



COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA

# Official Committee Hansard

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

**Reference: New east building for the Australian War Memorial, Canberra, ACT**

FRIDAY, 13 AUGUST 2004

CANBERRA

BY AUTHORITY OF THE PARLIAMENT



## **INTERNET**

The Proof and Official Hansard transcripts of Senate committee hearings, some House of Representatives committee hearings and some joint committee hearings are available on the Internet. Some House of Representatives committees and some joint committees make available only Official Hansard transcripts.

The Internet address is: **<http://www.aph.gov.au/hansard>**

To search the parliamentary database, go to:  
**<http://parlinfoweb.aph.gov.au>**

**JOINT COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS**

**Friday, 13 August 2004**

**Members:** Mrs Moylan (*Chair*), Mr Brendan O'Connor (*Deputy Chair*), Senators Colbeck, Ferguson and Forshaw and Mr Jenkins, Mr Lindsay, Mr Ripoll and Mr Wakelin

**Senators and members in attendance:** Senators Colbeck, Ferguson and Forshaw and Mrs Moylan, Mr Brendan O'Connor, Mr Ripoll and Mr Wakelin

**Terms of reference for the inquiry:**

To inquire into and report on:

New east building for the Australian War Memorial, Canberra, ACT

**WITNESSES**

**BROUGHTON, Ms Natalie, Senior Planner, National Capital Authority ..... 15**  
**GOWER, Major General Steve, AO (Rtd), Director, Australian War Memorial ..... 1, 18**  
**HUDA, Mr Shamsul, Principal Planner, National Capital Authority..... 15**  
**MARSHALL, Mr Barrington Charles, Director, Denton Corker Marshall Pty Ltd ..... 1, 18**  
**NORTHEY, Ms Vicki Anne, Head of Gallery Development, Australian War Memorial..... 1, 18**  
**PRATT, Mr Malcolm William, Associate, WT Partnership ..... 1, 18**  
**ROOT, Mr Peter Kenneth, Consultant Project Manager, Root Projects Australia ..... 1, 18**



**Committee met at 10.55 a.m.**

**GOWER, Major General Steve, AO (Rtd), Director, Australian War Memorial**

**NORTHEY, Ms Vicki Anne, Head of Gallery Development, Australian War Memorial**

**MARSHALL, Mr Barrington Charles, Director, Denton Corker Marshall Pty Ltd**

**ROOT, Mr Peter Kenneth, Consultant Project Manager, Root Projects Australia**

**PRATT, Mr Malcolm William, Associate, WT Partnership**

**CHAIR**—Welcome. I declare open this public hearing on the proposed construction of the East Building for the Australian War Memorial in the ACT. The project was referred to the Public Works Committee on 24 June 2004 for consideration and report to parliament. In accordance with subsection 17(3) of the Public Works Committee Act 1969:

- (3) In considering and reporting on a public work, the Committee shall have regard to -
- (a) the stated purpose of the work and its suitability for that purpose;
  - (b) the necessity for, or the advisability of, carrying out the work;
  - (c) the most effective use that can be made, in the carrying out of the work, of the moneys to be expended on the work;
  - (d) where the work purports to be of a revenue producing character, the amount of revenue that it may reasonably be expected to produce; and
  - (e) the present and prospective public value of the work.

We appreciated the opportunity earlier this morning of receiving a briefing from you in regard to the site and other aspects which were best appreciated by visiting the site. The committee has received a statement of evidence and a supplementary submission from the Australian War Memorial. These submissions will be available in a volume of submissions to the inquiry and also on the committee's web site. Does the War Memorial wish to propose any further amendments?

**Major Gen. Gower**—Not at this stage.

**CHAIR**—I now invite you to make a short statement in support of your submission.

**Major Gen. Gower**—Thank you very much for this opportunity to brief the committee on this very exciting project for the Australian War Memorial. We regard it as the next major step in the development of this great national institution, which is a shrine to the fallen, a world-class museum and a major archive. We have completed stage 1 of what we have termed 'gallery development' That concluded in 2000. It was a major undertaking that saw us redevelop the Second World War galleries and the Aircraft Hall and completely reconfigure the lower ground

floor and the research centre. In particular, the research centre became very much online to casual members of the public.

As a result of a Centenary of Federation grant, we then opened Anzac Hall, which is a 3,000 square metre major exhibition space. Late last year, we brought back on display the wonderful Lancaster bomber 'G for George' in a very challenging and striking object-theatre presentation, which has seen attendances jump by 20 per cent in the few months after its opening. We believe we have very high levels of expertise in the planning of gallery development and the development and presentation of world-class galleries.

Madam Chair, you may be aware that the Australian War Memorial has been Australia's No. 1 major tourist attraction for three years in a row, and last year was inducted into the Australian Tourism Hall of Fame. You might think that is unusual for a war memorial, on first glance, but we believe we have a very important national message about service to the nation and the values that the ordinary, decent Australian men and women who volunteered for overseas service sought to uphold. We want people to come and learn more about that service and sacrifice. We want to be out there in, for want of a better word, the marketplace so people do come. We are the most visited national cultural institute in Australia, and are second in Canberra, in terms of numbers of visitors, to Parliament House—but we are only a short way behind.

