

	<h1><u>Canberra Yacht Club</u></h1>
PO Box 7169 Yarralumla 2600 Mariner Pl, Yarralumla ACT (ACT Sailing Inc T/A) ABN 93 090 967 514	Tel (02) 6273 4777 Fax (02) 6273 7177 email: <a href="mailto:admin@canberrayachtclub.com.au">admin@canberrayachtclub.com.au</a> Website: <a href="http://canberrayachtclub.com.au">canberrayachtclub.com.au</a>

6 April 2009

Committee Secretary  
Joint Standing Committee on the National Capital and External Territories  
Department of House of Representatives  
PO Box 6021  
Parliament House  
CANBERRA ACT 2600  
AUSTRALIA

**JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE NATIONAL CAPITAL AND  
EXTERNAL TERRITORIES**

**INQUIRY INTO THE IMMIGRATION BRIDGE AUSTRALIA PROPOSAL**

**SUPPLEMENTARY SUBMISSION**

**CANBERRA YACHT CLUB (CYC)**

The enclosed supplementary submission from the Canberra Yacht Club is forwarded for the Joint Standing Committee's consideration.



Graham Giles  
Commodore

Enclosure: CYC Supplementary Submission to the Joint Standing Committee on the National Capital and External Territories Inquiry into the Immigration Bridge Australia Proposal

**JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE NATIONAL CAPITAL AND  
EXTERNAL TERRITORIES**

**INQUIRY INTO THE IMMIGRATION BRIDGE AUSTRALIA PROPOSAL**

**SUPPLEMENTARY SUBMISSION**

**CANBERRA YACHT CLUB**

**National Memorials Approval**

Immigration Bridge Australia (IBA) has pointed out that the Immigration Bridge is proposed as a ‘monument’ to immigration, rather than a ‘memorial’ as it has been termed by others. We believe that this is a semantic differentiation, the words effectively being interchangeable, as indicated by various reference documents. Moreover, we note regular reference on the IBA website to the intent of the proposed bridge to “commemorate” immigration. The bridge proposal would therefore seem to be subject to both the NCA Guidelines for Commemorative Works in the National Capital, and the National Memorials Ordinance, 1928.

Accordingly, with reference to the Inquiry’s third Term of Reference concerning the approval process for the proposed bridge, we suggest that this must include consideration of the proposal by the Canberra National Memorials Committee. Such a process would do much to provide the necessary formal substance to the concept of a national structure in Canberra to recognise immigration, and to the suggestion by the NCA that this might be a bridge as proposed.

**Heritage Values**

In addressing the impact of the proposed Immigration Bridge on the heritage values of Lake Burley Griffin, although discussed by others, we omitted to highlight the visual and physical intrusion of the land-based entry/exit towers and ramps. The towers are likely to need to be large enough to include lifts, stairs and ancillary systems (e.g. security). The ramps, from an elevation of 12m above the water, have been estimated by IBA to each need to be 280m long, a very significant structure whether linear or spiral (and potentially adding significant distance to the trip for those using them).

**Approval Uncertainty**

We suggest that the process entered into by the NCA in this project places IBA in an invidious position. The NCA has allowed IBA to promote and raise funds for the bridge on the basis of its in-principle support, when there has been no work done to ascertain whether the Commonwealth would support the cost of construction and ongoing maintenance of such a bridge. Nor has there been any assessment of the Commonwealth’s acceptance of the need for such a bridge in terms of benefits, detriments or alternatives, and its wider implications. To allow the project to proceed through to design completion without being informed on these matters is unreasonable.

We suggest that if the project is to proceed at this stage, then such work and assessment should be done in parallel with IBA development of its design brief. A decision could then be taken on whether the project should continue to the design stage, or an alternative course of action should be adopted. If this process, involving a preliminary review of all relevant matters had a positive outcome, it would allow IBA to proceed through design with a degree of confidence adequate to justify its additional work and expenditure, notwithstanding that final approval would still rest on review of design.