



**Australian Government**  
**National Capital Authority**

National Capital Authority

# Public Forum

29 April 2010

---

## **FILE DETAILS**

*Audio Length:* 198 minutes

*Audio Quality:* Good

*Number of Facilitators:* One

*Number of Interviewees:* Several

*Other Comments:*

---

## **START OF TRANSCRIPT**

Lynne Duckham: So, I'd like to begin first of all by saying welcome and thank you for coming out to the second National Capital Authority public forum. My name is Lynne, Lynne Duckham, and I have been asked to be your moderator for this evening. So, again, welcome.

Before we begin, a little bit of housekeeping in addition to having the hearing loops in those four rows, the foyer through which you came, straight back out and straight ahead into the corridor on the left are the ladies and gents. Should there be an emergency in the War Memorial this evening, we will have - a warden will come and take us in an orderly manner out through the exits.

Of course, the other is please, if you haven't already done so, please check your phones and make sure they are either off or on silent just as a courtesy to everyone else in the room. Thank you.

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

So, again, welcome. This is an exchange of information evening and I'd like to begin by outlining the format and the agenda and a few basic rules of tonight's proceedings.

On the way in, did you all receive your booklet? The green and the blue? Is there anyone who hasn't got one? You haven't? There we go. Thank you.

Now, to begin, I've been asked to read a formal notice about the audiovisual recording of this event. A copy of this notice also appears inside the front cover of your information booklet and it says; the National Capital Authority is making an audiovisual recording of this public forum.

The intention is to record the comments made by all speakers, including questions and comments from the floor. This means that there is a possibility that your image or voice will be captured on the audiovisual recording.

The National Capital Authority intends to make a copy of this audiovisual recording available on its website and as DVD to parties with a clear and legitimate interest in the proceedings of the public forum. Anyone wishing to view a copy will be able to do so by access the website or requesting a copy by the DVD. A written transcript will also be prepared and we expect that recording and transcript will be available within two weeks.

Now, to that end - and I will say this a couple of times - on each side of the theatre you can see there will be two runners with microphones and I do ask that you await a microphone before you speak when we get to that section. Thanks.

Now, from your programmes which everybody has indicated they have, you'll see that the basic format of the evening is that we start with a short opening statement from the chairman of the NCA. We'll then move into the first part of the agenda where we will deal with the topics raised by members of the community. The plan is then to take a short - and I mean short - break for tea or coffee around 7:40. After that we will move on to discussions about the NCA's Capital Works Program, revised consultation protocol and

the proposed process for the review of building height and the National Capital Open Space System. We are hoping to conclude the evening at 9:00pm.

Now I'm sure you'll agree, you know there's a huge range of topics that we're covering tonight and that we're discussing and I do thank you all for your contributions and your suggestions and we have a great deal to get through tonight. Therefore, when we do, I'm asking that people respect each other's points of view; everyone has the right to an opinion. Also, please be succinct and as short as possible when you're making your comment so that everyone gets the opportunity to ask their questions or make their comments.

For the sake of efficiency, I'll start the question and answer session on some of the bigger topics by naming the parties who registered to speak on that topic and outlining the range of issues that were raised that they registered for. Also on that note, I make an apology; if I actually don't say your name, it is simply because you registered later than the list I have. For that, I apologise. It in no way indicates that your registered concerns are any less important and I would ask that you do take the opportunity to make comment should you wish to.

Okay. I'll ask the NCA to speak on the issues and then I'll ask if any of the registered parties, as I say, wish to speak separately. Where there are registered questions of a complex or unique nature, I will go straight into inviting parties to speak from the floor, and there are a couple.

But before I move on any topic tonight, I will call for any other questions or comments on that topic whether registered or not. That gives you all an opportunity to have your say as long as you keep it short and to the point if at all possible, please.

So, I'd like to remind you that there are still the two roving mics that you'll see and I do ask that you wait for the microphone before speaking. I also ask that you introduce yourself before speaking so that that can also be recorded.

Now, the NCA panel members have confirmed that they are willing to take as many questions as you ask on any given topic. I will make this point now and I may need to make it again. If we actually get a lot of questions that are the same or if there is an extended discussion on a particular topic and we've already really well covered it, I might need to move things on. I apologise for that but, again, it's in the interests of getting everybody's comments and questions heard. Are we happy with that? I'll take that as a yes.

If there are any questions that arise to which the NCA cannot provide a comprehensive answer, then they have agreed to take them on notice and they do plan to publish both the question and their answered on a dedicated part of the website by Friday next week, okay?

As you know, this is an ongoing consultation and it will continue throughout the next 12 months. I've been asked to let you know that the next NCA public forum will be held late-April 2011. So if there are no questions about this evening's format, we will proceed.

So I would like to introduce you to the NCA panel. From - actually, my left, your left - we'll get it right in a minute - we have Authority Member Christine Storry, Authority Member Peter Core, Authority Member Shelley Penn, Chairman of the National Capital Authority, Professor Don Aitkin, Chief Executive, Gary Rake, Executive Director National Capital Estate, Alison Walker-Kaye, Executive Director Corporate and Promotions, Philip Wales and Executive Director National Capital Plan, Andrew Smith.

I would like to call on the Chairman of the National Capital Authority to make a brief opening statement; Professor Aitkin.

Don Aitkin:

Thank you, Lynne. I welcome you all to this second public forum from the NCA. When we met last time in November we wanted you to help shape this evening with your suggestions for topics and the first section tonight will deal with those topics.

You will have noted we have two new Authority members who sit on our board; Shelley Penn to my right and Christine further to my right - Christine Storry. Shelley Penn is an architect from Victoria who served her state as Associate Government Architect and has deep insight into urban design and the design needs of any large city, including this one. Christine Storry has a wide portfolio of experience in architecture and landscape and has studied the evolution of the national capital herself in her university work.

Peter Core, to my right, joined us in the middle of last year as did Gary Rake, our Chief Executive. Like me, the last three were present at the last forum.

Given that my own substantive appointment began only late last year, you will appreciate that we are a very new body. That helps to explain why we are approaching our task in a new way. This public engagement is part of that new approach, as is the consultation protocol that we will talk about later this evening.