We see this as the next major step in our development. We seek to overcome a difficulty we have lived with for some years—that is, the difficulty of presenting in an appropriate fashion the service and sacrifice of our peacekeepers. This is a wonderfully honourable story of Australian international service which goes back to 1947, with 50-odd commitments since then. We seek to tell the story of Korea—many people say that is the forgotten war—the very long and divisive Vietnam commitment and then subsequent commitments such as East Timor, Afghanistan and the two Gulf wars. Over 110,000 Australians have served in these commitments and, as you saw this morning, Madam Chair, the space we have available to show their service to the visitors is grossly inadequate. We have had a lot of understandable complaints over the years from veterans and their families as to the paucity of the presentation and displays of their service. We want to redress that and, by displacing staff and collection, produce 1,300 square metres of exhibition space.

In that space, we want to produce similar high-quality galleries as we already have for other conflicts, and to do that we need to house the displaced staff and collections. Hence, we have come up with the East Building project. We believe this building will fit very well into the precinct. We have engaged Denton Corker Marshall as the architects. They have considerable experience in working for us. They did the administration building and Anzac Hall and have come up with what I believe is a most appropriate design for the East Building. It is proposed that that building be for staff only—with no public access—and that it be connected via a tunnel to the main building. Our staff, volunteers and collections which are required in the research centre will move to and fro via that tunnel. We want to start work on this project early next year with a completion date a year later. That would give us just over a year to produce the exhibitions in the lower ground floor with an opening in October 2007. We believe we have the staff, the consultants and the designers to produce an outstanding result. As I said, it is a very exciting project for the Australian War Memorial.



I would like to touch on several points that were made in our response to comments by the National Capital Authority. The first one related to the building height. We have endeavoured to meet their requirement by lowering the height proposed by Denton Corker Marshall. I am sure Mr Marshall will be able to speak further, if the committee so desires, about this height question. I would like to ensure that the committee is aware that a drop of one metre in building height comes with a penalty of at least \$0.3 million. It is in our budget at the moment, and that is the cost of dropping one metre to have a new reference line.

The other thing is with respect to what is described in the National Capital Authority submission as the ‘articulation’ of the building. On the advice of the architects, we do not wish it to have a street address; it is for staff only. The staff and collection come in through the rear. The staff access the building via a tunnel within the working environment. We do not see the need for an address per se. Nor do we see any need to have a copper roof—and a similar argument was conducted for the Anzac Hall building. The copper roof is on the main building. It is a fundamental feature of the main building. We certainly do not want to mimic and detract from the very strong architectural lines of that main building.

That concludes my opening remarks. As I said, it is a very exciting project for the Australian War Memorial. We see it as the logical next step of development in accordance with the approved site master plan.

**Mr BRENDAN O’CONNOR**—Thank you, Major General, for such a comprehensive oral submission this morning. On behalf of the committee, may I say how grateful we were for the inspection today. We have an opportunity to see so many dwellings and places that are under construction. Some are very far from here. This war memorial is on our doorstep, but I know all members who were able to go today found it a wonderful opportunity for us to reacquaint ourselves with such an important site.

I start by making reference to some of the things you touched upon in your opening statement. At the end of your statement, you made comment on the fact that there would be a tunnel where most of the traffic would flow between the East Building and the memorial. Paragraph 55 of the submission says:

A discreet staff entrance, separate delivery and equipment access will be provided to the east, which will not be apparent to the general public.

I understand that for architectural, aesthetic and other reasons you have chosen to go in this direction. Are there any occupational health and safety or fire safety issues associated with the lack of a front entrance? I address that to you and any of the witnesses here before us.

**Major Gen. Gower**—We are unaware of any. One particular reason we do not wish to have an address is that we have an address for the administrative building and we find that a lot of visitors come down the road and turn right into the administrative building, thinking that it is the start of the museum. That aside, I think it is best if I ask Mr Marshall to speak specifically in response to your query.

**Mr Marshall**—There are certainly no problems about escape or exit. We have the requisite number of exits and escape stairs from the building, so there is no issue of safety as far as staff are concerned.

**Mr BRENDAN O'CONNOR**—Did you consult with staff, or did you have any discussions with people who might be being moved to the building? It may not have been your role.

**Major Gen. Gower**—Perhaps I could ask Ms Northey to respond to that.

**Ms Northey**—This project has been considered for quite some time. Over the last two years, we have done a lot of staff consultation. On top of that, the staff affected have been involved, down to the minute detail, with the design of the interior fit-out of the building, as well as with moving collections through the tunnel. The tunnel is specifically designed to allow our research centre collections to move through as simply as possible. We have also been very mindful of issues to ensure that staff do feel comfortable in that tunnel and with the finishes that we have been talking about.

