

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Kristine Klugman [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, 8 April 2021 10:22 AM  
**To:** Works Approval Consultation  
**Subject:** War Memorial redevelopment

**Categories:** Orange category, Green category

I am writing as a resident of Canberra to express my opposition to the early works proposed at the War Memorial.

I believe that the early works should be immediately stopped, that any further redevelopment must involve thorough community consultation, and the preservation of the ancient eucalypts that surround the area should be prioritised.

I also believe the NCA should release a response to all submissions it receives on this issue.

Thank you for your attention to my position.

Dr Kristine Klugman OAM  
[REDACTED]

[www.cla.asn.au](http://www.cla.asn.au)

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Info  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 27 April 2021 10:21 AM  
**To:** Works Approval Consultation  
**Subject:** FW: Objection to AWM redevelopment [SEC=OFFICIAL]

**Categories:** Green category, Orange category

**OFFICIAL**

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



---

**From:** Kristine Klugman [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, 26 April 2021 9:43 AM  
**To:** Info <info@nca.gov.au>  
**Subject:** Objection to AWM redevelopment

I write to object in the strongest terms about the proposal to redevelop the AWM.

At a time when veterans are being so poorly treated by the DVA, and suicide rates continue to rise, the cost of \$498m on this project is a scandalous waste of money.

Please consider this decision very carefully, in light of the objections of many people in the community. Show some courage against the militarist elements behind this extravagance.

Yours sincerely

Dr Kristine Klugman OAM  
[REDACTED]



[www.cla.asn.au](http://www.cla.asn.au)

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Barbara O'Dwyer [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, 30 April 2021 2:57 PM  
**To:** Works Approval Consultation  
**Subject:** FW: Submission on War Memorial redevelopment

**Categories:** Green category, Orange category

Resending

---

**From:** Barbara O'Dwyer [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, April 30, 2021 2:17 PM  
**To:** 'WAconsultation@nca.gov.au' <WAconsultation@nca.gov.au>  
**Subject:** Submission on War Memorial redevelopment

#### WAR MEMORIAL REDEVELOPMENT

I am deeply opposed to the redevelopment of the War Memorial, not just as a Canberra resident but as one who reflects the views of many people across Australia. I belong to a number of women's organisations who all oppose the redevelopment. A number of my relatives fought in World War II and one served in the Army in recent times as a Chaplain for 10 years. So I am deeply concerned about the type of redevelopment being proposed and that it does not seem to be consistent with the original intention of the War Memorial.

I know that we can only appeal to you to stop the early works on environmental grounds and I do implore you to do so, at the very least so that we don't lose the large number of mature eucalypts that currently surround it and which imbue it with a feeling of peace and serenity. And did we not lose enough trees throughout the country during the bushfires? And why demolish Anzac Hall – an award winning building less than 20 years old.

So I appeal to you on broader grounds and hope that they will strike a cord with you. Australia has become an increasingly militarized nation with expanding military expenditure; the policy that we become one of the world's top 10 armaments manufacturers; funding by armaments manufacturers, not just of the War Memorial, but of public think tanks and University research institutes; and the greater use of the military during domestic emergencies rather than the development of a civilian capacity to deal with them.

It seems that militarisation is becoming accepted as normal. And now the War Memorial – something that was supposed to commemorate those who died fighting wars – will be contributing to this normalization with the display of large scale military hardware adding not so much to the glorification of war but to its glamorization.

The War Memorial is visited, at some stage, by almost all visitors to Canberra, including tens of thousands of school children over the years. Should we not have a Memorial that demonstrates that Australia is a peaceful nation with the desire to settle conflicts by peaceful means; that we strive not to have any more of our citizens die for our peace and security but that we have a Memorial that induces a sense of peace, in particular that it is enhanced by the natural environment that surrounds it.

Let us commemorate those who have died by preserving the existing trees and not with militaristic displays of hardware designed to kill people and destroy environments.

I urge you to reject the application for approval for the redevelopment of the War Memorial and stop the early works occurring, particularly before the public has been properly heard on this. I hope you will also make all submissions you receive publicly available.