But most of all, the new approach is a recognition that the national capital is not finished and decided. Yes, it has a new Parliament House. Yes, the lake is full and the refurbished ANZAC parade served its purpose again last Sunday and there is a thriving and productive city. There are those who see that as the end of the Burley Griffin story as though nothing further needs to be done, as though the parliament, the lake, and the national triangle are really what the national capital is; the rest is simply a large inland city.

But there is no reason to suppose that the City of Canberra will stop growing. If it did, that would be the strangest thing because over the last century it is cities that have been the centre of population growth in all countries and Australia has not been an exception. I lived in this city when it had 15,000 inhabitants. It has now more than 350,000; a vastly larger number than Walter Burley Griffin ever seemed to have in mind.

Australia's own population has grown steadily and shows no sign of slowing down, let alone it declining. If Australia grows to 35 million people, as has been suggested, Canberra will have about 600,000, even if it only grows as fast as the country itself. If

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

Australia reaches 50 million, then the population of the national capital, all things being equal, will be verging on a million.

I make this point to ask you to think about such a future and what it implies for the national capital. Because one great beauty of the national capital is that we usually are in a position to plan for the future. We do not, as every other established city has had to do sometimes, retrofit a badly needed contemporary structure or service onto an overcrowded and expensive urban setting.

Given that the overwhelming likelihood is that our national capital will continue to grow, what do we need to do now and in the near future to ensure that those who come after us are grateful for the foresight and planning that made their national capital as attractive and agreeable as we think ours is.

Let me make it clear that we in the NCA do not have all of the answers but we do think we've at least isolated some of the questions and they are there tonight also in the agenda. You will know that most of the easily developed land in the ACT has already been built on or is being developed right now. If Canberra is to have half a million people, let alone a million, where will they all live?

We have some long established principles that govern building in the ACT. One of them is the principle of open space as everyone's amenity. The second is that we don't build on hills and ridges and buffers because that would allow the built form to dominate and Canberra was designed from the beginning as a city in which there was to be a harmonious integration of the built and the national environments. A third one that follows from the second is that we don't build higher than a certain level above sea level.

We would like you to help us open up these principles for contemporary discussion so that we continue to build a beautiful national capital. I repeat; we do not have the answers but we know that we have to talk about our future and that means looking at what we have done and what we may need to do. The consultation we are thinking of in these areas will take

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

considerable time and tonight we will only start the process. It is a process that must include the ACT government. We think it is time to start so we are developing a 50-year forward look for the national capital, one that would be revised and extended every ten years. One that is built around the National Capital Plan. That will be one outcome of the consultation process.

So let us start the evening. Thank you, Lynne.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you, Professor Aitkin.

So the main part of the forum, now that we have an introduction to this, we begin with addressing the many received community nominated topics. These came within three broad categories; planning in the national capital, land management and NCA projects and we'll move through them in that order.

So the parties who have registered to speak, of whom I have their names, or ask a question on the planning in the national capital are Caroline Le Couteur, Anne Forrest, Robyn Cooper, Sascha Brodbeck, Joelle Bou-Jaoude, Josie Bou-Jaoude, Rosemary Willett, Peter Ottesen, Greg Mews, Benjamin Reid.

The range of issues they have identified include the current state and future of the Griffin Legacy, planning and civic, the roles or and working relationships between the NCA and ACTPLA, the NCA vision for Canberra, building and developing in Canberra, the issues surrounding the Brodburger caravan, sustainable transport and World War I and World War II memorials.

I will start by asking the NCA to address a couple of the bigger topics there and we'll go to the floor for additional questions. Perhaps members of the panel might like to speak on the future of the Griffin Legacy, the NCA and the ACTPLA interaction and the Brodburger caravan. Gary.

Gary Rake: Thanks, Lynne. I'll make a start and I'll touch quickly on those three issues in that order. The planning amendments that proceeded in 2006 going by the name Griffin Legacy are now incorporated in the plan; those amendments are complete. Some of that vision is already being built.

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

Female: Can you speak up a bit, please?

Gary Rake: Is that better?

Female: Yeah, it is.

Male: A bit more.

Gary Rake: How is that?

Female: That's good.

Gary Rake: Okay. So the Griffin Legacy amendments that proceeded in 2006 are complete and those are now reflected in the National Capital Plan. Some of that vision is already being built, in particular around City Hill.

One of the key projects that the NCA forecasts for 2010-2011 is to look at the intersection of Constitution Avenue and Anzac Parade. We've identified that if the Griffin Legacy vision is to be realised on Constitution Avenue, one of the key pressure points will be the traffic performance of that intersection.

We've commenced our planning based on the need to allow for future development. The project would take into account remediating the existing pavement which is failing badly. It will complete Stage 3 of the rehabilitation of Anzac Parade and all of this work would happen in a manner that allows for the future expected traffic needs and in a manner that is consistent with the eventual upgrade of Constitution Avenue.

In relation to the relationship between the NCA and ACTPLA, we work very closely with ACTPLA and we have a shared responsibility for the planning of the national capital. At the moment we are both still contributing to an intergovernmental committee that is looking at the planning arrangements in Canberra with a very clear view on trying to improve the operability of those arrangements, simplify them where possible, and make sure that we each understand clearly our roles.

On the matter of Brodburger, I might just give a little bit of background and then we can move to questions. The van was placed down in Bowen Park in late 2008 without reference to the

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

NCA and so it didn't seek or obtain the necessary works approval. When we became aware of it in 2009 we had two ways forward, I guess, at that point, having identified an unapproved structure. We could look to a hard line and straight away look for compliance action or look for a softer approach and try and find a solution.

We chose the latter. The suggestion that we've made recently to the owners of Brodburger is that we can find a way to provide temporary works approval for that facility. It would allow the business to keep operating in that location with the caravan but we would need it to be a temporary structure and that would mean coming and going with each day's trade.

We're still keen to try and find a solution and if there is another proposal that we should consider, we'd be very keen to hear it but the current works approval that we've provided does expire on 1 June. Would any other panel members like to add anything on those topics?