We feel that our staff consultation has been quite effective in that. Certainly, from the feedback we have received, staff feel they have had a major role in designing the spaces, specifically in the research areas and in the photo, film and sound areas, which are quite detailed and require a high level of consultation about how things can be built there.

**Mr BRENDAN O'CONNOR**—Would the workplaces increase as a result of the move? Can you give me an estimate of the increase in workplace per employee and/or volunteer?

**Ms Northey**—It is a little hard to judge it in that way because, as you would have seen this morning, those rear staff areas are somewhat eccentric in how people have been fitted in over the years. As one of the guidelines, we used our workplace guidelines for office fit-out, and all the new offices meet those guidelines so, in many cases, staff do have larger spaces. Certainly in the photo, film and sound area the spaces are much more efficient and larger. In the new building they do not have any of the constraints they had when they had to move around the historic parts of the original building. So it means that, when specific equipment is changing, they can get that equipment in and change it over very simply. We have taken this opportunity to sort through those functional issues that we have had in the main building for some time.

**Mr BRENDAN O'CONNOR**—Were any alternatives to a tunnel considered, or was it always the case that a tunnel would be a requirement of this construction, given what was being sought?

**Major Gen. Gower**—We will be moving collection items backwards and forwards between the public area of the research centre, which is at the centre of the lower ground floor, and the storage area. I think you saw what it was like up on the site, and if it were raining it would be even worse. We have valuable items in the collection that we would not want to expose to unprotected surface movement, so we thought it was very good planning for once people were on the site. It is good for security aspects too. You check through with our security people either in the East Building or in the research centre. It is a very sensible way to function. Items are brought into the site either from our repository at Mitchell or through the back.

**Mr BRENDAN O'CONNOR**—You also mentioned that there was a need to lower the height of the building and that that had impacted upon the cost—I think it was to the extent of \$3 million.

**Major Gen. Gower**—No, it was \$0.03 million.

**Mr BRENDAN O'CONNOR**—So it was \$300,000. Your submission states:

Due to reduced access and height constraints under the existing bridge into the Aircraft Hall gallery, the roof to the tunnel in this location will be insitu concrete.

Can the architect or one of the other witnesses at the table expand on that?

**Mr Marshall**—That refers just to the tunnel construction itself. We have to go from the natural ground floor level of the lower part of the memorial across, so that we can wheel trolleys across at level. In order to do that we need to have a minimum height in the tunnel—when I say 'minimum height', I mean a minimum height that is high enough—

**Mr BRENDAN O'CONNOR**—Which is what exactly?

**Mr Marshall**—It is about 2.7 metres. That requires just a thin concrete slab on the top surface, which is then waterproofed so that we do not actually raise the top of the tunnel above ground level. So the tunnel will be completely invisible as far as anybody on the ground is concerned.

**Mr BRENDAN O'CONNOR**—Thank you.

**Mr RIPOLL**—My thanks to the Australian War Memorial for providing their tour of the facilities this morning and giving us a first-hand look at the site. It is always important for us to look at a site. The proposal looks very good to me, and the drawings seem to be very much in keeping with the standard expected of the War Memorial. I have a question in relation to parking. There is not a proposal for any additional parking. Have you considered any additional parking that might be needed because of future growth, either in staff numbers or in numbers of visitors coming to the War Memorial?

**Major Gen. Gower**—There is a cleared area to the east which we could use as a car park, across a rather large stormwater ditch. We have had initial discussions with the National Capital Authority on that. As I mentioned earlier in evidence, we believe that for the time being there is sufficient car parking. We will need, in due course, to return to the questions of where the buses with schoolchildren park and of disabled parking and so on, but that is a consideration separate from this particular project. It is something we are very mindful of. We want to provide good amenity for our visitors. I did mention that in our long-range master plan we would see underground parking somewhere. That is something that we will address in due course. We believe that, once the building is finished, we can dispense with the temporary car park, as we will not have the extra demand by workers on site. For the foreseeable future we think that will be adequate, but it is an issue we keep under close control. We did some studies a few years ago, in terms of the overall development of the precinct, with that in mind. We have taken them no further.

**Mr RIPOLL**—I know the proposed work would comply with all the relevant standards as to access for people with disabilities and so forth. Would you specify what you have put in place to give people the right sort of access to the new building? I know that we talked before about emergency access, but I would like to know about the ramps and so forth. Perhaps it might be better for the architect to answer this.

**Mr Marshall**—External access from the rear—from the outside on the east side of the building—is complete at-grade access for disabled or handicapped people. Obviously we have a lift inside the building. It runs from the level of the tunnel to the lower level of the building itself and then to the second floor.

**Mr RIPOLL**—How many levels is that?

**Mr Marshall**—In effect, there are really only two levels in the building, but of course the floor of the tunnel itself is one level lower than those. You come across in the tunnel into a small lobby and you then catch a lift up to the two main levels of the building.

