic regions, this will to some extent handicap the development of the town as a regional centre.

Tables 1 and 2 compare the distribution of the workforce in the A.C.T. with that in other provincial towns. Table 2 compares the A.C.T. distribution with that in Ballarat which had in 1947 a similar population to that in the A.C.T. in 1954; it also shows the change in the distribution of the A.C.T. workforce between 1947 and 1954.

Table 2 shows that there is a noticeable trend towards a better balance of activities in Canberra, but from a regional viewpoint serious deficiencies exist in both industrial and commercial (including retail trade) development. Today, with Canberra functioning largely as a capital city and administrative centre, and only 6.5 per cent of the workforce engaged in manufacturing and 6.8 per cent in commerce, the city cannot cater for more than a small section of the commercial and industrial needs of the Australian Capital Territory; nor can it offer as wide a range of employment opportunities as if the distribution of the workforce followed a more normal pattern.

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100

From the establishment of Canberra as an administrative centre it is natural that in the early years of its development, an abnormally high proportion of its workforce should be employed by public authorities. It is equally natural however that as the population grows, a wider range of service and other industries become economic with a consequent large increase in employment outside the public service. This process is accelerated in so far as the regional influence of the city extends steadily outward, and it is to be expected that eventually many industries which depend primarily for their localisation upon the demand for their produce will be attracted to the area.

Though the prime force in the expansion of Canberra has been and may remain that of increased public employment, the figures in table 2 show that "commerce" and "communication" increased their employment factor, between 1947 and 1954, than did "public authority and professional"; and "manufacturing" employed a slightly higher proportion of the population.

The continued development of Canberra as a city and as a regional centre should intensify this trend. In the following sections the development of various industries is discussed in turn.

A. SECONDARY INDUSTRY

By fostering selected industries in the A.C.T. a greater measure of effectiveness as a regional centre could be achieved. Tables 1 and 2 indicate that there is considerable scope for the expansion of selected industries. Suitable small industries or small branches of large industry would make possible a greater development of service industries and add vitality to both sociological and economic conditions, not only in their immediate area but in the surrounding region.

The rapid increase in the population of Canberra since 1947 gives new interest and impetus to the idea that the establishment of selected secondary industry is both practicable and important.

Advantages to be gained include:

- (a) Avenues of employment, other than in the Public Service, would be provided for those members of Canberra families who are either not anxious or not fitted to enter the Public Service. It is also possible that public servants retiring at 60 or 65 may find useful employment.
- (b) The Commonwealth recognises decentralisation of industry as a desirable end and by establishing secondary industry in Canberra it would not only be shouldering its responsibilities for the development of the Capital Territory but would also be setting an example in effective decentralisation and regional development.
- (c) Canberra itself and the surrounding region would benefit from a local supply of manufactures. Insofar as the new industries increased the population, some social advantages, such as better education and entertainment facilities might follow. ?

The resources available within the area need careful consideration since in view of the decentralised geographical position of Canberra, the establishment of industries requiring the transport of bulky raw materials presents considerable economic difficulties. These resources include:-

(i) Labour

The population of the A.C.T. has grown from 16,905 in 1947 to 30,315 in 1954, and it is expected to reach a figure of 47,000 by the end of 1960. Other towns of this size in Australia, e.g. Ballarat, Bendigo, Toowoomba, Rockhampton, Townsville support sizeable secondary industries, and while it is realised that in each case there are special reasons or advantages which have made those developments possible and that similar conditions may not apply in Canberra, it would seem that a town of 30,000 to 50,000 people should be able to support some manufacturing development. Some emigration of young workers to Sydney now takes place, so that while there is now no excess labour force in the A.C.T., there should be a potential labour supply of moderate dimensions. At the 1947 Census, Canberra, out of a population of 15,000 people, had only 480 engaged in manufacturing, while Bendigo showed 2,700 out of a population of 35,000 and Goulburn 1,350 out of a population of 16,000 (See Tables 1 and 2).

(ii) Raw Materials

A small part of the Territory is devoted to agriculture, pastoral and dairying pursuits. Grains, fruits and vegetables are grown in the region referred to in Section 2 and sheep and both dairying and (beef) cattle are raised. Good timber stands exist in forests in many parts of the region and on the coastal belt. Limestone deposits exist at Bungonia and Mount Fairy near Goulburn and in the Yass district, whilst in the Goulburn district are deposits of kaolin, slate and marble. Fuels required by industry establishing in Canberra would have to be imported.

In the planning of the Territory, care should be taken that areas rich in such materials as useful clays, gravels and sands, are not built on or otherwise encumbered.

*10/11/53*

(iii) Water

The development of population and industry will necessitate the eventual extension of the sources of water supply. A survey of the water resources may be desirable before further consideration is given to the establishment of industries which require large water supplies.

(iv) Electric Power

Power supplies are at present drawn from the New South Wales interconnected system and the policy of this system is to sell power throughout the State at the same price. When the major part of the Snowy Mountains hydro Schemes is complete it may be possible that cheaper power will become available in the A.C.F.

(v) Transport

Canberra is linked by rail to Queanbeyan located on the Monaro line which connects at Goulburn with the main southern line from Sydney. Total distance by rail from Sydney is 202 miles.

The Federal Capital is connected by main roads to Yass, Gunning, Goulburn, Braidwood, Jervis Bay, Bateman's Bay, Moruya and through Cooma to the far South Coast.

Air Transport services to and from Canberra are only surpassed by those operating to the State capitals. They thus provide to industry an important means of receipt and despatch of materials and goods, particularly those which have a high relationship of value to weight.

(vi) Market

The principal market available for secondary industrial products is first of all the A.C.T. itself, and the area South and East of the A.C.T., particularly along the Cooma-Bombala road, and if a connecting road is constructed, also Tumut and the surrounding districts. To the North, Yass and to the east Braidwood and Bateman's Bay may constitute the boundaries.

Manufacturers who would produce for an area wider than the City itself cannot count on more than 75,000 persons falling within their ambit outside Canberra. Thus, industries which can produce economically for a market of up to 120,000 persons could be established initially in Canberra and for up to 150,000 in the next decade.

Industries Suggested as Suitable.

Those industries likely to be most suited to the environment and location of Canberra are the clean, light type of manufacturing processes, including those employing a high percentage of highly skilled and professional personnel.

With the exception of specialised products of high value in which freight costs would not exert a major influence, initial manufacture at Canberra might be concentrated on industries providing products for the regional market and, where possible, utilizing the resources of the region. Such activities could include the following:-

(a) Building Materials, etc., e.g.

Joinery works, cement and cement products, bricks, tiles, asbestos cement products, fibrous plaster, venetian blinds and furniture manufacture.

(b) Food and Beverage Industries, e.g.

Brewing, ice cream manufacture, flour milling, cereal and breakfast foods manufacture, soft drink manufacture, small goods manufacture and confectionery.

(c) Textile and Clothing Industries, e.g.

Clothing - tailoring and men's ready made clothing, dressmaking and women's ready made clothing, millinery, shirts, pyjamas, and underclothing, dry cleaning, dyeing and laundry, hosiery and knitwear. In this group, preference would be for industries, the value of whose products is high in relation to bulk, e.g. high class blouses and skirts, swim suits, foundation garments, etc.

(d) Leather Tanning, Leather Products Manufacture, e.g.

Boots, shoes, bags, etc.

(e) Sporting Goods.

No heavy engineering industries can be suggested, but among the metal working industries possibilities may exist among the makers of the following goods, in which either the added values are high or the freight on raw materials and finished products are relatively small.

(a) Small forged products, e.g. cutlery, fine tools.

(b) Precision tools.

(c) Diecast products, e.g. motor accessories.

(d) Sintered metal products, e.g. components, bearings, brushes, etc., to almost finished dimensions produced by powder metallurgy.

(e) Garden equipment, sprays, etc. e.g. hose fittings, sprinklers and agricultural sprays.

(f) Small hydraulic systems, as components for machines.

Among the non-engineering industries, the following possibilities may be mentioned - Scientific and industrial instruments; Optical equipment including photographic and scientific equipment; Laboratory equipment and apparatus; Photographic supplies, chemicals, film and coated papers, Drugs and fine chemicals; Ammunition; Electronic equipment for radio, T.V. and telecommunications; Jewellery, badges, medallions, etc., e.g. jewels and industrial diamonds, precious metal working, fashion jewellery, medals, china and porcelainware of the finer types.

Employment for inhabitants possessing the necessary attributes could be provided by specialised craft industries engaged in such manufacture as art - potteryware, artificial flowers and other fancy goods and novelty items, e.g. decorative shells for ornamental wear. Such items would always have an attraction and find a ready market with tourists from overseas and visitors, and carefully branded "made in Canberra".

Some form of Government encouragement and planning may be necessary to expedite the natural process of industrialisation. Other Australian towns, which could be competing with Canberra for new industrial ventures, commonly have some support from local and State governments. In the special circumstances which apply in Canberra, consideration must be given to the pattern set in the U.K. where industrial estates have been established in decentralised areas, factories and housing facilities being built and made available to selected industries at adjusted rentals or selling prices. This gives control of the types of buildings erected, the industries attracted, and ensures that the whole plan fits in with the master plan for the development of the whole area.

The following extract from the "Municipal Journal" of June 1954 is relevant to the establishment of industries in Canberra:

"An industrial expert of the United States Department of Commerce, speaking at the National Planning Conference held in the United States recently, described the trend of industry to set up in planned industrial districts throughout the United States. He pointed out that the manufacturers are particularly pleased to be able to establish their businesses in a planned industrial district, because so many of the headaches which accompany the location and construction of a new plant are avoided. Properties are already divided into appropriate sizes, rail arrangements are complete, and services are not just promised, but are already installed.