Lynne Duckham: Alright. Now I want to ask if any of the registered speakers - the registered parties - would like to actually ask a question or make a comment on the planning in the national capital and I would remind you, please, to take a microphone and to introduce yourself before you start speaking.

So do we have anyone from the floor who would like to make a comment on some of the things either said by Gary or these topics? Yes, up the back. Thank you. Then in the middle here, thank you.

Caroline Le Couteur: Thank you. I'm Caroline Le Couteur, one of the registered participants. I'm particularly interested in transport issues because clearly the area that the National Capital Authority controls being in the centre of Canberra is very central to Canberra's transport and I'd like to hear more about how you're going to make the transport more sustainable in Canberra.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you. Andrew?

Andrew Smith: I might ask that - answer that, sorry - Andrew Smith.

In terms of improving transport sustainability, we work pretty closely with RoadsACT and have a particularly strong relationship with Tony Gill who runs that office. I guess the Authority and the ACT Government are pretty much of the one view here; we support the gradual reduction of single motor vehicles being used as the primary form of commuter transport. We encourage the use of non-vehicle means of getting around such as buses, cycling, walking.

We, I guess, are strong advocates of reduction of car parking spaces to encourage people onto those alternative modes of transport. But Canberra is a very big city and without working closely with the ACT Government, I don't think either agency would be able to achieve full sustainable transport options.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you.

Gary Rake: I might just quickly add a couple of projects that we've got on our business plan to try and support that. There's a gap in the north-south on-road cycling facility and that is around State Circle. We've reached agreement with the ACT Government. State Circle is a road that we own and manage. We've reached agreement with the ACT Government that we'll add on-road cycling to State Circle within the next 12 months.

Within the parliamentary zone, we've identified that some of the bus stop facilities for people who are waiting for a bus are a bit inadequate; there are bus stops but they don't have seating or shelters and we will look to put those in, again, within the next 12 to 18 months.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you. Are any more comments from the panel? Thank you. There was the gentleman in the middle?

Sascha Brodbeck: Should I stand up, or...

Lynne Duckham: Thank you. Just identify yourself if you would.

Sascha Brodbeck: My name is Sascha Brodbeck, business owner and partner to Brodburger. With the support of the Canberra community I would like to present 6000 signatures and counting. Businesses such as ours should not be hindered, but helped in this growing state of

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

ours. These are original signatures I have with me but we will be making copies for the NCA in the next coming week.

Joelle Bou-Jaoude: In response to us moving every day, that would have been fine for an ice cream van or a coffee place, however, we have a huge caravan that we can't move every day. So you're saying that we can stay there during the day but we have to move after midnight and be back at six in the morning. How is us staying during the day complying with the regulations of us moving at night does not. I don't really understand the question - the actual solution itself.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you. Gary?

Gary Rake: We're really trying to find an easier test to pass in assessing compliance with the National Capital Plan. Permanent structures need to demonstrate an appropriate architectural standards; it's a black letter requirement of the National Capital Plan, meaning it's a strict requirement. As soon as we're able to clearly demonstrate that a structure is temporary, that it's moving, that it's not in place on the days that you're not trading, whether that's - because like all of us, you've tried to take a short break or if there is a quiet day of the week that you're not trading - if the structure is not there, it's clearly temporary. That's the flexibility that enables us to take a softer approach on it.

Joelle Bou-Jaoude: But our caravan is not actually designed to - it is mobile, we can tow it but we can't tow it on a regular basis. We need to sit down and have a chat about a different solution that is workable that we can both work through because moving it is not an option for us.

Gary Rake: If there is a solution available that enables that to give approval under the National Capital Plan, we're happy to see it. I do appreciate that you might not have had in mind a mobile business when you set up. The other important thing that we have said is, if that is the only solution and if you need time to make arrangements, we're very happy to allow a transition period and we're happy to be quite lengthy with that.

Joelle Bou-Jaoude: Can I just ask one more question? What actually requires NCA approval? Is it the actual caravan or what is it?

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

Gary Rake: It's a structure. Any structure, however defined.

Joelle Bou-Jaoude: Thank you.

Lynne Duckham: If you would pass the mic back, thank you. There's a gentleman over here. Thank you.

Female: Sorry, can I comment in relation to that?

Lynne Duckham: Just one moment. Thank you.

Keith Storry: My name is Keith Storry. From that information about the...

Male: Hold the mic up please, Keith.

Keith Storey: The issues about transportation in the city. I've raised this before in two or three submissions that I've made to the National Capital Authority previously and also at the Senate Roundtable Conference; that there appears to be - certainly the National Capital is not carrying out any traffic modelling but neither is the ACT government.

Now I find this quite extraordinary when, quite rightly, the [inaudible] is now taking an approach to look at the bigger pictures. But certainly, if we are considering that Canberra might double its population, it's very much dependent on the transportation. It's where you put the workplaces, where you put the roads and the different types of [inaudible] and do you or do you not have proper public transport.

Gary Rake: Do you want to talk about traffic modelling?

Andrew Smith: It's not correct to say the NCA isn't doing traffic modelling. Sorry, I'll bring this closer - we were told we didn't have to lean in to these. It's not correct to say the NCA isn't doing traffic modelling, nor is it correct to say the ACT government isn't doing traffic modelling. In terms of the overpass project that Mr Rake mentioned earlier, or Gary mentioned earlier, we undertook traffic modelling looking at three long term development scenarios in central Canberra. They were at half a million square metres additional office space and two million square metres of additional office space. As an aside, at two million square metres of office

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

space, we start to run out of people to actually occupy the buildings.

The ACT government are undertaking some detailed traffic modelling of the North Canberra precinct and they've also commissioned and well and truly - they may have in fact concluded an east-west traffic study which picks up the long term development scenarios through Canberra as far as any of us can see.

So much of that work is, of course, not in the public realm but it is certainly informing some of the capital works considerations by the ACT government and is certainly guiding our proposals for works over the coming five years. So we're well aware of the growing pressures on traffic management in central Canberra. They're complex issues and we're certainly - both the ACT government and ourselves - are actively pursuing that.

Keith Storey: What I'm talking about is strategic planning modelling and certainly I agree with every little building that has been put in, questions of traffic are looked at, but that is not what I call modelling.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you. Any other comments from the panel?