**Mr RIPOLL**—Would this lift be just for passengers or would it also be used for transporting goods?

**Mr Marshall**—It is also for that.

**Mr RIPOLL**—So this would be a large service type lift?

**Mr Marshall**—This would be a large lift.

**Mr RIPOLL**—So it would also be used for access by people with disabilities and so forth?

**Mr Marshall**—That is right.

**Mr RIPOLL**—The only other question I had was about the tunnel but I think that has been well addressed, so I am fine.

**Mr WAKELIN**—I do not have questions on anything too major. I have two or three points needing clarification. It seems to me that, in operating the sort of facility that you do, there are some peculiar occupational health and safety issues in moving large equipment. I have been thinking about the logistics of doing that. What does moving equipment in and out do in respect of management and adding to costs in the design of a building such as this?

**Major Gen. Gower**—We have a specialist large technical objects team and we have got a very good record compared with those of some overseas museums that have dropped aircraft and damaged things. If you have the opportunity to see Aircraft Hall, you will see that a submarine and a Lancaster bomber are suspended there. Elsewhere in Aircraft Hall we have got all manner of aircraft up on pedestals and suspended from the roof, likewise in the Second World War area. We pay particular attention to moving items of our collection. Our staff are well trained. In addition we have an occupational health and safety committee, which meets regularly and is chaired by our Assistant Director of Corporate Services. Safety in the workplace is very

important for participants—that is No. 1. Also, these items are valuable items with provenance. We have to look after them and preserve them, so we place a lot of emphasis on that.

Getting items into the building is tricky. This morning you would have seen that bridge. That bridge had to be built to get the Lancaster bomber ‘G for George’ out of its previous exhibition space. An access door had to be increased in size. Now we can get all the aircraft in and out—some through dismantling—of Aircraft Hall. In Anzac Hall, we have a major door on the western side that swings upwards to get the equipment in and out. In the area where you were briefed this morning, the central column in those doors will slide to one side and the doors will come out so that we can items in. We have paid particular attention to moving items. For this particular project, we are looking at having a door on the western side of the building so we can get those items directly into the proposed exhibition hall. It is something that is quite fundamental to our planning.

**Mr WAKELIN**—Although it does add some cost in engineering, with supports et cetera.

**Major Gen. Gower**—Yes. The apron, for example, in that area where we briefed you this morning is strong enough to take tanks. The concrete is very strong.

**Mr WAKELIN**—Yes, so there are some cost factors in that and they are built in. On a practical matter, I note the requirement that no contaminated water leaves the site during the development or operation of the facility. What does that mean in terms of the infrastructure that is needed to do that? Is it just simply that something has to be put into a tank and covered? If it is not allowed to leave the site, what does that mean in terms of costs and logistics?

**Major Gen. Gower**—As one who probably drinks contaminated water every day on my farm, I will pass that question to an expert.

**Mr Root**—I am not sure that I am expert on that particular technical requirement, but fundamentally it requires holding tanks so that water does not rush out and is not contained within the normal stormwater provisions of gutters and whatnot. It is an issue of managing the volume of water in the short term so that in the longer term it dissipates over the site in an orderly way.

**Mr WAKELIN**—It says ‘no contaminated water’. I am just trying to understand what that means.

**Mr Root**—Can you refer me to the paragraph that you are looking at?

**Mr WAKELIN**—Actually, I cannot. Environment ACT has outlined its requirement ensuring that no contaminated water leaves the site.

**Major Gen. Gower**—Is it that new requirement of the ACT government?

**CHAIR**—I think there are some issues around contaminated water from the photographic processes.

**Mr Root**—I think it is referring to the containment of any contaminated water during the construction process, which is a normal requirement.

**Mr WAKELIN**—It says ‘development or operation of the facility’.

**Mr Root**—I have just been advised that we are talking about the trade waste in the area that contains the photography group within the building. Because of the use of chemicals and whatnot in those processes, we have had to allow for proper filtration of any water coming from that area to ensure no contaminated water enters the public system.

**Mr WAKELIN**—Not that it happens in Canberra enough probably, but I note there is a certain requirement for the stormwater run-off.

**Mr Root**—Which is what I was talking about originally with the containment tanks.

**Mr WAKELIN**—We have not had to worry about it for the last couple of years, but do we have the stormwater under control?

**Mr Root**—Yes, we do.

**Mr WAKELIN**—And we are optimistic that we will have a storm so that it might actually be a risk?

**Mr Root**—Yes, perhaps it will bring it on.

**CHAIR**—I am sorry, but we may need to go to a division in the chamber in a few minutes. The question that I had—which, indeed, we may not get through—is in relation to compliance with the site master plan under the National Capital Authority’s National Capital Plan. I notice that a number of issues have been raised during the consultations with the National Capital Authority. Some of those you have covered off on, including the provision of the proposed roofing material and the investigation and consideration of the more articulated western elevation, but the plan also mentions details of continuous mesh cover around the perimeter. Can someone explain that? I also have some questions in relation to a number of other issues that you are still in consultation with the NCA over.