"The manufacturer will know how much water or electric power is available to him and what the exact price will be.

"Restrictions in planned industrial districts are also attractive to new tenants. The new manufacturer will know that he has to meet high standards for control of noise, dust, smoke, odours, and other nuisances that in the past have made factories such unattractive neighbours.

"Most modern plants are now attractive architectural creations. The modern industrialist approves of generous setbacks from the street and of attractive landscaping, feeling that a good-looking plant is a good advertisement."

## B. TRANSPORT

To function efficiently as a regional centre for south-eastern New South Wales improved road communication between Canberra and the region would be a necessity. The present day trend is for the regional distribution of goods to be effected by road transport. Railways are used mainly for the long distance hauls of bulky goods such as coal, minerals, wheat, flour, wool and fertilisers. Road transport is especially suited to shorter distance hauls of goods with a relatively high value per unit weight.

Canberra could function efficiently as a regional centre for the collection and distribution of goods and industrial produce if better road access was provided into the region from Canberra. Roads involved in this regional network would be to the coast at Bateman's Bay, to Cooma and then on to Bega, and the provision of a satisfactory direct route to the Tumut area.

The greater importance of transport should result in an increasing proportion of the workforce being employed in this industry.



C. COMMERCE (including Retail Trade)

Canberra is not at present adequately served for retail trading purposes. Only 6.8 per cent of the work force are engaged in commercial activities as compared with 15 per cent in Goulburn and 17 per cent in Wagga Wagga. Far from Canberra serving the surrounding region for retail trade purposes, many Canberra people look to Sydney, Goulburn and even Queanbeyan and Yass for the provision of these facilities. Additional shopping blocks at present under construction will help to cater for the needs of A.C.T. residents, but it is clear that more stimulation of commercial enterprise is necessary before Canberra could assume the role of a retail trading centre serving a regional function. The attraction of large, well known capital city firms and the provision of more shops of the chain-store variety are important steps in the attainment of this position.

D. EDUCATION

We have not discussed this subject, or the subject of health, with the respective expert departments; and what follows on these subjects should therefore be regarded, to a degree, as an uninformed view.

Canberra is well served with public schools including two high schools and a technical college. In view of the New South Wales Education Department policy, it may be thought unlikely that Canberra will ever serve an area much outside the present A.C.T. boundary. The establishment of a full technical high school in Canberra, however, would fit in with a general policy of industrial development. It is in the field of private secondary and high education where Canberra could naturally serve as a centre catering for the needs of an extensive surrounding region. The Australian National University provides educational and research facilities which transcend, but nevertheless serve both local and regional needs. The Canberra University College although at present serving the needs of A.C.T. residents only has plans to expand to taking in full time scholars from many parts of southern and south-eastern New South Wales. In the field of private secondary education schools in Canberra, perform an important regional function, serving much of the south-east of New South Wales. The only other centres where complete private secondary education is provided are Goulburn and Albury. Because of its healthy climate, amenities and "educational atmosphere" Canberra could readily develop to become the private educational centre of southern New South Wales on a similar basis of efficiency as at Toowoomba and Charters Towers in Queensland. Every help possible should be given to facilitate this desirable regional function.

E. HEALTH

Certain specialised hospital facilities in Canberra serve people from Yass, the Monaro and Far South Coast areas, yet the hospital has neither base or district status. The provision of a full range of specialist services and the establishment of pathological clinics and other services would give substance to Canberra as a logical centre for the provision of regional specialist hospital treatment. Because of its climate, amenities and healthy environment consideration should also be given to the establishment of a convalescent home, a tuberculosis sanatorium and an eventide home to serve the needs of people from Canberra and all parts of south-eastern New South Wales.

F. TOURIST ACTIVITIES

It is estimated that 225,000 tourists visited Canberra during 1954. The figure for annual tourist influx has been increasing steadily since the early post-war years. The influence of Canberra's tourist attractions are nationwide rather than local or regional, however, as tourists converge from all parts of the continent the beneficial effect on regional areas can be classed

at least as significant. Adequate provision in the form of hotel and hostel accommodation and tourist camp amenities must be made within the City itself to cater for further tourist development. There also seem to be possibilities of stimulating tourism by giving a little more attention to making accessible to the tourist the many impressive national activities which are carried on in Canberra. The tourist trade could support a large population for catering and servicing. An extension of the regional influence of tourism is the provision of easier access for a growing Canberra population to coastal and seaside resorts within the Canberra region itself. Easier access could be provided by better roads and more frequent tourist coach services. The large numbers of Canberra residents spending holidays and acquiring property in nearby coastal areas has already created a feeling of regional association between the two areas. Many regional tourist attractions e.g. Snowy Mountains Authority area, limestone caves etc. could also be developed to make the Canberra region one of the main tourist areas in Australia.

#### G. BROADCASTING

Canberra already serves as the regional centre for an extensive area of south-eastern New South Wales. The development of specific programmes designed to foster regional thinking can do much to create efficiency in regional development.

#### H. SOCIAL AND CULTURAL

There is a growing need in Canberra for the provision of galleries, museums, theatres, places of cultural interest, zoological and botanical gardens; recreational centres and resorts. This would not only have local and regional significance but would probably develop as a factor of national importance, thus further encouraging the growing tourist traffic.

#### I. PRIMARY PRODUCTION

As Canberra continues to grow rapidly, the provision of the city's fresh food supply will assume greater significance. Within the A.C.T. itself greater attention could be given to land use so that the best use is made of available agricultural land in providing fresh food towards the city's needs. With the provision of better roads and regional organisation the remainder of Canberra's needs could be obtained from the surrounding region, especially from coastal areas where dairy products and sea foods would be available in large quantities. If a market was available produce from the Far South Coast area might be marketed in Canberra at less cost than in Sydney.

#### 4. ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS

If Canberra is to become a focal centre for a considerable area of New South Wales, some administrative problems will certainly be raised. They are problems that very likely will have to be faced in any event sooner or later.

The improved roads that would be required to link Canberra with its "region" would be mainly on State territory, and yet they might be regarded as providing a service mainly, or at least equally, for the A.C.T. On the other hand, if Canberra were to be an educational and medical centre of the region, its schools and hospitals would be providing services for residents of New South Wales. Questions obviously arise of how and by which Government these undertakings ought fairly to be financed.

Of at least equal practical importance would be the need for an integration of policy in the development of the relations between the Commonwealth controlled centre and the State controlled periphery.

One particular element of this general problem is the question of the future of Queanbeyan. This town is geographically fast falling into the position of a Canberra suburb. Its administrative relations with Canberra already present an unsolved problem. If Canberra became the regional centre, Queanbeyan would presumably become a Canberra satellite economically also; and the administrative problem would become acute.

All these considerations naturally give rise to thoughts about the possibility of a joint Commonwealth-State Regional Authority, which would act as a policy forming and financing authority in such matters as roads, transport, engineering services, education and health, for Canberra and the relevant State areas. We have, however, no specific suggestions to make about such an authority, the setting up of which would doubtless meet many difficulties and objections.

#### 5. SUMMARY

The existence of a city of the present and potential size of Canberra must influence the development of its surrounding region to a certain extent. Australia, Canberra and the "Canberra Region" would all benefit materially if attention were given to the future planned development of Canberra in relation to the economic and social development of this surrounding region. It seems likely that centres such as Wagga Wagga and Goulburn will continue to act for many years as regional centres to large areas of agricultural and pastoral land, whilst Canberra initially could adequately provide regional services to the previously defined area of south-eastern New South Wales. As Canberra's population gradually increases its area of regional influence can be allowed gradually to expand, finally to serve as a focal point for all southern New South Wales. This, however, will undoubtedly raise administrative problems.

TABLE I.

1947 Census Classification	Australian Capital Territory		Goulburn		Wagga Wagga		Orbitland		Cairns		Bundaberg		Bendigo	
	No. in Work Force	% of Work Force	No. in Work Force	% of Work Force	No. in Work Force	% of Work Force	No. in Work Force	% of Work Force	No. in Work Force	% of Work Force	No. in Work Force	% of Work Force	No. in Work Force	% of Work Force
PAVARY	477	5.7	270	4.4	320	5.2	341	4.5	257	3.5	609	10.0	358	3.6
FLYING AND QUARRYING	8	0.1	16	0.2	9	0.1	316	4.2	24	0.3	12	0.2	245	2.5
MANUFACTURING	506	6.1	1348	22.1	905	14.6	2541	33.9	1548	20.9	1355	22.2	2688	26.9
BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION	1494	18.0	569	9.3	765	12.7	620	8.3	726	9.8	586	9.6	819	8.2
TRANSPORT	266	3.2	1007	16.5	486	7.8	576	7.7	1220	16.5	553	9.1	857	8.6
COMMUNICATION	172	2.1	106	1.7	158	2.5	118	1.6	120	1.6	70	1.1	144	1.4
FINANCE AND PROPERTY	85	1.0	136	2.2	180	2.9	129	1.7	192	2.6	133	2.2	269	2.7
COMMERCE	401	4.9	848	13.9	1037	16.7	1011	13.5	1166	15.8	907	14.9	1630	16.5
PUBLIC AUTHORITY ETC.	3856	46.5	925	15.2	983	15.9	815	10.9	779	10.5	591	9.7	1244	12.4
AMUSEMENT, HOTELS ETC.	737	8.9	494	8.1	668	10.8	475	6.3	729	9.9	673	11.0	845	8.4
INDUSTRY INADEQUATELY DEFINED AND INDUSTRY NOT STATED	355	4.1	418	6.9	476	9.4	531	7.0	646	8.7	585	9.6	924	9.2
TOTAL	8337	100.0	6137	100.0	6146	100.0	7407	100.0	6074	100.0	6074	100.0	10023	100.0

TABLE 2.