Gary Rake: No, I'll just take that as a comment. Thanks.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you. We have other registered speakers or those from the floor. Yes, there's a microphone. Yes?

Robyn Cooper: Robyn Cooper, Yarralumla Residents Association. My question comes out of the last forum where a statement was made that you were going to be asking Australians what they wanted their national capital to look like. My question is around how are you going to balance the rights of the residents of Canberra, particularly those living in the inner area, with future development. What kind of mechanisms will you have in place?

Gary Rake: I think the best example of that is the proposed review of the Open Space System and the building heights that we will talk about later in the evening but the short answer to how we engage and collect all of the views; we think that we should have a key stakeholder advisory group to help us run those reviews and that one of those -

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

there'll probably be five or seven people on there, a couple of independent experts and five representative stakeholders, one from the ACT government, one to represent local residents, one to represent other community special interests, for example heritage, one to represent business and industry and one to represent the professional bodies.

We'd be looking for those key stakeholder representatives to, I guess in place in placing their nomination, convince us that they can represent the broadest view. So rather than having the Canberra Business Council, the Chamber of Commerce and the Property Council perhaps competing to be the business or industry representative, we'd ask them to coordinate and nominate one person and then to make sure that they're free to talk to that wide constituent group.

We wouldn't ask those key stakeholders to maintain confidentiality about the workings of the group. They'd be free to go back and talk to their constituencies as much as they like so that we really get that broadest view, leverage it up and bring it in and help inform our decisions.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you. Any other questions from the floor? Yes?

Caroline Le Couteur: If I'm allowed a second, just continuing on the transport scene, two questions; parking in the Parliamentary Triangle and also Northbourne Avenue. As you'd be aware, that's an item of considerable discussion in Canberra at present. I noticed something that the NCA has planning control of. What are your views for the future of Northbourne Avenue?

Andrew Smith: I might take the second one first if I may. In terms of the development of Northbourne Avenue - I sort of mentioned before - we regularly have discussions with RoadsACT. There have been a couple of studies done previously and I understand from the media that there is likely to - RoadsACT are likely to look at that again. We've indicated in the past to RoadsACT that we would support a dedicated bus line. We've also indicated that we'd support a dedicated cycle lane.

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

Now I understand the study that is being proposed will look at the best way of dealing with both those issues to improve both public transport and cycling along Northbourne Avenue but also to improve traffic itself. I have no doubt that once - should - funding be provided for that study, that RoadsACT will come and talk to us in the very near - well, not long after the announcement.

We'd support an improvement to the traffic performance of the road as long as it doesn't severely or adversely impact the landscape qualities of the space.

The second question, of course, is parking.

Gary Rake: Nice try.

Andrew Smith: Yeah, nearly got away with it. That's sort of later on in the agenda but I can jump to that.

By way of background, the Authority in the middle of last year agreed to chair an intergovernmental committee on parking that looked at parking management in parks, the parliamentary zone in Barton and in Russell. That committee met in September/October for the first time last year and since then we have commissioned an audit to actually establish what the real circumstances are regarding parking in the study area.

That audit occurred from December through to about March of this year. We had a lot of trouble getting into basements of various buildings so it took a little bit longer than we'd hoped. We've received a draft report from the consultants who have done that audit and that is currently being considered by the members, various members of the IGC.

I'll just backtrack a bit. The membership of the committee is ourselves as the chair of the committee, from the Commonwealth Government we've got Prime Minister and Cabinet, Department of Finance and Deregulation, the Department of Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts - they're sort of an umbrella department there, picking up all the national cultural institutions - and also the Department of Defence and Attorney General's Department.

From the ACT government we have representatives of the ACT Planning and Land Authority - ACTPLA, Territories, and Municipal Services and we had representatives of the Chief Minister's Department but the ACT government has recently done a bit of a restructure so I suspect that those people are now part of Land and Property Services I think it's called.

As I said, we've done the audit and we're assessing that. Our next step is to actually develop a discussion paper to describe the circumstances and the findings of the car parking audit. That is, I guess, best described as a working draft at the moment. Once that is finalised and circulated in a group by all the IGC members, the discussion paper and the full results of the parking audit will be released to the public for input and discussion. That's where it's sitting at the moment.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you. Yes, up the back there please. Then the lady down here in pink. Aaron?

Eleri Harris: Eleri Harris from the *CityNews*. I just wanted to clarify something that Caroline just asked then about the Northbourne Avenue - you pointed to a study that you said hadn't been funded. Can you tell me a little bit more about this?

Andrew Smith: Look, I'm relying on what I hear on the radio and the *Canberra Times* [laughs]. I did see Tony on the TV looking a little bit embarrassed about the outcomes of the budget process that hadn't actually happened yet but, as I understand it, they're likely - RoadsACT are likely to get some funding to commission a new study about the best way of improving bus services, cycleways, and traffic movements along Northbourne Avenue. That's as far as I understand it. It's something we've discussed with them previously and we've given some in principle support to a couple of options that have been put on the table in times past.

Male: Detailed questions on that would have to go to the ACT government.

Don Aitkin: But I think we could say, and you'll all agree with this, that as we look at the future there are two things that are quite clear. First of

all parking is going to get harder and more expensive. That's almost being regarded by the ACT government as one of the levers to encourage people to use either two people to a car or four people to a car or for people to get out of cars into buses.

The reason for it is very straightforward; all the open air car parks progressively are going to be replaced by buildings and as they do you replace them with underground car parks which cost a very great deal of money to construct and they have to be paid for. This has happened in every other city in Australia and it is going to happen to us. That's number one.

Number two is that as the city increases in population, the economies of scale of using public transport get better and better and when we've got a million people you can expect light rail or maybe half a million people. This is one of the key significant strategic questions facing us all, both us and the ACT government, is when you start bring that in.

Because the infrastructure costs are very high and it operates at a terrible loss until it becomes part of the system. Once upon a time we used to indebt our children for that. So all the state railways of Australia were built in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century on promissory notes for the future. They were still being delivered in the 1930s and 1940s.