**Major Gen. Gower**—I would just like to emphasise that we like to have a constructive, positive relationship with the National Capital Authority because they have regulatory responsibilities—

**CHAIR**—Yes, indeed.

**Major Gen. Gower**—and we like to work within that. My view is that we address, in consultation, the issues they have raised. I have raised some with you and your committee, Madam Chair, because I thought they were worth mentioning to you to help your deliberations and your thoughts on the project. Having said that, the architect, Mr Marshall, can address the specific questions.

**Mr Marshall**—That refers to the fact that, because the building is sunk into the ground, in order not to spend, if you like, an exorbitant amount of money in reinforcing and waterproofing the walls of the lower part of the building, we have cut back the earth as it goes to the lower level. That leaves a trench around the building, which means that we do not have to tank or waterproof that lower floor. The top of that trench then has a grid mesh surface so that people cannot fall down it but it still allows ventilation down through there.

**CHAIR**—That is very nifty solution to avoid having problems with the section underground in the future. In relation to some of those other matters, there are a number of them, so I will not list them all. The one that I do think you might explain a bit more is the provision of the pigmented precast linear external wall planks, which are to match the colour of Anzac Hall. Can you tell us how those negotiations are proceeding?

**Mr Marshall**—I probably cannot tell you about the negotiations—perhaps Major General Gower can do so.

**Major Gen. Gower**—I think we had a similar situation when we did Anzac Hall, when we consulted very closely with the chief executive officer. We went through a number of proposed panels of colour, we got agreement and the building went ahead. I think that is part of the process of working in consultation. They have a very strong interest in having an architectural solution, which has great merit, to fit the site, and so do we.

**CHAIR**—I know the committee appreciates that you have had this consultative process and it has been very successful. Indeed, the National Capital Authority has expressed confidence that all of these issues can be addressed. But would you like to explain a little bit more, Mr Marshall, about the actual precast linear external wall planks?

**Mr Marshall**—Yes, certainly. Obviously, for reasons of cost, we are not proposing to use stone for the cladding of the east wing building, so we are using a precast pigmented concrete which has a very fine-honed finish. The colour is essentially the same as the colour of the big wall of Anzac Hall—the big spine wall at right angles—which comes from the darkest tone of the sandstone on the memorial itself. We have articulated these panels in a series of horizontal joints or planks, which are at about 400-millimetre centres. They approximate to the coursing on the War Memorial itself, so there is a very loose linkage between the two. Obviously we do not want to just have a big, massive, bland building; we do want to get some sort of texture and scale into the building.

**CHAIR**—Thank you for that. Can you also explain to us what the difficulties are in relation to the mechanical plant and exhaust vents? There have obviously been some negotiations going on between the War Memorial and the National Capital Authority.

**Mr Marshall**—I think—although I may be corrected on this—that they are referring probably to vents and things like that coming out of the roof of the building. I imagine that is what they are concerned about.

**Ms Northey**—Yes, that is correct.

**Mr Marshall**—Of course, we are also concerned to make sure that there are no protrusions sticking out of the roof. We are all working towards making sure that does not happen.

**Ms Northey**—This specifically relates to exhaust for the photo, film and sound area, in particular. We have had discussions with the NCA just in the last couple of weeks about our approach to that, to minimise the impact on the roof as much as possible. Our approach, which we have discussed with them, is to group these protrusions together as much as possible and to treat them in the same type of finish as the roof. For all intents and purposes, if you were on Mount Ainslie, you probably would not see them at all. The NCA seem very comfortable with that. Obviously, when we bring the samples of the materials themselves as part of that approval process, we can finetune that, but certainly in principle they were quite happy with that approach.

**CHAIR**—So that seems to be pretty much resolved.

**Senator COLBECK**—Just going to back to the precast concrete, what is the finish on the panels?

**Mr Marshall**—It is what we would call a fine honed finish, so it is not a—

**Senator COLBECK**—So it is a ground finish.

**Mr Marshall**—It is like a ground finish, yes. It looks like natural stone superficially; it looks like a rubbed stone finish. It is not shiny; it is not coarse. It is very fine.

**Senator COLBECK**—It is a polished finish with a fine sandblast—something like that.

**Mr Marshall**—That is what it looks like. It is actually not achieved that way. If you—

**Senator COLBECK**—So it is an off-form finish?

**Mr Marshall**—It is not off-form. It is actually treated with a light acid wash or something. To be quite honest, I am not sure exactly how they achieve that finish. I just know that that is the finish. It is very similar to the one on Anzac Hall—that same sort of finish.

**Senator COLBECK**—Okay. Unfortunately, I did not have the benefit of the visit this morning because of being required in the chamber. Has there been experience of this on the site before?

**Mr Marshall**—There has been, yes.

**Senator COLBECK**—That is the Anzac Hall?

**Mr Marshall**—That is right: the big spine wall that runs right across the back.

**Senator COLBECK**—With respect to the minimisation of windows, how does that impact on energy use with respect to lighting in the building and other costs?