Classification of Work Force	A.C.T. 1947 Census		A.C.T. 1954 Census		Ballarat 1947 Census	
	No. in Work Force	% of Work Force	No. in Work Force	% of Work Force	No. in Work Force	% of Work Force
TEXTILE PRODUCTION	477	5.7	572	4.2	543	3.7
MILLING AND QUARRYING	8	0.1	20	0.1	35	0.2
MANUFACTURING	506	6.1	872	6.3	5284	36.0
BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION	1494	18.0	1800	13.1	1209	8.2
TRANSPORT AND STORAGE	266	3.2	545	4.0	1048	7.1
COMMUNICATION	172	2.1	420	3.0	184	1.3
FINANCE AND PROPERTY	85	1.0	162	1.2	342	2.3
COMMERCE	401	4.9	933	6.8	2263	15.4
PUBLIC AUTHORITY AND PROFESSIONAL	3856	46.5	6958	50.5	1673	11.4
AMUSEMENT, HOTELS, CAFES ETC.	737	8.9	1114	8.1	1130	7.7
INDUSTRY INADEQUATELY STATED AND INDUSTRY NOT STATED	355	4.1	390	2.6	1092	6.7
TOTAL	8337	100.0	13,780	100.0	14,703	100.0

CANBERRA SENATE COMMITTEE.

GRENFELL RUDDUCK, Assistant Director Development, Department of National Development, sworn and examined.

FREDERICK LOCKWOOD McCAY, Senior Project Officer, Department of National Development, sworn.

MR. RUDDUCK.- I have presented evidence on behalf of the Institute of Architects, and I would like to keep my remarks as *Area* President of the *be born Committee of the Royal Australian* Institute of Architects quite separate from my evidence as a departmental officer. I desire to divide my evidence into two sections, and give the departmental evidence first. I have already submitted documentary evidence which I do not intend to read, as it has already been circulated. That evidence is headed "Canberra's functions as a regional centre". However, I desire to reiterate one or two points that may be found in that document. Canberra is the biggest city between Melbourne and Wollongong. It is growing very rapidly and I would say, in round terms, that I believe that an upper limit of 100,000 for Canberra in twenty years is not unlikely, although the number may be less. The planners of Canberra should be thinking in terms of a city of a 100,000 people in twenty years. A city of that size will bring to mind a number of important factors affecting trade and commerce and various services. Obviously a city of that size would be a very important market and service centre for the surrounding area. The immediate vicinity of Canberra is not particularly *productive* attractive, and it is also fairly isolated.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

MR. RUDDUCK.- That characteristic applies, in fact, to the whole of the south east corner of Australia. In a moment, I should like to show the Committee one or two maps that illustrate that point. The whole of the south east is relatively backward and under-developed. It is partly a problem caused by the scarcity of resources and partly by lack of transport, and it is very difficult to distinguish between one and the other. The Australian Capital Territory could not hope to provide for a city of 100,000 people. In fact, it cannot provide for its present population. We import up to one third of our milk. We eat some 6,800 head of cattle, 1,300 calves, about 3,700 pigs, and about 66,000 sheep. Compare those figures with our production of livestock! We have some 9,000 beef cattle, about 2,000 dairy cattle, and about one quarter of a million sheep, most of which happen to be wool breeds. So we cannot feed ourselves at present. When we grow to a city of 100,000 people, or anything approaching that, this problem is going to become much more acute.

It is interesting to contrast the relatively low productivity of the Australian Capital Territory and the south east of Australia with the areas on the other side of the range and the Riverina. I shall illustrate that by reference to a couple of maps. I do not know whether the Committee has seen the map in the series "Atlas of Australian Resources" which we are producing, but I could leave this volume with the Committee. This map is a simple topographic map illustrating the situation of Canberra and its relation to the very mountainous area in the south east. I wish to illustrate the relatively low productivity of this area, compared with the high productivity of the Riverina by referring to the map of agricultural production. There you see a comparatively ~~poor spot~~ <sup>Low Production</sup> in the south east, compared with the extremely fertile and highly productive area just over the range.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Is the main difference one of rainfall?

MR. RUDDUCK.- No, because indeed this is by far the highest rainfall in the area. It is due very largely to the problem of

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

isolation and soil deficiencies.

SENATOR WOOD.- And, perhaps, mountainous terrain?

MR. RUDDUCK.- That is so.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I take it that productivity will increase here?

MR. RUDDUCK.- It will undoubtedly increase, particularly as the local markets develop. As you can see from the population map, this area is remote from the major markets and, consequently, it has extremely little attraction from that point of view. Over the range, transport is relatively easy. I wish to emphasise what I think is one of the main points in the paper we have put before the Committee, namely, that if the future requirements of the capital are to be met, and if the capital is to act as an effective centre for this region, there must be development of communication, particularly towards the inland, so that the products of the Riverina can come through to Canberra, be processed here and consumed here. In time, Canberra can act as a service centre for the whole of the area, being the biggest city, as I have said, between Melbourne and Sydney. It must play a very important part in the days to come as an inland regional centre.

The final point in connection with that pattern of transport that we now have is that it seems to be absurd that the products of the Riverina and the south coast - Bega, for instance - are now hauled to Sydney and then hauled back again to Canberra. That applies to a number of the primary products on which we depend and, I think, is an explanation of why our supply of essential commodities is so poor.

I think I have said enough to indicate the growing importance of Canberra to this area, and the reverse - the importance of the area to Canberra. On the subject of secondary industry, I wish to emphasise a point we have made in this paper, namely, that decentralisation of industry is a government policy. It is not a party issue. Every party subscribes to it, but if you look at what has happened in Australia over the last twenty years, for example, you find that the population of the state capitals has increased by some five per cent compared with that of the rest of the country. I think that the 1933 census disclosed that there



SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

was something like 43 per cent of Australia's population in the state capitals; that figure has now risen to approximately 54 per cent. Instead of making some progress with this rather difficult task of decentralisation, we seem to be slipping back. There are various reasons for that, and I shall not elaborate on them, but Canberra is one place where the Federal Government, if it is sincere about decentralisation, could show by example what can be done, without getting involved in the rather thorny question of Commonwealth-State financial relationships and constitutional questions.

There is one very minor aspect of secondary industry which is not covered fully in this paper and on which I should like to comment. It is a particular departmental function of ours and refers to what might be called "extractive" industries. Many of the state capitals are suffering now because inadequate reserves were made years ago of clay deposits, sand, river gravels, stone and other materials required for building construction. In Canberra there is an excellent opportunity, if we seize it, to reserve adequate areas for the extraction of clay, sand, gravels and other materials which the growth of the city will require. I think that in the land use planning of Canberra reservation should be made of areas which will be required for that purpose. That is a particular concern of ours because the Bureau of Mineral Resources, which is a section of our Department, is of course an authority capable of handling surveys of that kind.

Finally, the growth of Canberra as a regional centre, and the development of secondary industry here - which we think is desirable and also inevitable - will raise a number of administrative problems affecting the relationship of Canberra to the areas round about. We do not want to say much about that at the moment, but the Committee will notice that on pages 3 and 9 of our paper we have made some reference to the need for an integration of policy in the development of relations between the Commonwealth controlled centre and the State controlled periphery of this region. Possibly, some sort of joint Commonwealth-State regional authority <sup>will be</sup> necessary in years to come

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

to sort out the responsibility for financing and construction of roads serving the area, transport facilities, engineering services, and things like educational and health facilities. We have no specific suggestions to make about this now, but we think it is a problem of the future to which this Committee might perhaps give some thought.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Perhaps it might be better if we heard what Mr. McCay had to say before we ask him questions.

MR. McCAY.- I only wish to add one or two very brief remarks to what Mr. Rudduck has said on the subject of manufacturing industry. Our paper covers this topic also, but I wish to say something about the nature of our approach to the question of what manufacturing industries are desirable in the territory. We have approached this question primarily from the point of view of our concept of Canberra as the centre of a region wider than the territory itself. Our paper has set out the arguments that we have submitted about that concept. The first ground that we have suggested for deciding that a manufacturing industry is suitable for location in Canberra is that it is an industry that is needed in the centre of that wider region, an industry which serves that wider region by providing services for it or by processing its products. The validity of that concept, of course, depends entirely on whether you accept the argument that Canberra should serve as the centre of a region wider than the Capital Territory. What we say about manufacturing industry is related to that in the first place. That gives you your first criterion for deciding that a particular manufacturing industry is suitable for the Australian Capital Territory.

The second ground on which we suggest you might make such a decision independently of that first ground, is one which Mr. Rudduck also mentioned. You might say that it is desirable to set up a particular manufacturing industry in Canberra because it is an industry suitable for decentralisation and because it is a good idea for Commonwealth, as well as ~~for~~ States, to try to make some essays in solving the national problem of decentralisation of industry. There, of course, you direct your attention not so much to the relationship of the industry to the region or to the city as to issues

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

involving the cost of freight of its raw materials and products, and the possibility of setting up an industry, which might be national in relation to its markets, in a centre as isolated as Canberra.