So we've got out of that habit of saying, oh, well let's just borrow a great deal of money and do it now and let the kids pay for it and the grandchildren. We don't do that anymore. These are the [permeates] in which both governments have to construct policy.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you. Did you want to say something?

Peter Core: Thanks, Lynne. I just wanted to go back to the question that Robyn raised from Yarralumla about the balance of interest between the residents of Canberra and the national agenda.

I think that it is virtually impossible to answer that question other than to say that if we, in the community and in the National Capital Authority, are open in their engagement through greater transparency and involvement through the processes of decision

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

making. I think we will come to a better point than historically we have done.

I think it requires, unfortunately, a lot of work by community people and an open willingness by the National Capital Authority and its staff to work jointly to come to these points of intersection between a broader national agenda and a very legitimate interest of people who have made Canberra their home.

In part, that is one of the reasons why the authority has put before Canberra residents here tonight an exposure draft of a new consultation protocol so that we can work jointly to finalise that and that can be a yardstick and our road map for working through the inevitable difficult issues and options that confront the National Capital Authority in its decision making responsibilities and the implications of that for the Canberra community. Thanks.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you, Peter. Thank you for clarifying that.

Shelley Penn: Sorry, Lynne, I just wanted to add to that as a - sorry, we were told to speak normally and it would project but - how's that? Is that okay?

As a relative outsider - I'm not a Canberran, and a relative newcomer, if not very much a newcomer - I just wanted to add to that observation and I guess, for me, what are the sort of great strengths of Canberra and the ACT are also the difficult bits; what makes it extraordinary are also the things that are probably the hardest, i.e. that it is relatively small, very local important place as a local town, if you like. At the same time it's the national capital. It's extraordinarily big in that way. In the same way, it's a landscape dominated environment - so strongly about landscape and yet it's a growing city as Don has pointed out.

Just because it is difficult I don't think we should therefore shy away but should confront that and I think, as Peter has talked about, it's about proper processes which are about engaging people and hearing what the community wants as well as engaging with the national issues and also having robust processes around what we mean by quality and how to ensure that

at every level, whether it's strategic planning - I agree that appropriate modelling is necessary - or whether it is architectural and landscape details.

So I think they're the challenges and therefore we shouldn't all just throw up our hands. That's what is actually unique about the place. So, for me, I see that as a very positive thing even though I don't think it's an easy thing to answer.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you, Shelley. Thank you for sharing that with us. Now, the lady in pink who has the microphone.

Jean Geue: Jean Geue speaking. I was going to say, we can't talk about transport problems in Canberra if we don't address the issue of light rail and then Don Aitkin did. But, he used the Saint Augustine - God give me light rail, but not yet.

I don't know if you know but there have been things about light rail in Canberra because there was a Peter Newman and something [Nosworthy], I think, about 20 years ago and Canberra at the crossroads and Paul [inaudible] says that our self contained cities and our central city are ideally suited to light rail and we should grasp it. We should get away from this business of having governments that are not in surplus - that are in surplus.

We have a government to do the things that we cannot do by ourselves so we should be putting the government into debt to do things like light rail and anyway, Save the Ridge calculated it would be cheaper to put light rail from Gungahlin to Civic than it would be to do the 9 km of the GDE. While we're at it, we should be putting employment out at Gungahlin to reduce the pressure on commuting in the cars because I've just seen in my retirement it's almost impossible to get out of the city when I want to get to Bungendore at nine o'clock.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you, Jean.

Jean Geue: Thank you.

Don Aitkin: I feel for you. I really do. I mean, I'm not trying to use the [unclear] God make me virtuous but not yet - I think was the original one or God make chaste but not yet I think it really was, he was young at

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

the time. Go and tell Kevin Rudd and Jon Stanhope this. It's no use telling us because we basically put up proposals to the Commonwealth Government to put money into this and that and the other.

Jean Geue: But you are in the middle of the situation.

Don Aitkin: No, no. None of us are elected members of the House of Representatives or the Senate and that's where the decision lies. You've got to understand that there's been a culture since the 1980s that we ought to be in budget surplus. I frankly don't agree with it but that's neither here nor there. I'm not an elected member. I don't run the Department of Finance or Treasury. When they decide that the betting on the future and borrowing against the future is the right thing for infrastructure [inaudible]. But we cannot do it as an NCA. That's a political economy question, not a National Capital question.

Lynne Duckham: Gary?

Gary Rake: I'm going to find Dr Henry parked across my car park tomorrow, aren't I?

Lynne Duckham: Gary, you didn't wish to say anything more? The lady down here, please. Thank you.

Rosemary Willett: On World War II memorial, it's a completely different matter. Before I speak about the World Work II memorial I've got a couple of questions to have clarified from the first meeting of the NCA from 2010. Do national memorials have separate guidelines or are they the same as those for commemorative works is one of the questions. If separate, have they also been revised? Are there provisions for public notice, security, and consultation? Then after you answer that I'd like to have a few words on the World War II memorial.

Andrew Smith: Okay. There's a few questions there so if I miss one, just remind me. In the first instance there are not separate guidelines in terms of the siting and design character between a commemorative work and a national memorial. The difference, I guess, in simple terms

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

comes to the process through which the design and the siting is endorsed.

A national memorial will be considered by the Canberra National Memorials Committee; the prime minister is the chair of that committee and basically there are a number of other parliamentarians - it's generally the leader of the government and the leader of the opposition in both houses, senior bureaucrats, our departmental secretary, most recently the secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs that's been on the committee.

They, the CNMC, will view both options for siting and in the design character for each memorial. That's the difference. In the case of the World War I and World War II memorial, the CNMC agreed both the siting and the design character for both of them and that proposal is now currently with the proponents who are seeking to raise additional funds and are also, I understand, looking to commence engagement with the Canberra community to better sort of ensure that the works are accepted by the community and better integrate with the existing users of the Rond Terraces.

Rosemary Willett: That public consultation is for both; just clarify that again?

Andrew Smith: Yes, look, I guess World War I and World War II are considered a set, it's not a separate memorial, they're both works and they'll be designed and constructed at the same time and the consultation for both memorials will occur at the same time.

Rosemary Willett: Right, well now specially the World War II...