**Mr Marshall**—The windows are relatively small. Obviously at one level the smaller the windows are the better the energy costs are because you are not actually heating the building up through the glazing. On the other hand, the smaller windows become, the more artificial lighting that you need inside the building. We believe that we have sufficient window area. Where the floor areas are occupied there are sufficient windows to provide natural daylight for the occupants. Obviously, like in all buildings, there will be internal lighting to supplement that on darker days.

**Senator COLBECK**—Are there any energy measures built into the windows—double glazing or anything of that nature or protective films?

**Mr Marshall**—We are looking at double glazing. As I said earlier, it is one of those cases in which, because the windows are relatively small in area, it is conceivable that you could get away without double glazing. But the chances are that we will still use double glazing.

**Senator COLBECK**—So some of these things are obviously still part of your design process as you move forward—

**Mr Marshall**—Part of design development, yes.

**Senator COLBECK**—which is in line with notion of the design and construction processes working concurrently. Does that fit with maintaining your budget process?

**Major Gen. Gower**—I think it might be best if the project manager, consultant Mr Root, explains that.

**Mr Root**—The process that we are recommending for this project is what we call document construct. We recommended it after looking at a range of alternative procurement processes, and it is consistent with the process that was recommended for Anzac Hall, which was the last major undertaking of the War Memorial, and it worked very successfully for that. The reason we have recommended it is that unlike with design construct it means that we—with our client and the architects—can work the design through to a point where it is fully resolved prior to letting the contract.

We novate the architect under that contractor and the contractor then becomes responsible, with our architect, for the development of design detailing. The design of the windows is a good example of the budget control. We have provision in the budget for double glazing. We are working through that and a number of other details. We will settle on those details before we go to tender and then the construction documentation will be prepared after we have let the contract.

**Senator COLBECK**—So there is room for finalisation of some detail items as the construction process goes through?

**Mr Root**—That does not happen during construction; that happens prior to construction. That occurs after letting of the document construct contract.

**Senator COLBECK**—So this provision in the budget allows you to move things and, if necessary, make some sacrifice to achieve the outcome that you are looking for at the end of the day?

**Mr Root**—Yes, that is right. We also have two contingency provisions: a construction contingency of around five per cent and a 2½ per cent design contingency that remains. We would also be relying on that as a basis for managing costs through design before construction commences.

**Senator COLBECK**—How does that method of working fit with the local construction industry?

**Mr Root**—As I said, it is the same process that was used for the Anzac Hall project, which was undertaken by a local construction company. It is a process that is well known in the construction industry, and the local construction industry here is well able to deal with it.

**Senator COLBECK**—What would be your expectation of the expressions of interest for tender on the process, and what is your process for managing that? Do you go to expressions of interest to have selected tenders—

**Mr Root**—Yes.

**Senator COLBECK**—and then operate around that basis?

**Mr Root**—There are a number of Canberra based contractors who are already expressing an interest informally but we will go through a formal expression of interest process, which will be a public call for expressions of interest. On a set of criteria we will evaluate those, recommend a short list of contractors to go to tender, and then call tenders.

**Senator COLBECK**—And that should provide for some capacity for local contractors to participate in the process?

**Mr Root**—Very much so.

**Senator COLBECK**—Does that form part of the criteria, or is that not something that you are able to determine?

**Mr Root**—I am sorry, I cannot tell you whether or not we are constrained in that regard. In the past we have not restricted short-listing to contractors based in Canberra and we would normally recommend that we do not do that, simply because price competition is essential.

**Senator COLBECK**—What is your understanding of the capacity of the local construction industry at the moment to undertake the project?

**Mr Root**—The industry in Canberra is very busy. We are encouraged by the fact that a number of the local contractors have already informally expressed an interest

**Senator COLBECK**—Do you see that as a factor that might impact on your costs?

**Mr Root**—We do. It may impact on the costs. We have discussed that with our quantity surveyors in the reassessment of the costs in the last few weeks. We have taken that into account and we believe the costs reflect the current market position.

**Senator FERGUSON**—I apologise for not being here earlier. I have read the submission. I do not know what questions have been asked so I will leave my questioning.

**Senator FORSHAW**—Similarly, I regret not being able to be here earlier and not being able to do the inspection.

**Mr WAKELIN**—I should have mentioned this earlier. I was going to offer a comment on the travelling exhibition on the peacekeepers. You would recall what a magnificent effort it was and how much it was appreciated. Therefore I have a supplementary question. Given that I think you said that 45 per cent of your visitors—or a figure like that—have some direct connection, what is the anticipated response? This peacekeeper dimension is important. I remember that the exhibition, which would travel all over Australia, I would expect, is very significant. You reminded me of it. You mentioned the criticism about your not having it. What might you expect—and if you did not get it you would be disappointed—in terms of the take-up in a couple of years time? It was a very significant exhibition and I compliment you on it.

**Major Gen. Gower**—Thank you very much for the compliment. We undertook that travelling exhibition because we felt quite keenly that there was a significant sector of veterans whose service seemingly, for all intents and purposes, had been ignored. We were hopeful that we would get funding. We have, and now we are embarking on the stage of recognising that service permanently. I believe there will be a lot of interest in this gallery. It is said that 110,000 people were involved in the Second World War and the various commitments overseas, and there is all their next of kin. I think there will be an increase in visitation. It is very hard to predict that.