The particular list of industries that we have set out under the heading "Industries suggested as suitable" on pages 4 and 5 of our statement ought to be read in the light of what I have just said, and read also as no more than a prima facie list of the sort of industries which you would look at first as being probably suitable for Canberra. Before you could decide, of course, whether any particular industry ought to be set up here, a very careful examination of its economics would be desirable, as well as an examination of the market for its products and the people already in the field.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The matters that you have brought before us raise some very interesting constitutional problems, and I think we will have to approach this very carefully. I quite appreciate the need for a balanced community, but the thing that strikes me is that this area was set up to be the federal capital. It was never envisaged as the chief country town of the state of New South Wales. We have to justify expenditure to the whole Commonwealth. As you know, Australia consists of two main islands. The people in the southern island might be very resentful if we spent a lot of money for the benefit of the people in New South Wales. Do you think that if we bring here all the public servants connected with the headquarters of the departments and do all that is necessary from the governmental point of view but deliberately do nothing else, the natural growth of Canberra will enable it to achieve the other things itself, without the government having a deliberate policy? This city has grown enormously since I knew it first, and I feel sure that it will continue to grow. Certainly if we bring in 7,000 public servants, their wants will have to be supplied. It seems to me that we might very well come to the conclusion that that is all that it is our duty or the right of the Federal Government to do. I am not saying that we will finally adopt that viewpoint, but it is an important consideration when you are talking about deliberately stimulating industry.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

MR. RUDDUCK. - I think that is a question that will certainly have to be answered. I think it can be done specifically in some instances, and in others it might be more difficult to answer it. Let us assume that the government brings to Canberra the civil servants it requires and provides the necessary services. Canberra by that time will have, let us say, 60,000 or 70,000 inhabitants. I have tried to show in my evidence that the main provision of supplies to a city of that size should logically come from over the range in the Murrumbidgee<sup>area</sup>. That requires a road to ~~Canberra~~ <sup>Tumut</sup>. I think the Federal Government is certainly going to be faced with specific problems of that sort. Is it going to have any truck with the construction of a road to Tumut, and similarly of roads to Bega and to Cooma? Those things are on the plate already. I do not think we can build a fence around the Australian Capital Territory and say that we shall provide only what we require for our civil servants. Industries will come here. They will require transport and we shall want better transport to obtain our food. I do not think we can draw a line around the place as one does on a map.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Do you think that a policy of developing industry here will create jealousy in country towns in New South Wales?

MR. RUDDUCK. - I am sure it would.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Do you think that New South Wales would benefit more than it lost.

MR. RUDDUCK. - I am certain it would benefit more.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Which town would be near enough to feel that its prosperity might be to some extent <sup>by the development of</sup> militated against/the Australian Capital Territory?

MR. RUDDUCK. - Towns such as Goulburn and Wagga Wagga, and more immediately, Queanbeyan. But Queanbeyan's plans have been brushed aside and it is virtually a suburb of Canberra.

SENATOR WOOD. - Queanbeyan benefits from Canberra.

MR. RUDDUCK. - Of course.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Do you think that those towns might exhibit jealousy?

MR. RUDDUCK. - Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Their relative development might be more if Canberra did not exist, but on the whole their inhabitants would benefit?

MR. RUDDUCK. - I think they would. At the present time in Australia, a capital city of 250,000 or more persons serves a radius of about 250 miles. You can draw your circles of 250 miles radius on the map and just about cover the south-east of Australia. Between Melbourne and Sydney is a considerable distance and a major <sup>of 100,000 people</sup> centre ~~established~~ <sup>located at Goulburn</sup> there would very effectively service the area round about in a way in which a country town like Goulburn or Wagga Wagga could not. It could have higher education facilities and medical facilities that a town the size of Goulburn or Wagga Wagga could not have.

THE CHAIRMAN. - In view of the certainty that Canberra will grow, do you think that we should deliberately try to increase the population? I have certain views about town planning. I do not like big cities, and I think that as far as possible they should be discouraged. I think that Canberra will necessarily attain a population of 100,000 persons. Should we try to make it any bigger than that?

MR. RUDDUCK. - I have a few feelings on the question of size. I think cities ought to be limited. It is extremely difficult to do. It has never yet proved practicable to do it. I should think that if Canberra could be limited to a population of 150,000 or 200,000 persons, it would be a better place to live in than if it grew to 500,000 residents, but I think it would be extremely difficult to limit it in that way.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Do you think that <sup>if</sup> it tends to increase beyond a population of 100,000 people we should deliberately plan satellite towns at intervals instead of allowing a great aggregation of population?

MR. RUDDUCK. - I think that ought to be the approach to it.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Would you recommend any railway construction to serve this area?

SENATE-CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

MR. RUDDUCK. - Not immediately, but I think it is quite conceivable. We do not know what the development in rail transport is going to be. There have been big improvements with diesel-electric trains and so on, and there may be a case in years to come.

(continued on page 190)

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

THE CHAIRMAN . - One of my main ideas is to ensure the preservation of decent standards. Would you impose any restrictions, other than those requiring the use of decent material, proper hygiene and so forth, on residential buildings? Do you think an authority should try to lay down what type of residence you should have, or do you think that people should be left quite free on that point, apart from ordinary local government requirements?

MR. RUDDUCK . - I can answer that question only as President of the Institute of Architects. Departmentally, we have no concern with that aspect, but, speaking in the other capacity, my feeling is that, for residential development, it is sufficient for the plans to be prepared by a qualified architect in conformity with the normal building regulations.

THE CHAIRMAN . - Do you think that the standards required of a modern architect are sufficient to guarantee that such a building will be respectable?

MR. RUDDUCK . - They ought to be.

THE CHAIRMAN . - What are the standards required of an architect? Must he have a University degree?

MR. RUDDUCK . - Yes, or the equivalent. The University course is of the order of five years. There are other ways of admittance to the Institute of Architects, <sup>namely</sup> by examination, but this requires virtually the equivalent of a five year course of training.

THE CHAIRMAN . - What standards should we adopt to ensure a high quality of architecture in public buildings?

MR. RUDDUCK . - In answer to that question I should like to refer to the other set of documents that I have brought with me. One of the papers which I have submitted to the Committee is entitled "The development of Canberra". It has been prepared by the Canberra Area Committee of the Royal Australian Institute of Architects, and it discusses three main aspects of Canberra's

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

development - administrative machinery, planning principles, and architectural control. Your question relates largely to the third point. However, with your permission, I shall go back over the other points and comment briefly on them.

We feel that the difficulties and complexity of planning and developing Canberra have been underestimated. We think that it is an error of judgment to believe that the departmental procedures are adequate for this purpose. When the Snowy Mountains scheme was proposed, some thought was given to the manner in which it should be carried out and a strong argument was put up that it ought to be carried out, as any other Commonwealth work is undertaken, by the Department of Works. However, after a good deal of examination, it was decided that the ordinary departmental procedures were quite inadequate for a work of that magnitude.

In England a few years ago they decided <sup>to undertake</sup> on a programme of new town development and they went through all the hoops of deciding how best to undertake that programme. The departmental procedure did not get a run. I now table the reports of the New Town Committee, which sat under Lord Reith a few years ago to examine the question of how they should <sup>investigate</sup> complete those new towns. There are two interim reports and a final report. In the first interim report you will find a detailed discussion of the various ways in which projects of this type should be undertaken. As I have said, the departmental procedure was simply not considered. They went through all the other processes - using private enterprise, using Government corporations, and so forth - and finally came to the conclusion, which we recommend to the Committee for study, that the development corporation method of procedure was the most satisfactory for this type of problem.

The construction of a town is an extremely complex task. It is not only an engineering and technical task; it involves also artistry and social and economic problems of the most complex character. If you are to undertake a task of that sort satisfactorily, we think, you must have a single authority which should



have a degree of freedom to act which is not available to a department.

We seriously recommend that this Committee, or some of its members, should visit the United Kingdom and study the new towns and see what a success has been made of the development and construction of those towns.

I have a number of reports here, which I make available to the Committee, referring to some of those cities, such as Harlow and Crawley. They are all very fine examples of successful town building. The method adopted in each case was that of the development corporation with a corporation appointed by the Minister for the sole purpose of carrying out the construction of a town. Each corporation was financed by the Treasury. Under that system, when the town has been constructed, the corporation *will* fade out of existence and <sup>be</sup> replaced by a local authority. Its assets and functions <sup>will be</sup> transferred to that authority.

We feel that ~~that~~ <sup>the</sup> procedure is quite applicable to Canberra. I do not want to discuss the problem of local government, which is somewhat outside of the field of interest of the architects in Canberra. However, we feel definitely that a development corporation with the sole task of constructing the town should operate for a period of years until it is felt that the task has been virtually accomplished. Then its assets and responsibilities can be transferred to a local government body.

THE CHAIRMAN . - You recommend that for a new town. Would you recommend it for a partly constructed town?

MR. RUDDUCK . - Yes. The term "new town" in England is somewhat of a misnomer. In fact, there were existing towns in the centre of those areas. It is difficult to find a virgin site in England. Therefore, they selected small towns and proceeded to build around them. The same thing could apply here. It would be the most direct and expeditious way of handling the job.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

THE CHAIRMAN . - But beyond that stage you will still want some standard of architecture in public buildings.

MR. RUDDUCK . - Certainly.

THE CHAIRMAN . - What would be your idea? Do you favour some body like the Fine Arts Commission in Washington?

MR. RUDDUCK . - I think there is a case for such a body. But we have not put it forward as a proposal because we think it is somewhat too far away. Speaking personally, I think there is a task for at least ten years ahead for a development corporation. Towards the end of that term you might well have questions which ought to be the concern of a body like the Fine Arts Commission. I would not oppose that concept, although I rather doubt whether it is warranted now.

THE CHAIRMAN . - Your general idea is that the architects are the judges, but, with a corporation of the sort you have suggested, the public would have to accept what the corporation gave them.

MR. RUDDUCK . - The corporation would not be a technical body. It would be a body of lay people representing various walks of life - people who had made reputations for themselves and whose judgment could be trusted. Under them they would have a chief executive officer. His staff, broadly speaking, would consist of two branches. One would be a technical branch concerned with the architectural and engineering services and the other an administrative branch concerned with land tenure and other such problems. Within the executive of such a corporation, we feel, there could well be a chief architect who could be responsible for exercising a degree of architectural control over the design and development of the buildings.