With my very best wishes

Barbara O'Dwyer



[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Karis Muller [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, 8 April 2021 12:01 PM  
**To:** Works Approval Consultation  
**Subject:** Stop the War Memorial redevelopment

**Categories:** Orange category, Green category

I am writing as a resident of Canberra to oppose the wasteful and pointless works planned without consultation for the War Memorial. Better to pay more nurses and age care workers rather than grandiose posturing by glorifiers of other people's wars.

Also stop destroying trees for this idiotic expansion. Hold a referendum or arrange public meetings , let the people speak not developers or martinets.

Sent from my iPhone

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Shane Carmody [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, 30 April 2021 7:59 AM  
**To:** Works Approval Consultation  
**Subject:** Australian War Memorial Redevelopment

**Categories:** Green category, Orange category

I am writing to lodge my formal a objection to the proposed redevelopment of the Australian War Memorial (AWM).

It is my view that the AWM redevelopment is too large for the site.

Notwithstanding the extension/redevelopment is allegedly due to Australia's longest war, we live in an age of modern media where Australia's longest war was actually more visible to the general community through the period of its conduct, than any other war. Therefore, super large exhibition space to commemorate every aspect is not required. The risk here is to over commemorate one aspect of Australia's military history.

My second ground is that Anzac Hall has previously received awards for its innovative design and should remain. It is architectural vandalism to tear it down.

My third and final ground is that I object to the damage to the tree scape and natural setting within which the AWM rests.

Regards  
Shane Carmody

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Patrick Gourley [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, 15 April 2021 4:04 PM  
**To:** Works Approval Consultation  
**Subject:** FW: THE AWM

**Categories:** Orange category, Green category

Thank you for sending me an email about the “early works” application for the extensions to the Australian War Memorial.

I would like to make a couple of brief comments.

While noting that the need for the expansion is not now a matter for the NCA to consider, the rationale for it is relevant to heritage considerations affecting the status of Canberra as the National Capital, especially in the longer term. These considerations are, of course, central to the NCA’s responsibilities.

Both the previous and current Director of the War Memorial have justified the extensions on basis that those killed on active service “can have their stories told” (Nelson). Mr Anderson is also recently reported as saying that “the expansion’s purpose is to recognise the service of veterans from more recent wars.” Both Directors have offered variations on these themes over recent years but the basic message is the same. Unfortunately their arguments are not consistent with the functions of the War Memorial as set out in section 5 of the Australian War Memorial Act which, in summary, are to:

- provide a memorial to those who have died while on “active service”
- maintain a collection of historical material and exhibit it
- conduct research on military history
- disseminate information, and
- make the most advantageous use of the Memorial’s collection.

There is nothing in the Memorial’s legislated functions requiring the stories of those killed on active service to be told although meeting those functions obviously can involve a degree of story-telling. That is, to claim that the Memorial exists to have “stories told” is an inversion of its role and responsibilities. Certainly Mr Anderson’s claim that “the expansion’s purpose is to recognise the service of veterans from more recent wars” is unambiguously outside the War Memorial’s remit as specified in its enabling Act.

The main point is that in twisting the functions of the Memorial to justify the current extension, its proponents are, in a none too subtle way, misrepresenting and seeking to change the nature of the institution from a memorial to a museum, as has been observed by a former Chief of the Defence Force. That is to say, it is being changed from being primarily “an...institution...established in memory of a person or event” into a “building used for storing and exhibiting objects of historical, scientific or cultural interest”, to use the Oxford English Reference Dictionary definitions. Institutions of memory and buildings to store and exhibit objects can co-exist however institutions of memory will be degraded when their primary purpose becomes one of storage and exhibition.

Obviously the Australian War Memorial has been an important support to the status of Canberra as the National Capital. In slowly changing it into a museum, its heritage contribution as a memorial to the status of Canberra will be reduced and that reduction will grow over time. That is to say, if the rationale for the current extensions were to be maintained requiring all military



service somehow to be represented, the size of the War Memorial would likely need constant extension and the heritage value of the present site would be likely to be abominated. Certainly the current Director's reported argument that "If we're doubling the space available to tell stories, we're doubling the heritage value of the building..." is preposterous.