**Mr WAKELIN**—The role of women, too, was very prominent in the exhibition, which is something that I was not used to. That was something that was quite appreciated by many people at the functions that I attended. I offer that comment.

**Major Gen. Gower**—Thank you.

**CHAIR**—I have one more question. At paragraph 161 of the submission you list the authorities consulted, and the list is quite extensive, but there is no reference to the Australian Greenhouse Office. Given the government's commitment to ensuring that all buildings minimise energy use to minimise greenhouse gas and to ensure that buildings are ecologically sustainable in their design, do you plan to consult with the Australian Greenhouse Office to ensure that you are minimising energy use?

**Major Gen. Gower**—I see no reason not to, but I will take advice on that.

**Mr Root**—I think we could commit to that.

**Major Gen. Gower**—We would be happy to do so, of course.

**CHAIR**—As there are no further questions, thank you very much.

**Major Gen. Gower**—Thank you for this opportunity to present this project to you and your committee.

[11.44 a.m.]

**BROUGHTON, Ms Natalie, Senior Planner, National Capital Authority**

**HUDA, Mr Shamsul, Principal Planner, National Capital Authority**

**CHAIR**—Welcome. The committee has received a submission from the National Capital Authority. The submission will be made available in a volume of submissions for the inquiry and is also available on the committee's web site. Does the authority wish to propose any amendment to its submission?

**Mr Huda**—Yes. I would like to make two minor corrections. One is on page 2 of our submission, under point 3, 'Section 12(1)(g)' should read 'Section 12(1)(b)'. The other is on the same page. In the first paragraph of 3.1, 'National Land Use' should read 'National Use'.

**CHAIR**—I now invite you to give a brief opening statement and then we will proceed to questions.

**Mr Huda**—The National Capital Planning Authority was established in 1989 as part of the introduction of self-government to the ACT and with the view to securing the federal government's continuing interest in the planning and development of Canberra as the national capital. One of the functions of the authority is to prepare a National Capital Plan and administer it. A plan was prepared and approved in 1990. The act requires the authority to deal with works approval in designated areas. As part of our consideration of such works we need to make sure that they are consistent with the provisions of the National Capital Plan. The War Memorial site is within a designated area and therefore the East Building works would require the authority's approval.

From a land management point of view, section 27 of the Australian Capital Territory (Planning and Land Management) Act 1988 allows the Commonwealth to declare land that is required for its use. The War Memorial site is national land for that purpose. Under section 4(1) of the National Land Ordinance 1989, the land management responsibility for that land rests with the National Capital Authority. A memorandum of understanding signed between the authority and the War Memorial in November 1998 thoroughly sets out the relationship between the War Memorial and the authority with respect to planning and land management functions.

One of the points to note is that the War Memorial and its surrounds is entered on the Commonwealth Heritage List and it is also on the Register of the National Estate. The National Capital Plan requires the authority as part of its consideration of any application for works approval to give due protection to any natural or cultural heritage places registered in the ACT.

The authority prepared a site master plan for the War Memorial in 1993, which was later updated in 1999. That update was done based on a conservation management plan that I understand was prepared in 1997. The authority and the former Australian Heritage Commission has had several discussions with the War Memorial over the last two years on this particular project. All the comments that we have made are essentially comments that have been provided

both by the authority and those that were given to us by the Australian Heritage Commission. We basically passed it on to them for their consideration.

Of the list of issues that we have identified, a lot of the matters that we have raised with the Australian War Memorial have been addressed. Those are the first dot points in our submission on page 4. The outstanding matters are more to do with additional information that we have actually requested or we need to have as part of the ongoing design development which they will be undertaking in the subsequent months. We believe that we should be able to thoroughly address all those issues to everybody's satisfaction. With that I will now leave it open to questions.

**Mr BRENDAN O'CONNOR**—What process is in train to resolve those outstanding matters?

**Mr Huda**—We hope to have further discussions on those issues. We have written to the War Memorial—I think the last letter we wrote was on 13 December 2002. So it is basically for the War Memorial to come back to us to respond to some of those issues. The matters that we have said have been addressed are those based on their submission as part of the Public Works Committee inquiry. The conclusions that we have drawn that these issues have been addressed have been based on what we have seen in the submission. We are yet to have further discussions with the War Memorial on those outstanding matters.

**Mr BRENDAN O'CONNOR**—Would it be right to say that most of those matters that were of concern to you have been resolved?

**Mr Huda**—I would say so, yes.

**ACTING CHAIR (Senator Ferguson)**—Unfortunately, I have been on this committee long enough to remember a discussion and debate over the roof of Anzac Hall. I noticed in the national Heritage Commission's submission that they still say that they would prefer that the new building has a metal deck to match the colour of Anzac Hall. I can see from your own submission that you have suggested that you do not agree with that proposition. In fact, you say that it is much more feasible to have a roof fabric in keeping with the quality of the building. Is this an issue that has been settled? Are the Heritage Commission quite happy to go along with the fact that we decided back some years ago that the copper roof was not the way to go, partly because of cost and partly because of aesthetics?