CANBERRA SENATE COMMITTEE.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think that it would be practicable to have a body which could offer advice on the design of buildings to certain associations such as church bodies which may desire to erect a certain type of building for reasons other than those of an architectural nature?

MR. RUDDUCK.- I think that that would be possible. I think that this matter should be approached in two stages. Initially, it is necessary to have a broad concept of the massing and form of the buildings, particularly in the main centres of the city. That concept should be developed in the form of models and drawings. Then, any building that it is desired to erect in those centres should conform to the broad lines of the scheme. For example, a proposal to construct a single storey building on a site that had been zoned for a four storey building ~~would~~ <sup>should</sup> not be ~~generated~~ <sup>permitted</sup>. The details of design would be much more difficult to handle. Certainly, cases such as you mentioned, Mr. Chairman, would have to be provided for. An elastic approach would be necessary to the subject of design.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think that a good deal of variety in the design of buildings is a mistake? For example, would you approve of the erection of a period style build-<sup>ing</sup> in Canberra?

MR. RUDDUCK.- I think that it would be a mistake to construct what I shall call "old-fashioned" buildings.

THE CHAIRMAN.- But Canberra already has old style buildings such as St. Johns Church. Would you pull that down?

MR. RUDDUCK.- No. I do not object to buildings of an appropriate character.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think that the further construction of period style buildings would be a mistake?

MR. RUDDUCK.- Yes, <sup>but I would</sup> I ~~should~~ not endeavour to enforce that view. If I had control of town planning and somebody wanted to construct what I regarded as a building of "phoney" design - that is a design which drew too much on historical tradition and was out of character with modern construction techniques - I would hesitate to refuse permission for the construction of that building unless refusal were vital to the implementation of a particular scheme; but

if it were a key building in the civic centre, <sup>for example,</sup> I would not accept it.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Would you consider it a mistake to have a mediaeval building in Canberra such as St. Patricks Cathedral in Melbourne?

MR. RUDDUCK.- No. But if I were commissioned to design a cathedral I would not design it in that way.

THE CHAIRMAN.- There are buildings which try to convey a similar effect by the use of modern methods?

MR. RUDDUCK.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Certain periods in architecture were regarded as being drab. What guarantee have you that a future age will not regard buildings which are constructed at present as drab?

MR. RUDDUCK.- None. About 60 years ago people in Sydney and Melbourne looked upon Greenaway's work as horrible. Now it is all the rage. The Victorian architecture of last century is now coming into vogue in England.

SENATOR WOOD.- Do you consider that the advance planning of cities to provide for community centres, green belts and other special areas results in a good organisation of traffic?

MR. RUDDUCK.- I agree that the neighbourhood pattern in a city helps to overcome traffic problems and other problems.

SENATOR WOOD.- Do you consider that the introduction of an industrial community into a place such as Canberra with its large public service population would bring about a broader community outlook?

MR. RUDDUCK.- Yes. I think that it would vitalise Canberra to have a <sup>large</sup> proportion of the population concerned with business <sup>and industry</sup> other than the ~~public service~~.

SENATOR WOOD.- Simplicity appears to be the prevailing tendency in modern architecture. Would you agree that simplicity never becomes outdated?

MR. RUDDUCK.- That is very close to my feeling on the subject of design.

SENATOR WOOD.- Therefore, modern architecture would be less likely to pass out of favour than the more ornate type?

MR. RUDDUCK.- Yes.

SENATOR VINCENT.- Why do you consider the establishment of secondary industry in Canberra to be both desirable and inevitable?

MR. RUDDUCK.- I think that it is desirable in order to provide a balance in the diversity of interests of the population. I also consider that it would be good to have industry here because I am fairly sure that it would provide cheaper products, in a number of cases, than those which have to be brought from Sydney and Melbourne at present. I consider that the compelling factor in the establishment of secondary industry will be the existence of a market. Raw materials, transport and power supplies are very important to the establishment of industry. But I think that it is the market provided by the <sup>large</sup> population <sup>of the capital cities</sup> that has proved to be the dominant factor in the concentration of industry. A population of 50,000, consisting largely of civil servants, will inevitably result in Canberra developing its service industries and, later on, other industries associated with them.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

SENATOR VINCENT.- Here we have a federal government using federal funds for the provision of water supplies, roads, land, transport, power and so on. Many of those commodities are provided from public funds. Do you suggest that we should give a manufacturer the benefit of those conditions in competition with state governments?

MR. RUDDUCK.- I am not sure that that is a valid argument. In the states there are governments which are deliberately sponsoring development. We also have the second and third tiers of government, local government, which are sponsoring industrial development. I do not consider that there is anything wrong in saying that the government responsible for Canberra should wish to sponsor development here, using loan funds or revenue for that purpose if the ultimate objective is the good of Canberra and, consequently, the whole of Australia.

MR. McCAY.- We have many industries in Australia which are located in one state, but serve the whole of the Commonwealth. For example there is the steel industry, the coal industry and so on. These industries are supplied with free facilities by the government of the state in which they are located. They use roads freely, and they get the benefit of free elements in the supply of power and water. We do not say that South Australia and Victoria should make a contribution to New South Wales in respect of the use by the Broken Hill Pty. Co. Ltd. of free service facilities to provide steel for the whole of Australia. We do not refine our ~~own~~ governmental accounts to that extent - in fact we could not do it. The proposition that we could have industries in Canberra does not get out of step with that principle, which operates, without us thinking about it, as between the States.

SENATOR VINCENT.- Do you suggest that it would be equitable for a taxpayer living in Perth to assist in the establishment of a secondary industry in Canberra, and assist the manufacturer to establish such an industry to his own disadvantage? The disadvantage is that here we have certain services which are supplied at a loss. The services are water supply, road construction, transport facilities

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

and so on. The taxpayers of Australia are paying for those services. Is it equitable for the taxpayers to support secondary industries in this city in competition with themselves?

MR. McCAY.- Formally the taxpayers give that support to secondary industries in particular states, as they would be giving it to industries in this city.

MR. RUDDUCK.- The argument is that the cost of water, power and transport is subsidised in this city. If the city grows it is reasonable to assume that those services could be provided without subsidy. One of the factors in the subsidy is that the services have been planned for the future, and there is now an artificial set-up.

SENATOR VINCENT.- While the artificial set-up remains it will not be equitable to establish secondary industries in Canberra?

MR RUDDUCK.- I consider that it is a set-up that has to be rectified.

SENATOR VINCENT.- I appreciate that there should be certain industries encouraged to provide for the livelihood of Canberra, but encouraging additional secondary industries is a completely different matter. That involves constitutional questions and Commonwealth-State relations. It brings to light the important question why this Commonwealth was established at all. Do you say that the Commonwealth Government was originally set up for the purpose of directly establishing secondary industry?

MR. RUDDUCK.- Certainly not. I ~~do not know~~ <sup>hope</sup> whether Senator Vincent <sup>does not</sup> believe that our departmental view is that we should encourage secondary industry willy nilly. That is not our view. We submitted a list of the industries that might be effectively established here, and that list is based on the assumption that the industry will serve the city and the region. We will not go so far as to try to encourage industries which go beyond that field, and which have an Australia wide market. Our first step is to meet local Service requirements.

THE CHAIRMAN.- And to provide alternative employment for members of families so that young people will not have to leave

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

Canberra if they do not want to enter the public service.

SENATOR VINCENT.- With regard to the regional functions of Canberra, that involves questions as to the final purpose of the capital?

MR. RUDDUCK.- Yes.

SENATOR VINCENT.- It does not necessarily follow that we should establish Canberra as a regional centre?

MR. RUDDUCK.- No, but it is inevitable that you will. When Canberra was first thought of, I doubt whether those matters were considered, but one of the earlier proposals was that the Australian Capital Territory should take in ~~the~~ <sup>a very large area in the</sup> south east part of N.S.W., whereas it is now only about 900 square miles in area.

SENATOR VINCENT.- I am concerned to find ways of perpetuating certain architectural standards in Canberra. You advocated setting up a developmental corporation?

MR. RUDDUCK.- Yes.

SENATOR VINCENT.- Presumably that body would insist on certain standards with regarding to siting of a location and so on?

MR. RUDDUCK.- Definitely.

SENATOR VINCENT.- After Canberra has been built and the body has been disbanded, how can we ensure that those standards will be maintained and enforced?

MR. RUDDUCK.- Only by <sup>adequate</sup> ~~federal~~ <sup>embodiment</sup> legislation ~~insisting~~ <sup>which</sup> ~~on~~ certain documents and plans <sup>as</sup> part of the town planning scheme.

At present there is no land use plan for Canberra. The Department of the Interior can approve any sort of building anywhere it likes. Any worthwhile town planning scheme will include a land use plan which cannot be altered without the alteration being submitted to a parliament, or some similar body. Canberra definitely needs a provision of that character in its town planning, protected by legislation of the Australian Parliament.

SENATOR VINCENT.- Is there any body at present that can control siting and architectural standards with regard to public and semi-public buildings. Canberra is a small city which conveys a pastoral atmosphere to me. Assuming that it is desirable to



SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

maintain that atmosphere, is there any organisation to ensure that it shall be so maintained?

MR. RUDDUCK.- I should think that it is within the power of the department controlling Canberra to ensure any type of development that it wants, ~~I do not know what its functions are, and~~ *but* it does not appear to be exercising the degree of control and development that our Institute thinks is desirable.

SENATOR VINCENT.- Do you consider it desirable to have a statutory enactment under which even the Department is bound to maintain standards?

MR. RUDDUCK.- I do not think that we can do without it. I believe that we must leave ~~this matter~~ <sup>the control of development</sup> to the judgment of a group of people, and that is why we desire to see a corporation composed of people whose judgment the government is prepared to trust. That body would set and insist on the maintenance of <sup>adequate</sup> standards.