Lynne Duckham: Rosemary, could you just hold it?

Rosemary Willett: Sorry, I'm not doing this very well.

Lynne Duckham: It's an ice-cream.

Rosemary Willett: Now specifically the World War II memorials. Now I consider the World War II memorial a threat hanging over the Australian War Memorial. There mightn't be any money for the World War II memorials - this is the memorials on the Rond Terrace, yes - and that may seem a comfort but that is not a good reason to abandon this proposal, just because of the money.

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

The good reason to abandon it is the bad effect it will have on our accustomed vista towards the Australian War Memorial. The existing vista has soul. The human presence is frail but felt in the lives of the soldier's [sacrificed/sacrifice]. The feelings engendered are respectful and reverential and empathetic to the tragedy and waste of war.

The emotion is heightened by the scale relationship of the memorial with a conical form of Mount Ainslie fully appreciated in the wide vista between the portal buildings. The proposed memorials photographed in the *Canberra Times* last year cut across the line from eloquence to propaganda. War is being oversold. The vertical monuments take over from the portal buildings as the marker of Anzac Parade reducing its visual width and our full appreciation of the conical form of Mount Ainslie.

Their scale relationship is insensitive to the superior relationship already established. For these reasons the threat of this proposal should be removed.

Male: At this stage I propose that we take this as a comment until the proposal comes before us. We actually don't have a proposal before us at the moment.

Lynne Duckham: Okay, thank you.

Raymond Saad: My name is Raymond Saad. Mine is more a request than a question. My understanding - back to the red van if I may please - my understanding is that the local residents are very much in favour, in support, of the red van. We just heard there is more than 6000 signatures, a large petition, and I think that's pretty large for a city the size of Canberra.

The visitors are pretty much in favour. The media, local and interstate, what I have seen; politicians on both sides, that's the ACT government and the federal, the opposition and senators which I've seen on the websites - everyone. Again, this is my understanding, everyone except one agency which is the NCA.

It's really an institution. It's a nice institution, what I've seen from it. So please, my request is please listen to the people, listen to the majority of the people, and let the red van stay. Thank you.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you. Gary?

Gary Rake: I thought I should comment. The solution that we've proposed would allow the red van to stay but with a change to the framework. We've tried to find a way that recognises that people like that service. We've tried to find a way that the service can remain working there but in a way that complies with the same rules as any other temporary trader. That's all we've asked.

Lynne Duckham: Shelley.

Shelley Penn: I just wanted to add, again as a relative newcomer, I can't qualify on that basis for very long but I'll use it for tonight. I think there's an important thing going on about our role and responsibility and what I think - and I hope everybody here feels - which is the importance of Canberra the place - not just a place that you live - but as a national symbol and all of that stuff. It's about the quality of the place and a very strong part of our role, a core part of our role, is a responsibility to protect and enhance and maintain it. That's very clear. So there are a number of, you know, guidelines and objectives and regulations that fall out of that objective.

One of them is about quality of any structures in the place; that's an obvious thing. One thing I'm just wondering about is when we talk about design quality that's - particularly in the Canberra context - often taken to mean grand civic formal architecture, the sorts of buildings that there are quite a lot of here that are fabulous.

But design quality can also include lightweight, whimsical, economical structures and that's very much, I think - I guess what I'm trying to say - it seems to me without knowing the van a lot - I think I've seen it, I haven't had a burger I believe they are fabulous - but that's a whimsical, fun place to go. It does apparently serve very good food and I can see why that would be a wonderful thing to attend.

But, in itself, the quality of the van and the way it is sited, there are a number of issues with that around quality and it's not of an appropriate quality to fit with what we would call proper quality as far as permanent structures. So one of the things we have talked about is, is there a way of facilitating a permanent structure that would, therefore, not have to come and go but is a good quality. That doesn't mean it's got to be formal and civic and of a grand scale, it can be whimsical and lightweight; it might even resemble a caravan.

So I think, if you go to the other side and you say, well, because of a majority vote we should just bend the rules in this case, that becomes a free for all for any sort of structure of any sort and how do we then defend that when another 6000 people say we want to keep that even though various others might say no. So I think it is incumbent upon us to work within our responsibility but I think there are ways that we can do it. I guess I'm anxious to say design quality; it doesn't have to be what we might perceive it to be as a formal and grand, it can be light and whimsical. In fact, I could imagine structures like that of a high quality, but whimsical, probably economical in many places around the lake supporting some community based, low key informal activity. So that's all.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you, Shelley. Mindful of time and the many issues we have to cover, we have a gentleman at the back and then the lady who has her hand up and this gentleman and we'll see how we're going for time. So, sir, would you like to...

Gary Petherbridge: On the same topic just discussed.

Lynne Duckham: Name please?

Gary Petherbridge: My name is Gary Petherbridge. I live at Landmark which is one of 282 apartments directly opposite that caravan.

In general, it's fine but we would prefer that the 6000 who probably travel there every day don't travel through our backyard. I think that's a broader issue to do with what is the access to all the government [officers/offices] to the lake? I think we would be

prepared to discuss it with people but right now we haven't been given the opportunity.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you. Gentleman up the back.

Jason Oliver: You mentioned...

Lynne Duckham: Name please?

Jason Oliver: My name is Jason Oliver, sorry.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you.

Jason Oliver: You mentioned about quality and that a whimsical structure could even resemble a caravan. There are obviously 6000 people who obviously don't mind what the caravan looks like. Who is deciding what is good quality and what is bad quality? Is it your personal decision that this caravan is just not good enough or is this an objective standard that we can go home and apply?

Shelley Penn: I'll just answer very briefly but I will pass it to Andrew because there is considerable expertise that comes to assessing design quality. You can assess design quality. It is not about style. Good quality encompasses all styles and we all have different response to style; some people love Federation Square in Melbourne, some people hate it, but there's a general agreement that it is good quality because it works extremely well.

Female: [Inaudible]

Shelley Penn: I suppose I've spent the last four years in the role of assessing design quality in relation to large and small scale public projects and there are many organisations around the world which use various processes which including bringing in expertise on assessing design quality and that's usually people who are educated and experienced in the field and there are a number of processes as well to assist with that and they often involve independent advice.