**Mr Huda**—When we were getting comments from the Australian Heritage Commission, that was under what we used to call a section 30 referral, which was under the previous legislation, and the authority would have to then make a decision based on the advice that we used to receive. With the new Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 that has come in, the obligation comes on the part of the proponent to address environmental issues, including heritage, directly with the Department of the Environment and Heritage. As I understand it, the War Memorial are about to put in a submission or have put in a submission to cover the heritage aspects. The quality of the roof material was one of the things that was raised by the former Australian Heritage Commission. I will have to wait to see the outcome of that referral to the Department of the Environment and Heritage before we can say whether that issue has been resolved or not.

**ACTING CHAIR**—Is it fair for you as the National Capital Authority to say that you do not mind either way?

**Mr Huda**—We would be very happy to look at alternative options.

**Senator COLBECK**—I would like to explore that a bit further. There is concern about the fabric and consideration of a higher quality fabric and yet the submission from the War Memorial states that what is being proposed corresponds to the design of the Colorbond roofing in the administration building and Anzac Hall. How does that reflect the concerns that are being expressed now?

**Mr Huda**—Are you talking about the material of the roof?

**Senator COLBECK**—Yes.

**Mr Huda**—Normally, the approval of works is a negotiated outcome as opposed to very fixed policy parameters that itemise what materials are acceptable or not. We would like to see a very high quality material not only for the building fabric but also for the building's roof and everything. Often—especially in this particular case—we are to a large extent guided by the fact that the War Memorial is a heritage listed building and there are therefore heritage considerations on top of the requirement for the development to be of high quality and obviously materials conducive to that. If you put the heritage requirement, the advice that we have received from the Heritage Commission, which suggests that they would prefer to see a copper roof, and our requirement that the materials have to be of high quality together, there has to be a middle ground where we would say, 'That particular proposal is probably the best compromise or the optimum outcome that you can achieve.' But that discussion would still have to happen with the heritage people and the War Memorial before we can come to a decision about what material we would allow.

**Senator COLBECK**—It is obviously an argument that has been had at least twice before already. I want to go on to the continuous mesh cover around the perimeter. Could you enlighten us as to your concerns with respect to this?

**Mr Huda**—It was not so much a concern. It was more that we wanted to see the details of how it was going to work and all that. So we did not have that level of information. It was asking for that information so that we can form a view. But, listening to what I have heard today, I think that should not be an issue. It is just a matter of getting the information.

[11.55 a.m.]

**GOWER, Major General Steve, AO (Rtd), Director, Australian War Memorial**

**NORTHEY, Ms Vicki Anne, Head of Gallery Development, Australian War Memorial**

**MARSHALL, Mr Barrington Charles, Director, Denton Corker Marshall Pty Ltd**

**ROOT, Mr Peter Kenneth, Consultant Project Manager, Root Projects Australia**

**PRATT, Mr Malcolm William, Associate, WT Partnership**

**ACTING CHAIR (Senator Forshaw)**—Welcome back. Was there anything arising out of the comments and submission of the National Capital Authority that you would like to respond to?

**Major Gen. Gower**—I was very heartened by the comment that the representative from the National Capital Authority believed that these issues could be resolved through discussion and negotiation. We would certainly hope that would be the case. The Head of Gallery Development, Ms Northey, may have some points of detail which I invite her to address—if indeed there are any.

**Ms Northey**—No—certainly as we have been proceeding through the design development. We also put the project on hold for a period while we were waiting to secure the funds necessary. So the design had developed up to a certain part, and that it is where that final discussion came with the NCA. So we began work again, and moved on. We are now ready to provide that information that they are looking for. This information has been prepared anyway, for the formal works approval on the building before we can actually start construction. So the details of materials, which we now have—and with the resolution of services on the roof et cetera—and the landscaping, in particular, are all areas that we can resolve in the next six weeks. Because of the expertise of our architects and the consultants involved, and through our previous experience with the NCA, we do not see any issues that would be concerns going to formal works approval.

**ACTING CHAIR**—Thank you. We note for the record that there will be further discussions and consultations going on with the National Capital Authority and, hopefully, all those issues can be satisfactorily resolved. I thank all of the witnesses who have appeared before the committee today and those people who assisted the inspections and the private briefing this morning. I apologise again for those members of the committee, including me and Senator Ferguson—and perhaps others—who were unable to make the inspections because of the extended sittings of the Senate, and particularly of the House of Representatives today.

Resolved (on motion by **Senator Colbeck**, seconded by **Senator Forshaw**):

That, pursuant to the power conferred by section 2(2) of the Parliamentary Papers Act 1908, this committee authorises publication of the evidence given before it and submissions presented at public hearing this day.

**Committee adjourned at 11.59 a.m.**

---