SENATOR VINCENT.- Your first recommendation was that a planning authority is necessary. Is there not such an authority at present in existence?

MR. RUDDUCK.- May I qualify that recommendation? I believe that there should be one planning authority.

SENATOR VINCENT.- A single authority responsible to a Minister?

MR. RUDDUCK.- Yes.

SENATOR BENN.- Would you say that the development of Canberra is closely linked with the employment of more public servants in Canberra?

MR. RUDDUCK.- I do not understand that.

SENATOR BENN.- There are so many public servants here at present?

MR. RUDDUCK.- Yes.

SENATOR BENN.- And development is at a certain level. Supposing we bring 3,000 more public servants in, then there would be further development?

MR. RUDDUCK.- Yes, the growth of Canberra is linked with the growth of the Public Service.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

SENATOR BENN.- The growth of Canberra is almost wholly dependant upon the number of public servants coming to this city?

MR. RUDDUCK.- Yes, at the present time. However, a time will come when it will cease to be wholly so dependant.

SENATOR BENN.- That is why you have dealt with regions?

MR. RUDDUCK.- Yes, then the city will grow of its own accord.

SENATOR BENN.- The object of establishing a city here was to provide houses and living conditions for public servants?

MR. RUDDUCK.- Yes, and also to provide for the people of Australia some sort of focal point for their thinking about Australia and its government. That is an important matter which to the present time has been overlooked. If you ascend the Washington Memorial you find that the attendant in the lift talks to you while you are in the lift, which is about one and a half minutes, to such effect that when you get out at the top you are convinced that that is the most important day of your life and that the memorial is the most important place on earth. When you come to Parliament House in Canberra you hear a few wisecracks about the gasworks and so on, and I believe that there is a place in our thinking about Canberra for the sort of consideration that we find in Washington.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I approve that sentiment and I believe that the American idea is very sound. Unfortunately you find the same sort of thing in England as you find in Canberra. I once visited Blenheim Palace, and was amazed at the jokes of the guide about the Duke of Marlborough and his wife. I would not have tolerated such jokes about my ancestors.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

SENATOR BENN. - I think it was you who said that in another 20 years we may have a population of 120,000. I take it that depends on more public servants coming here?

MR. RUDDUCK. - Yes.

SENATOR BENN. - Fundamentally, we must have more public servants in Canberra to increase the population?

MR. RUDDUCK. - That is right.

SENATOR BENN. - Supposing 3,000 public servants were brought here. What, according to your estimate, would be the resultant increase in the population of Canberra?

MR. RUDDUCK. - I think that that brings us to the 1960 estimate of 47,000 people in the Australian Capital Territory. I think an additional 3,000 would result in a total population of 47,000 by 1960.

SENATOR BENN. - Supposing that we had housing accommodation in Canberra for 3,000 more public servants, and also the office accommodation in which they could carry out their duties. Naturally, there would be an increase of population because there would also be wives and children. Would not the increase be nearer 12,000?

MR. RUDDUCK. - On account of public servants alone, yes, but there is the other increase on account of trades people and so on.

SENATOR BENN. - I am speaking about immediate transfers.

MR. RUDDUCK. - There would be an increase of about 12,000 on 3,000 public servants immediately transferred.

SENATOR BENN. - And it is proposed to bring 7,000 here?

MR. RUDDUCK. - I cannot say.

SENATOR BENN. - That would give an increase of 28,000?

MR. RUDDUCK. - Yes.

SENATOR BENN. - Then I think that we should forget about the regional population and the development of the country. If we concentrate on bringing public servants here, that should be sufficient. After all, the object of establishing the Parliament here was to have central administration.

MR. RUDDUCK. - With respect, I do not think that you can forget about the other aspects.

THE CHAIRMAN. - I think we have to decide whether it will correct itself or whether we have to take positive action to do it. I am all in favour of laissez-faire where laissez-faire will work. When you get beyond a certain point the city will act as a magnet, and it may be that that will be sufficient to rectify the unbalance. I take it that that is what took place in Washington?

MR. RUDDUCK. - I think that that is quite right.

THE CHAIRMAN. - According to evidence given here this morning, at a certain stage of its development Washington was in a much worse position than Canberra, but that unbalance has gone. Washington is now a fairly big city, even by American standards, and that has been done without doing anything else than to make it deliberately the seat for the government. I think that is something we cannot decide here. We shall have to debate it.

SENATOR WOOD. - Does the Government impose severe restrictions on industries which propose to come into this area?

MR. RUDDUCK. - I do not think so. That is not a departmental responsibility of ours, and I cannot answer the question directly. In the past, however, there was a policy of restriction. There were obstacles. It was difficult. We have not seen the fruits of the present policy. We understand that areas are being opened up at Molonglo for industrial development and so on. I think that as a result<sup>of</sup> simply opening up the land and providing services there may be industrial growth.

SENATOR RYAN. - Could you give us an idea of the difference between the growth of Canberra and that of the new towns in England to which you referred?

MR. RUDDUCK. - In terms of rate of population increase?

SENATOR RYAN. - Yes, and also in relation to industrial and housing development.

MR. RUDDUCK. - I cannot remember the actual figures of growth. These towns were mostly of the order of from 5,000 to 10,000 people originally when they started in 1947, and they aimed to expand them to about 60,000 and then to put a ring around them and stop. Some of them are now getting on towards the 60,000 mark, so that they

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

have grown rapidly. Industrial development has been encouraged because they do not want them to be merely satellite towns in which people live and go to work in London. They have built factories and let them to industrialists fully serviced, so that if you wish you can walk in and start producing tomorrow. That policy has worked very well indeed. They provide housing, too. An industrialist can negotiate with the corporation to obtain a block of houses - ~~200 houses or 300,~~ <sup>the number</sup> dependent <sup>ing</sup> on the size of his staff.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Ultimately, far from encouraging industry you might get to the point where you would want to discourage it, because you will only want industry to prevent having this terrible bias in favour of public servants. I have in mind the city of Oxford, which would be much better off without industry, such as the Nuffield Works.

MR. RUDDUCK. - Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN. - You stress in your paper the value of the tourist trade. Do not you think that that is one of the things that might help to develop Canberra, and that all the Government need do is to put up the public buildings and construct the parks and other attractions?

MR. RUDDUCK. - Yes. I am sure that is quite an important feature. There will be a big development of that kind.

MR. McCAY. - That also raises the question of the development of roads and communications.

THE CHAIRMAN. - How many good roads have you <sup>into</sup> / Canberra now?

MR. McCAY. - Two.

MR. RUDDUCK. - There is the other interesting connection between Canberra and this mountain area to the south. There should be better communications between Canberra and the Snowy region, for instance.

SENATOR WOOD. - I think that the road from Canberra to the Snowy should be an important consideration.

MR. RUDDUCK. - That is right.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - Perhaps Mr. Rudduck would like to comment on the existing buildings in Canberra, particularly in relation to the new administrative building.

MR. RUDDUCK. - On the whole, I think that the buildings in Canberra are not bad. They are better than the average buildings in most cities and towns of Australia. I think that that applies right through.

THE CHAIRMAN. - You say that they are not bad, but is that a good enough standard for a national capital?

MR. RUDDUCK. - No. I was going on to say that I think it is not a good enough standard. There is ample room for improvement. As to the administrative building that is now being built, personally I do not like it. I think that it is out of date - I believe that that type of construction and design is out of date. It is the sort of thing which was very common in architectural magazines some 20 or 30 years ago - that particular type of fenestration and design.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - Have you any explanation why that building should have been pursued on those lines?

MR. RUDDUCK. - No. I do not know the history ~~of the designing~~ of the building, and I am not competent to comment on that. I can only express a personal opinion about it.

THE CHAIRMAN. - With regard to getting the best type of architecture, do you think that it would be better to have a competition among architects, independent architects, for all your important public buildings?

MR. RUDDUCK. - That is a very difficult question. The fact is that competitions are notorious for their lack of success in the application of results, shall we say. You get some good designs out of competitions, but to my knowledge there are very few successful competitions. Incidents seem to arise from which, for some reason or other, <sup>have led to a great deal of</sup> ~~unhappiness and dissatisfaction, even~~ Why that should be so, I am not sure. I think that for certain buildings a competition is a good idea, such as limited competition where a group of architects is selected and invited

to submit competitive <sup>it</sup> drawings.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Would you limit that to Australian architects, or would you cast your net over the whole world?

MR. RUDDUCK. - I would cast the net.

THE CHAIRMAN. - That leads me to another important point in connection with schools of architecture. Is there any modern type of architecture that you could call characteristically Australian? Are not modern designs pretty well common to Europe, America and Australia?

MR. RUDDUCK. - Yes. There is a tendency for certain residential designs to be characteristically Australian, but generally speaking there is ~~none~~ *no Australian style*.

THE CHAIRMAN. - We would like your opinion about a number of particular things, such as those Lonsdale Street shops that people have been arguing about. Would you care to express an opinion on that?

MR. RUDDUCK. - Briefly, I think it is an unfortunate development. I do not think there is any merit in that particular street.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Have you seen the design for the new library?

MR. RUDDUCK. - Yes, but I have not studied it in great detail.

THE CHAIRMAN. - I do not think there is any question about its utility. I think it is thoroughly sound from the point of view of the working of the library, but I thought that, externally, it looked too much like a factory. If your architecture is functional, a library should not look like a car factory, should it?

MR. RUDDUCK. - No, I suppose it should not.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Factory construction has been greatly improved, but I think too many other buildings which are not factories look like factories. Do you think it would be a good idea, if you have a supremely good architect, to entrust the whole thing to him as, for instance, was the case with Sir Christopher Wren

CANBERRA SENATE COMMITTEE.

in relation to certain portions of London?