It's usually about qualification and design quality is not about how things look, it's about things like how they work in relation to access and infrastructure, how they work in relation to public safety, whether they support good visual surveillance and

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

connection for people; there's a whole range of things that I won't go through in detail but I'm sure many of those have informed the assessments that have been made about that and other temporary structures.

Andrew Smith: I'm not sure I'll be able to add much more to that but I would make the observation that it does get to matters of amenity around the van. If we had a permanent structure or if the van were removed, matters such as rubbish being left around, the gas cylinders adjacent to the van - these public safety issues wouldn't be there and they would be addressed if it was a permanent structure - those services were required to provide such amenity would be handled in a more considered and perhaps a safer way.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you. Conscious again of time, if there are any other issues - I know this is a very contentious issue and one that does need debate - but if there are other issues that haven't been raised, the people who I've actually got lined up at the moment, you'll be able to make your comments, ask your questions, but I would ask you to consider the other issues in this segment because we're very soon going to move on to another area.

So it is the lady up the back who has her hand up at the moment.  
Thank you.

Christine Storry: Can I just quickly ask clarification from the gentleman about accessing his backyard? Is that your personal backyard or is that the lake?

Gary Petherbridge: It's a common property of the complex. There's private property signs all over it and we regularly get abused when we ask some of the people who work directly opposite not to walk through our backyard and they basically say, well, you know, they use some sort of language that you'd better not use back in reply. So they don't take any notice of the fact that it is our backyard.

Christine Storry: How does it relate to the van?

Gary Petherbridge: Most of the government offices, you walk from them, through our backyard to get to the van. There is no defined access for as many of those government officers through to the lake except

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

Brisbane Avenue or Kings Avenue or whatever. That's not well defined by the NCA at this point.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you, Gary. The lady up the back.

Gina Pinkus: Gina Pinkus. This is a personal comment, nothing to do with the organisation I am representing. I'd just like to remind everybody here that there is another structure in the ACT in the national capital area which is at a similar ilk, though a different purpose to the caravan and that's the Aboriginal Embassy. I'd just like to say I thoroughly support it; I've very proud of it and happy that it is there, but you can't say that allowing the caravan to proceed would be breaking the mould because we've already broken the mould. I'm proud of that but I just wanted to remind you all.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you.

Don Aitkin: There is a fundamental difference. Many Commonwealth Governments since the McMahon Government have discussed whether or not they should try to remove the Aboriginal Tent Embassy and they have been very close to doing so on a couple of occasions and have desisted from doing so. It's a political, not a commercial, undertaking and that's the reason that governments have finally said let it be.

This is a commercial undertaking and I have to say to the proponents and to those that think 6000 signatures is a very powerful thing; the 6000 should go to the people who made the law, that is the Commonwealth Government. The National Capital Plan is a piece of law.

The structure - the Brodburger van - is illegal. It's as straightforward as that. We have an obligation to do something about it and in the short or long run we will do something about it because if we don't do something about it, as somebody said, somebody else will say, oh, didn't do anything about the Brodburger van, I'm going to have one over here and I'll have one up this street or that street because there's...

Male: We've got a licence.

Don Aitkin: No, you don't have a licence from the Commonwealth to do what you're doing. You have a temporary works approval and that will run out. I'm sorry that people - yes, it's important; we all think the van is a good thing in what it does but in what it is, it is simply an illegal structure. I hope that is understood. If you want it changed you get the Commonwealth Government to take out from the National Capital Plan the section that says that buildings around the lake must be of an appropriate architectural quality and then it's not a problem.

Shelley Penn: Which is like saying let's get rid of planning controls. What's the difference? Should we put every building to the vote?

No, I don't think - I think if you apply an objective assessment of design quality - that the plan talks about design quality in architectural landscape and urban outcomes quite clearly and I think if you put that to an objective assessment, and that could be got by any number of experts; we could get a council of government architects from around Australia who I am sure would be prepared to do a design review for us and...

Lynne Duckham: Can I - or others - suggest, Shelley, that this is taken up during the coffee break? If you would like to discuss this in depth and I think that would be a much better idea and you can actually talk about it then. We have time only for one more question on the planning in the national capital before we move on to the next topic and we have many interested parties.

Ben Reid: Okay, I'm Ben Reid, final year landscape architect student from the University of Canberra.

Lynne Duckham: [Unclear] registered.

Ben Reid: Basically, the NCA might not be able to make light rail work but can you not designate the land for future development of it? So is there any work in proposing that at the moment or not?

Don Aitkin: For light rails specifically, no. What we have later in the agenda is a review of building heights and open space systems. They are predicated on the fact that if the city is to grow to a much larger scale than at the moment, the allocation of land decisions need to

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

be made very soon otherwise we'll find we foreclosed on possibilities and we'll be doing something like the Cahill Expressway; you'll know what I mean. You know, putting an urban freeway across a port because nobody thought about it in 1788.

Gary Rake: The aggregate of the open space and the building height reviews are really a fresh examination of the landscape setting and the urban morphology, urban form. Critical to this is how do people move around.

Christine Storry: Can I also ask clarification with regard to how you're perceiving light rail? Is that between town centres or is it...

Ben Reid: Between - well, basically whatever we're going to need when we have 500,000 people living in Canberra; so between town centres and - yeah, everything basically.

Christine Storry: Is it multiple stops or is it express between major stops?

Ben Reid: Well, you know, it hasn't really been decided yet what the light rail system is going to be. Sorry.

Christine Storry: I was just wondering in that instance why you nominated light rail as a particular...

Ben Reid: Oh, just because it was mentioned before, basically. That's why.

Christine Storry: Thank you.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you for that. We'll now move on to the next topic which is the NCA land management. As I said earlier I have some registered names here and some of you may not be here. Again, I ask that if you are a registered speaker, let me know early in the piece so that you can actually have an opportunity to speak but there's also opportunity for everyone here.

So the registered speakers for the NCA land management is Susan Vidler, John Holland, Henry Hatch, Les Landau, Dianne Firth. They've raised the following issues; the NCA budget and impact on its work, the heritage, and management of Sterling Park, Lake Burley Griffin water traffic rules, transport regulations, access to Parliament House and Commonwealth heritage in the ACT.