As indicated, it is appreciate that the need for the AWM extensions is not now a matter for the NCA to consider. The consequences of those extensions for the position of Canberra as the National Capital are, however, very much matters the Authority should take into account in examining the "early works" application. At a minimum, it is suggested that the NCA should delay approval of the current application until a comprehensive proposal dealing with the extensions in their entirety is available so that it will be better able to assess the wider heritage implications of what is involved. Taking these applications in relatively small segments makes it difficult for the NCA properly to meet its responsibilities and may well back the Authority into a position from which in its progressive consideration of the extensions it will not be able to retreat no matter how much it may want to do so.

Thank you.

Patrick Gourley

## Submission to the National Capital Authority Consultation

re:

### **“Early Works” Proposal Submitted on behalf of the Australian War Memorial for NCA Consideration**

#### **1. In Summary**

**The NCA should not consider this deeply troubling “Salami-Sliced Trojan-Horse-style” approach by the AWM, separately from and in advance of the receipt by the NCA of the full Works Approval Applications from the Memorial.**

#### **2. Background**

I am making this Submission as a deeply concerned citizen who (along with a most others in the ACT community and across the country) has been wholly and vehemently opposed to this deeply flawed and utterly inappropriate proposal to partly demolish and unsuitably reconstruct the Australian War Memorial, from the point at which this proposal first took on any sort of tangible form and on through its extended piecemeal iteration down to the present ante-penultimate point.

My views have been shaped not only by being a visitor to the Memorial over the years, but also an understanding gained through a period of attachment to the Memorial’s staff in the 1990s as a member of a team conducting an extensive and wide-ranging review of the range of visitor services provided, including extensive public consultations as to the experience, expectations and responses of its then visitor “populations” and extensive interaction with the Memorial’s wide-ranging expert team of deeply committed people.

Hence, I have followed all aspects of this present process continuously and closely: and have contributed a personal submission both to (a) the Public Works Committee consultation on the outline AWM proposal, and to (b) the overlapping consultation process to evaluate its detrimental Heritage Impacts.

Having read all the unprecedented numbers of submissions to each of those inquiry processes - the vastly majority of those being in total opposition to the Memorial’s proposals - and the paucity of any convincing level of support for the AWM’s intentions - it strikes me as incredible that the AWM’s deeply flawed and totally counter-productive proposal is somehow still in being, and still in serious contention.

Be that as it may, my purpose at this point, having worked in detail through the so-called “Early Works Proposal” is to oppose most strongly the NCA considering this so-called “early works” proposal separately from and in advance of the receipt by the NCA of the full Works Approval Applications from the Memorial.

#### **I take this position because:**

- The proposal that has been lodged with the NCS goes way beyond what could be considered as in any way no more than ancillary or incidental preparatory housekeeping – in fact it embodies the major critical core elements and enabling components of the entire project as envisaged.
- Thus, should the NCA give approval to this submission separately, acceding to the subterfuge of these elements being put forward under the misleading cloak of “early works” - then this would make the NCA’s consideration of the rest of the project in May or June, virtually redundant and essentially pre-determined.
- The real, devious intended purpose of this “early works” approach is to anticipate and pre-empt that fuller later approval process by the NCA, and to ensure that by this means the die will have been cast irrevocably and the rest must then inexorably follow as they intend.
- The demolition of ANZAC Hall is essential to and inseparable from the achievement of the entire project purpose – and indeed its achievement fundamentally depends upon it happening. Accordingly, the intended demolition belongs with, and should only be considered with, that total package as a complete entity.