MR. RUDDUCK. - I think you have to, provided that he is working with fairly clear instructions about <sup>how</sup> the thing is to fit in with your overall plan.

THE CHAIRMAN. - But he would have to be a supremely good architect to be entrusted with that?

MR. RUDDUCK. - Yes, I think so.

THE CHAIRMAN. - I am not in any way trying to discount the value of general architectural opinion, but I know that in connection with other professions the average man is not good enough. You need a man above the field to set high standards?

MR. RUDDUCK. - That is correct.

THE CHAIRMAN. - That is so in medicine, law and teaching, and I am sure it is also the case in architecture.

MR. RUDDUCK. - Yes.

(continued on page 208)



SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

SENATOR VINCENT . - What is Mr. Rudduck's opinion of the University College?

MR. RUDDUCK . - University House?

SENATOR VINCENT . - Can you give us your frank view of University House?

MR. RUDDUCK . - Putting it in the negative that is not a bad building. Beyond that I shall not go.

SENATOR VINCENT . - It appals me. I would rather look at Goulburn Gaol which is a much more satisfactory building.

THE CHAIRMAN . - It may be not bad but it is not good either.

SENATOR VINCENT . - Did the design for that building not win a competition?

MR. RUDDUCK . - Not a competition. Each year in New South Wales a <sup>Prize</sup> medal is awarded. It is given for various classes of buildings. Last year, in the category of educational, religious and academic buildings, this building was awarded the ~~medal~~ <sup>Prize</sup>.

SENATOR VINCENT . - Did the architects or somebody else award the medal?

MR. RUDDUCK . - The architects awarded it.

THE CHAIRMAN . - In a building that costs so much and is so important we want something better than that. It does not compare with any great college that I have seen.

MR. RUDDUCK . - The general massing of the building is good. There are details about it that could have been very much better.

THE CHAIRMAN . - Is the tower a good feature? It looks like another storey half constructed.

MR. RUDDUCK . - I do not think that is too bad.

THE CHAIRMAN . - From the point of view of utility the building is deficient. I have stayed in it twice. On each occasion it rained and it was impossible to get from the corner in which I was accommodated to any other part of the building without getting wet. That brings up the point that modern architects are working out definite standards and concepts. How far are those just the standards of professional men? How far have they considered that it is the people

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

who look at and live in buildings who are the final judges? We are consumers of architecture, even if we are not constructors.

MR. RUDDUCK . - I do not know how far architects in history have ever worried very much about that, but I am inclined to think that the profession, which determines its own standards, no doubt is influenced by public opinion, but in rather a subtle way. Architectural standards in Australia, generally speaking, are not particularly high at present.

THE CHAIRMAN . - Are they rising or falling?

MR. RUDDUCK . - I think it is impossible to say. If you look at the new Civic building compared with the old Civic building, I should say that they are falling. There is a very clear ~~retro-~~  
*evidence of retro-gradation*  
~~grade architectural~~ when those two projects are compared as architecture.

SENATOR VINCENT . - Is it a matter of cost?

MR. RUDDUCK . - I do not think so.

THE CHAIRMAN . - It think it is a matter of complacency.

MR. RUDDUCK . - I think that is close to it. There are a number of factors involved. There is a good deal of uncertainty today. I do not think people know where they are going in the matter of taste. There is a ~~tendency to produce~~ <sup>evidence of</sup> what you might call an accelerated ~~obsolescence in design~~ <sup>buildings, along with other</sup> ~~so that things go~~ <sup>things go</sup> out of fashion ~~deliberately~~ <sup>very</sup> and quickly. It stems partly from the process of industrial design, where it pays a person to ~~have~~ <sup>introduce</sup> a model ~~this year,~~ <sup>each</sup> a new model ~~next year,~~ and every year afterwards. If you apply that to architecture, ~~you get into to all sorts of~~ <sup>it is difficult to establish any</sup> ~~with which standards~~ streets. There has been a tendency throughout the world to apply ~~the~~ <sup>techniques of industrial</sup> ~~to architectural designs~~ <sup>to architecture, the result is</sup> here today, gone tomorrow.

SENATOR VINCENT . - Are our standards in public buildings comparable to those of Britain or Western Europe?

MR. RUDDUCK . - I should say they are much higher than the British. I think British architectural design is at a very low ebb at the moment.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

THE CHAIRMAN . - Which standards are the highest?

MR. RUDDUCK . - I should say the Swiss.

THE CHAIRMAN . - I saw some good new buildings in France.

MR. RUDDUCK . - I did not see much in France. I was not there very long.

THE CHAIRMAN . - What about the United States of America?

MR. RUDDUCK . - I think it is very patchy.

THE CHAIRMAN . - What do you think of the United Nations building?

MR. RUDDUCK . - I think the concept is good. It is very poor in detail.

THE CHAIRMAN . - The part that you see as you cross the bridge nearby looks like a glass rectangle.

MR. RUDDUCK . - That is not entirely successful, but I think the broad outlines of that building group are quite good.

THE CHAIRMAN . - If that is all there is in architecture, we do not need architects. All we have to do is to get our dimensions and a ruler and any builder can do the job.

MR. RUDDUCK . - I think the architects would be happy if the laymen could produce good proportions. It is not an easy matter.

THE CHAIRMAN . - The United Nations Building is nothing but an ordinary rectangular figure.

MR. RUDDUCK . - There is scope for success or failure in a rectangle. There is the question of scale and its various components.

THE CHAIRMAN . - I think that that is an architect's alibi.

SENATOR VINCENT . - The artist in the architect has not yet got to the stage at which he is sure of himself when building in the modern materials.

MR. RUDDUCK . - That is true. There is nothing more certain than that. I think the essays in architecture<sup>that</sup> are seen today are very much comparable to a lot of the very early Gothic work when they were blossoming out from the Romanesque to the Gothic and played about with flying buttresses and that sort of thing. It is U.3.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

much the same sort of experimentation that is going on today. Some of them we think are very good.

THE CHAIRMAN . - Do you think that modern architecture will attain a perfection equal to that of architecture in previous ages?

MR. RUDDUCK . - Yes. It depends upon society.

THE CHAIRMAN . - That is why we as laymen are entitled to express our opinions.

MR. RUDDUCK . - Certainly. Without an informed lay body there will not be any good architecture. That is absolutely certain.

THE CHAIRMAN . - I am familiar with most of the types of architecture from the Greek onwards. In most I find something that I like a great deal, and I find it also in modern architecture. I think particular buildings are very fine but there is an enormous amount of it that is undistinguished and commonplace.

MR. RUDDUCK . - Yes.

CANBERRA SENATE COMMITTEE.

SENATOR WOOD.- What do you think of the Canberra plan itself? Do you not think that the city is ~~too~~ complex from the point of view of movement from place to place?

MR. RUDDUCK.- Yes, I do.

SENATOR WOOD.- And do you not think that the national capital should be designed so that it is easy for people to find their way around?

MR. RUDDUCK.- I would not say that that was an essential criterion but I think that in a good plan it is relatively easy to find your way around. I think Canberra is a reasonably good plan but too complex.

SENATOR WOOD.- Do you think that it lacks the human community element because of the way in which it has been designed?

MR. RUDDUCK.- I think that, in a city like Canberra, you look for the sort of human aspects that you have mentioned in the residential areas but that you also look for a degree of monumentality and impressiveness in the public sector. I think you ~~can~~ <sup>could</sup> get that in Canberra but it <sup>will</sup> depend very much on the way in which the plan is handled from now on.

I think it is very important that some means be found of giving sense to that third apex of the triangle near Russell Hill. At the present time it is simply the American War Memorial. It is not enough justification for the major elements of the plan simply to define that as a war memorial and let it go at that. Originally, I think it was intended to be a major centre of population and commerce. I think there must be some means of providing balance in the plan at that point - something that will have equivalent weight and importance to the civic area.

SENATOR WOOD.- I feel that there is a lack of cohesiveness in the whole area.

MR. RUDDUCK.- That, I think, arises from the retention in the central areas of so much open space which is not really understood by people now and will not be understood until the lakes are constructed.

CANBERRA MATTERS COMMITTEE.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Do you not think that the difficulties of finding your way around are rather exaggerated at the present stage?

MR. RUDDUCK.- Yes, they are.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Nobody could say that he could not find his way around the various suburbs near Civic Centre without difficulty, and I have never had any difficulty in finding my way around the southern suburbs. It is just in the central part of Canberra, with its open spaces, that you have difficulty, particularly in a motor car at night time.

SENATOR VINCENT.- Do you agree with what I have called the pastoral atmosphere of the general layout of Canberra and the construction of the buildings?

MR. RUDDUCK. - I like it. I do not think that it will be easy to retain that atmosphere indefinitely.

SENATOR VINCENT.- Do you think it can be retained?

MR. RUDDUCK. - ~~Yes~~. The only way to retain it would be to adopt the skyscraper principle of development in the inner arcs and group all the things that you had to put in the central area in very large skyscraper buildings which were reasonably well-spaced apart with parks and gardens between them. That could be done, and in many ways it would set a new pattern for city development - the sort of thing that Corbusier has written about and illustrated in his books. I think there would be a good deal to commend such an arrangement.

SENATOR VINCENT.- Do you think we should strive to maintain it?

MR. RUDDUCK.- Yes, subject to that qualification about the adequacy of population densities in those areas. *It will not be possible* There is no point in ~~trying~~ <sup>are</sup> to retain it if your buildings will be only two-storey structures which will not accommodate enough people. If you are to retain that park-like character in the central area of the city, you will have to adopt fairly large building units, like those of the United Nations type, *that is high buildings which* The United Nations buildings are high and accommodate large numbers of people.

CAMBERRA SENATE COMMITTEE.

SENATOR VINCENT.- Why do you say we should go up high in order to retain the pastoral atmosphere?

MR. RUDDUCK.- What is the alternative? To spread out with buildings of two or three storeys! I do not think you would attain sufficient density of population. Your city would be too spread out.

SENATOR WOOD.- The trend today with the building of flats is to put hundreds of people in a sky-scraper block. Instead of the tenants having individual back-yards they all use the whole garden area attached to the block.

MR. RUDDUCK.- I think Senator Vincent is talking about the central area of the city.

SENATOR VINCENT.- I am talking about the whole city.

MR. RUDDUCK.- I think that, if we continue to develop on the sort of densities we are now working on, the city will become quite unworkable. I think we have to work towards higher densities. To do that and still retain the park-like character of the city that we have now means going up rather than out. How far you go up is a matter of looking at each particular case.

SENATOR VINCENT.- I understand there is to be an 8-storey block of flats near Civic Centre. Do you consider that one or two tall buildings like that would have the effect of creating an imbalance architecturally and artistically in relation to public buildings and would tend to emphasise relatively unimportant buildings so as to give a wrong impression?

MR. RUDDUCK.- I think they probably would have that effect. I do not object to the principle of flats, and I think that, sooner or later, we will have to cope with our building problem in that way. However, I think the design of the proposed flat buildings ought to have been related to the proposals for the design of Civic Centre so that we could see what effect they would have on Civic Centre.

SENATOR VINCENT.- And surely related, also, to the ultimate public buildings here?

MR. RUDDUCK.- Yes - that is, on the south side of the river.

CANBERRA SENATE COLLIERIES.

SENATOR WOOD.- What is your feeling about the loss of the lakes from the Canberra plan?

MR. RUDDUCK.- I do not think that it is any great tragedy that West Lake is to be replaced by a ribbon of water. I think it is probably better to use the land as a recreation area than to flood it with water. The nature of the terrain is such that you cannot build on it without engaging in extensive flood control work.

SENATOR WOOD.- What about Griffin's idea of building around the lake?

MR. RUDDUCK.- Personally, I do not think that is very important. The central basins will create a satisfactory effect. I do not think it will be much of a loss not to have West Lake.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- As a previous witness said, the use of the area will be determined by flood conditions. In order to prevent flooding over a lot of the ground that was planned originally for West Lake, you would have to provide extremely expensive levees.

MR. RUDDUCK.- Yes. You could not build on the area without very extensive engineering works, so it must be used for a lake or a recreational area of some sort.

SENATOR WOOD.- Have you investigated the establishment of the avenues? You know the Mall in Washington. Apparently the idea here is similar but, if you look at the terrain, the avenues are too long. You will not get the same effect.

MR. RUDDUCK.- I think that the major avenues in Canberra, in some instances, will never read as architectural units. There is a danger that the major avenue between Parliament House and the war memorial will never read. That is one of the most difficult problems facing the planning authority. It is due <sup>partly</sup> to the nature of the country.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- You said that they would never "read" as architectural units?

MR. RUDDUCK.- Yes. People will never feel that <sup>there is</sup> ~~they have~~ any ~~read~~ connexion between one end of it and the other. You could never walk up it. It would be too far.



CANBERRA SENATE COLLEGE.

SENATOR RYAN.- What is your opinion concerning the erection of a building similar to the new block of Commonwealth offices on the other side of Parliament House? Would you favour the erection of a block similar in design and construction?

MR. RUDDUCK.- No. I would not favour a repetition of that building on the other side of Parliament House. I think that would be to repeat a tragedy.

SENATOR RYAN.- Would not a different type of building be out of harmony with the picturesqueness of the area?

MR. RUDDUCK.- I think you could get your architectural balance by a different type of design. I think you need a building there - or perhaps two or three - but you need not repeat the same form. The buildings will be so far apart that they will not read as an image of each other.

SENATOR RYAN.- What is your objection to a similar building? Is it based on an architectural point of view or a utilitarian point of view?

MR. RUDDUCK.- I think there are utilitarian difficulties in the new building. We have been trying to plan our office accommodation to fit one of the floors in that building. There are great difficulties. The wings are too wide. You are too far from day-light. The plan is bad. That is the principal factor, and I also think that the design is outmoded.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- It seems shocking that the building should have been proceeded with on those lines.

MR. RUDDUCK.- I agree.

SENATOR RYAN.- Was it not originally planned back in 1934?

MR. RUDDUCK.- I do not know the history authoritatively, but I understand the design was based on a competition held years ago and that, when they resurrected the idea of building on the site, the quickest thing was to proceed with the old plans.

SENATOR VINCENT.- Ultimately we shall have a Parliament House on the proper site I hope.

MR. RUDDUCK.- Yes.

CANBERRA SENATE COMMITTEE.

SENATOR VINCENT.- Would you express any view as to the style of architecture you consider to be appropriate for that structure?

MR. RUDDUCK.- No.

THE WITNESSES WITHDREW.

THE COMMITTEE ADJOURNED.

SUBMISSION BY MR. M.J. MOIR TO THE SENATE  
COMMITTEE ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF CANBERRA.

I have been asked to offer comment on the relationship of Canberra development to the original plan.

I have lived in Canberra since the beginning of 1928. I am an architect by profession being a Bachelor of Architecture of the University of Sydney; a Fellow of the Royal Australian Institute of Architects, an Associate of the Royal Institute of British Architects and a member of the Australian Town Planning Institute.

I came to Canberra originally as an architect with the Federal Capital Commission and subsequently began private practice here. Since 1932 I have been associated with the company controlling the two cinemas. I am Managing Director of that company. I was for six years President of the Canberra Chamber of Commerce. I have been a member of the Parks and Gardens Advisory Committee, the Road Safety Committee, the Tourist Bureau Board and Tourist Advisory Committee, the Building and Grounds Advisory Committee of the Australian National University.

In the days of the Federal Capital Commission the Griffin plan seemed to be regarded as sacrosanct. I felt then, and still feel, that a complete overhaul and revision to bring it in line with modern traffic conditions would be desirable. I regard the plan as basically a splendid one for the site conditions of Canberra. However, any master plan must be flexible and fluid to suit changing circumstances and, from time to time should be reviewed by some very competent and experienced authority or group of authorities in the way the Washington plan has been and more recently that of Ottawa. Several cities have sought and received advice from outside experts such as Sir Patrick Abercrombie and Professor Holford - London, Cambridge, Singapore, Johannesburg, for examples.

Since the war a large number of minor changes have been made in the Canberra plan without the prior knowledge of the local residents. These seem to have related to details of planning to meet particular problems without the fullest consideration being given to the over-all plan of the city and their long range effects on it. These changes smack of expediency and do not seem to be the result of any close study of Canberra's problems.

As an average resident it seems to me that there is insufficient co-operation and understanding between the various sections of the administrative machinery. Of course, as a private citizen I don't know what is going on and perhaps I do not appreciate all the problems. I think the private citizens or some of them at least should be kept in touch with planning and development. Some years ago the Chamber of Commerce had some liaison with the Department of the Interior but this is no longer the case. I have known a case where trees were planted where street lights were to go and other cases which demonstrate a lack of co-ordination between sections. I am sure, for instance, that the town planning section cannot be happy about the types of houses and their siting in newly developed areas. Well planned developments have been spoiled by poor houses unimaginatively placed. I cannot help feeling that Canberra's future would be brighter if all the units responsible for town planning, provision of streets and services, building and landscaping, co-ordinated their activities. This might best be brought about by the local division of the Department of Works being incorporated with the appropriate parts of the Department of the Interior as a special Canberra Development Organisation. The examples of City Corporations as have been created to develop new satellite towns in England might well prove to be excellent prototypes. Such corporations could, at the appropriate future time, merge into a City Council.

A Commission of three to five experts meeting much more frequently and for longer periods of time than the present National Capital Planning and Development Committee - even a full time Commission - might well be appointed as it were an appointed Council to settle policy, with the chiefs of the administration in roles equivalent to those of Town Clerk, City Engineer, City Architect, etc. It is said that too many cooks spoil the broth. But in the complexities of developing a city I think a number of well chosen heads are better than one. Changes must be kept in perspective and their repercussions recognised in advance.

I have always felt that the administering body should be able to plan well in advance - flexibly, of course, as circumstances change from year to year, but in such a way as to be independent of annual estimates and budgets.

The post war administrations have certainly produced action in many respects but in others the replacement of tortoise movement with that of the hare has left indelible marks on the city. Ill advised hostel construction, tardiness in stepping up the production of bricks and other materials, the adoption of poor housing designs and layouts, the elimination of West Lake from the plan, an apparent distrust of private enterprises' motives and responsibility can be cited in a general way.

Parliament has now realised its responsibility for the National Capital. But in the past the administration has often been powerless to do what it could have done. Encouragement of pre-planning for the post war years should have been given. This was given to Departments such as Post War Reconstruction and National Development while Canberra, the nation in microcosm was largely ignored.

All the mistakes of the past cannot be corrected but some can and it is from Parliament that inspiration to electrify progress and funds to bring it about must spring. But continuity must be assured. Thus Ministerial control, which, by the nature of the political structure must change character with personality, must largely give way to the steady planning and realisation of a concept of a really beautiful and useful city up to the point where its residents can carry it on. There is a target size for Canberra when all the public service to come here arrives. After that, Canberra will grow as Australia grows. A ten-year plan, for example, might anticipate Australia having a population of say, 12,000,000, and Canberra one of, say, 10,000, and prepare for this while wiping out all back-logs. Then would come the time when growth would be normal for such a city and the responsibility for it be transferred to the people.