- Consequently, it cannot reasonably or appropriately be “hurried through” in the guise of incidental “early work”. The destruction of ANZAC Hall has always been, and actively continues to be, probably the most controversial and contested element of the whole project; fiercely resisted and opposed by all key expert stakeholder groups.
- The Preliminary Arborial Assessment shows at least 65 trees at the Memorial as “likely to be removed”. Most or all of these are in “good” or “very good” condition; and the list includes some massive eucalypts at the front of the Memorial building. It is also unclear how many other trees may also be felled in the process. Whether the total number to be arbitrarily destroyed is 65 or goes beyond that staggering number, it is wanton vandalism of the site at a scale that would brutally denude and negatively change the appearance of the Memorial for many decades to come. Something with such stark ongoing and long-term consequences for the site surely cannot be brushed over as an “early work”.
- With similar major and extensive detrimental consequences, the proposed “early work” items also include a massive excavation from the existing southern entrance and extending across the Parade Ground. A vast excavation of this magnitude would fundamentally change the look of the Memorial; as such it surely cannot possibly be considered as an incidental “early work”.
- Seeking thus disingenuously to trivialise as “early work” the destruction of the award-winning and architecturally significant Anzac Hall, the destruction of scores of healthy trees which shape the heritage values of the site, and a massively disfiguring excavation of the main-axis view of this heritage-significant site, is nothing more than an abuse of process.
- This “early works” proposal is therefore inherently a cynical, dissembling and duplicitous charade – a travesty and as such a calculated insult to and denigration of both the NCA and of the Parliament which established that important regulatory body.
- Thus, should these proposed “early works” prevail, that result will inevitably cause reputational and credibility damage to the NCA commensurate with the permanent damage to the heritage-listed Memorial and its surrounds.
- In essence, then, the Memorial is seeking to cozen the NCA to indulge its “salami-slicing” gambit; by approving supposedly “early works” that are in reality of such critical weight and importance in the AWM’s greater plan as to swing the entire balance in ways that will make it subsequently impossible for NCA not to approve the whole plan when that time comes.
- If the NCA is to avoid being thus invidiously out-manoeuvred and neutralised by means of this pre-emptive gambit move by the Memorial, then it is essential that the NCA shall now defer consideration of these somewhat duplicitous “early work” elements until it has received the Works Approval applications from the Memorial in respect of the balance of the project as an entire integrated package.

Thank you for the opportunity to present these perspectives, issues and their implications, for your consideration.

Yours sincerely

Rupert Macgregor



23 March 2021

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Marjory Kobold [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 28 April 2021 9:48 PM  
**To:** Works Approval Consultation  
**Subject:** We do NOT support the proposed expansion of the Australian War Memorial

**Categories:** Green category, Orange category

Peter and Marjory Kobold of [REDACTED] do not support the proposed expansion of the AWM. We and our family do not believe that the proposed expansion to showcase military hardware is consistent with the AWM's chief purpose - to remember the fallen and reflect on the griefs of war and the terrible waste of lives (and resources).

The function of AWM will become more like a museum of weaponry than a place for deep, quiet reflection in line with its original purpose, remembering our lost.

We love seeing the names of our grandfather, uncles, father and cousins recorded respectfully and their efforts in the field explained.

The "early works" involving destruction of the beautiful Anzac Hall, wrecking the AWM's current simple front, and removing many significant old trees is NOT in line with the simplicity, spirit and historical social values of the original purpose of respect and honour.

Please maintain the symbolic traditional remembrance and reflection values of our AWM by NOT approving these 'early works' or the proposed expansions.

Marjory and Peter Kobold  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Susan Robertson [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 28 April 2021 3:55 PM  
**To:** Works Approval Consultation  
**Subject:** War Memorial plans

**Categories:** Green category, Orange category

To the War Memorial planners,

I would like you to know how completely opposed I am to the current designs to the expansion to the War Memorial. My particular anger is about the planned destruction of so many trees there. Those trees are an essential habitat for many many birds, animals and insects in that area. They form a vital part of the War Memorial landscape. The War Memorial should be a place of quiet contemplation not a demonstration of planes and other weapons of war. It is also very sad that you are considering destroying the beautiful and perfectly functional Anzac Hall.

Please make some very basic changes to your plans. The money could be so much better spent in helping veterans with the problems they may be having in civilian life.

I remain,  
Yours sincerely,  
Susan Robertson

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, 29 April 2021 2:30 PM  
**To:** Works Approval Consultation  
**Subject:** Fwd: AWM

**Categories:** Green category, Orange category

Please accept this submission. Your address sounds more specific than the one to which I initially sent it. See below,

Renée

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** <[REDACTED]>  
**Date:** 26 April 2021 at 8:04:57 pm AEST  
**To:** [info@nca.gov.au](mailto:info@nca.gov.au)  
**Subject:** AWM

**Subject: AWM**

We wish to complain about the wanton destruction of 100 trees in front of the AWM. Particularly when Australia is so far behind the rest of the world concerning environmental matters.

We also wish to state our total disapproval of the shameful waste of money this project is to spend. Half a billion dollars could be spent so much better on

1. Helping the many war veterans suffering from PTSD.
2. The many homeless veterans housing.
3. Creating more housing for the hundreds made homeless by the many catastrophes from which veterans and other innocent victims suffer.

Please heed our comments and stop this senseless act.  
Sincerely,

Renée Goossens  
John Painter

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Richard Barnes [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, 24 April 2021 4:08 PM  
**To:** Works Approval Consultation  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Early works approval for AWM

**Categories:** Green category, Orange category

Dear NCA,

I write as a concerned citizen to oppose the proposed "early works" at the Australian War Memorial. The "early works" would include the removal of more than 100 mature trees, many of them beautiful eucalypts; and the demolition of the award-winning ANZAC Hall. To state the obvious, such works would be irreversible, making a careful formal assessment by the NCA, of the proposed AWM redevelopment, irrelevant.

The AWM is one of the nation's most precious places. It seems to me that we would all agree that any proposed change to it requires the most careful consideration. To act in haste may mean to repent at leisure. I urge the NCA to refuse permission for these "early works".

Yours sincerely and anxiously,

Dr Richard K Barnes  
[REDACTED]



**From:** WorksApproval  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 30 March 2021 8:07 AM  
**To:** Works Approval Consultation  
**Subject:** FW: Proposed demolition of Anzac Hall at the War Memorial in Canberra [SEC=OFFICIAL]

**Categories:** Orange category, Green category

---

**From:** Info <info@nca.gov.au>  
**Sent:** Monday, 29 March 2021 9:08 AM  
**To:** WorksApproval <WorksApproval@nca.gov.au>  
**Subject:** FW: Proposed demolition of Anzac Hall at the War Memorial in Canberra [SEC=OFFICIAL]

**OFFICIAL**

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



---

**From:** Elizabeth Shearman <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Sunday, 28 March 2021 11:48 AM  
**To:** Info <info@nca.gov.au>  
**Subject:** Proposed demolition of Anzac Hall at the War Memorial in Canberra

Spending \$500 million to demolish and redevelop this award-winning, architecturally significant building less than 20 years old is appalling.

No proper consultation. No exploration of more sustainable options for expansion. No consideration of the needs of military veterans which are continuing to be underfunded.

The Australian War Memorial is one of the most important monuments in this country.

Consult experts such as the Australian Institute of Architects and those in the veteran community who have strong views concerning this proposal.

The current situation is totally unacceptable.

Elizabeth Shearman

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Info  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 14 April 2021 3:07 PM  
**To:** Works Approval Consultation  
**Subject:** FW: Proposed destruction of 80 year old trees on War Memorial site [SEC=OFFICIAL]

**Categories:** Orange category, Green category

**OFFICIAL**

**OFFICIAL**

**From:** Elizabeth Shearman [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 14 April 2021 2:51 PM

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**To:** Info <info@nca.gov.au>  
**Subject:** Proposed destruction of 80 year old trees on War Memorial site

Further to my last letter - to destroy the healthy and significant trees planted 80 years ago on the War Memorial site is an extension of the shocking and unnecessary destruction of the existing and award winning building.

The whole project is a waste of money and this \$500 million would be better spent on assisting military personnel and veterans.

Elizabeth Shearman

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Elizabeth Shearman [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, 30 April 2021 8:12 AM  
**To:** Works Approval Consultation  
**Subject:** Anzac Hall and 80 year old trees removal

**Categories:** Green category, Orange category

Further to my last two emails regarding the destruction of Anzac Hall and the 80 year old trees - there has not been proper public consultation on this matter and you have no right to destroy these icons without the public being fully briefed and agreeing to your proposal. From the evidence broadcast by the ABC Canberra today, two thirds of the population disapprove of this appalling destruction. Your organisation needs to consult and listen and act on public opinion.

Elizabeth Shearman  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]