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

Again, we'll ask the NCA to actually get the ball rolling by talking about one of the bigger items before we go to questions from the floor. Perhaps we could start with the NCA budget.

Philip Wales: Thank you, Lynne. Phil Wales. I've got responsibility for corporate, which also includes finance.

Like all government agencies, the NCA operates within a fixed budget allocation. That's an annual appropriation from parliament. It's true, a couple of years ago our budget was cut, however, with every challenge, we do have opportunities.

We have prioritised our spending to focus on continuing to deliver our core statutory responsibilities. With our land management activities - keeping in mind we have over \$700 million worth of assets to maintain - this means we give the highest priority to those works which contribute to maintain public safety and preserving key assets in the national capital for which we have responsibility.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you. Okay, are there any questions from the floor, please? Yes, this gentleman followed by the lady in the middle. Thank you.

Jamie Pittock: Jamie Pittock at Friends of Grasslands. We've certainly appreciated the NCA's work in the last two years to improve management of key areas of national land, particularly at Stirling Park and Yarramundi Reach. I'd certainly commend the NCA for preparing, for example, excellent management plans.

What we have noticed, however, is that a number of the ecological values of these sites, threatened species and ecosystems listed under national laws are threatened by invasion from various noxious weeds and so on. It does seem to us that the NCA is struggling with the resources required to keep those pressures under control.

Those sites are also lands where National Capital purposes were suggested in the National Capital Plan before the current *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act* was adopted and it seems to us unlikely that a number of those would be approved now under that act.

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

So I guess we had two questions or suggestions for the NCA. One is that at the public forum for next year, that the future use of Stirling Park and Yarramundi Reach in particular be considered as an agenda item for public consultation and the second is to urge the NCA - the Authority members - to consider how the resources can be enhanced from the federal government to better control some of those threatening processes. Thank you.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you.

Gary Rake: I'll just quickly grab the second part. We've received a - I might just clarify for the rest of the audience - we've received a formal piece of correspondence from Friends of Grasslands asking us to consider removing a couple of development provisions that would apply on Yarramundi Reach, Stirling Park and Attunga Point.

What I'd say is, I'll bring those to my colleagues on the Authority, I only read the letter today - and, yes, we'll bring it forward to the public. We may even bring it forward earlier than next year's public forum. If not by then, certainly at that occasion.

Alison Walker-Kaye: Alison Walker-Kaye, can you hear me alright? Yep? Good. Look, I just wanted to say that in terms of our maintenance of national land, like every government department we do have a particular budget that we have to stick to. We are very aware of the significance of Stirling Park and of Yarramundi. We are very appreciative of the work that the Friends of the Grasslands are doing, we really do appreciate that. Where we can bring other projects to bear in those areas we do so. We try to do some - we've done some work recently, as you are probably aware, in Yarramundi Reach so we try to do that where we can.

A lot of the fine scale work that we're aware of; the removal of the woody weeds as carried out by the Grasslands' skilled workers and volunteers, we're appreciative of that. We can't do everything we want to do. We recognise that. We'd certainly be very, very happy to engage in more debate on that issue and in the meantime we'd like to obviously continue with our very valuable relationship with the Friends. Thank you.

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you. The lady here, thank you.

Dianne Firth: I'm Dianne Firth. I'm a registered speaker. I'm deputy chair of the Heritage Council. I'm also a landscape architect and I teach at the University of Canberra in landscape architecture. But my particular concern is with the imminent disposal of particular Commonwealth land. These are sites that are very important to the Canberra story. There is a lot of community concern about the likely future of these sites.

Now currently they're protected under the EPBC Act, however, the criteria for assessment that we use in the ACT and what's used nationally are slightly different. The [curtilage] - the boundary of these sites is not always clearly defined in landscape terms in terms of the fabric of the building being important, like Westridge House for instance, doesn't particularly - the situation doesn't include the landscape setting for instance and there are very strong concerns that there will be development pressures on these sites in the terms of town housing, et cetera.

So how do we actually ensure that the disposal of these sites are handled, that perhaps, you know - is the land going - *Canberra Times* again, it's going to be sold. Now does it remain Commonwealth land and managed under the EPBC Act or is it likely to transfer to the ACT? In terms of any development application that needs to be done, does that go through ACTPLA or will it go through the NCA process? So what are the checks and balances? How can we, in heritage terms, protect the things that we value but still enable development to occur in a well informed and timely way?

So it's imminent and we've got three sites that are currently up there that we perceive as being under threat. In an ideal world we would like a conservation management plan that enables a transfer over to the ACT criteria where we have a clear boundary - curtilage - and that any development application comes through ACTPLA to Heritage Council so that we can undertake due scrutiny. Thank you.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you, Dianne. Andrew?

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

Andrew Smith: Okay, that's one for me. Is this working? Okay, there's a lot in that Di. We're a little bit more aware of what is going on than perhaps what has been reported in the *Canberra Times*, but only for some of the sites. As I understand it, the three properties that are to be sold, as I understand it, are all currently national land. The decision to de-gazette them to become territory land is not one for the authority, it is one for the Department of Finance and Deregulation and/or the CSIRO.

So the decision about whether it becomes national land or not is not one for us. Of the sites that are to be sold only one is in a designated area and that is Westridge House. We have advised Finance and CSIRO that it's our strong desire that that building remain on national land and it remain in designated areas.

So what that will mean in the case of Westridge House is that it has the full protection of the EPBC Act. We've also advised both those agencies that should a purchaser which to undertake any sort of development, they'll have to do a development control plan and that will be issued at least to the public and will have a full public consultation process about that.

So as best I can for Westridge House at this stage and there are other agencies involved, I can assure the community that there will be as full a consultation as there possibly can be and the full protections of the EPBC Act will apply.

Gary Rake: I think we can, with the permission of my colleagues, say that the Authority did also consider a preliminary request about what our view would be if a change of purpose was requested at Westridge House. The reason that is important is that the current range of purposes relate to science and education and the only reason that it was allowed to be used as a residence for the head of the CSIRO was because of that scientific connection.

So if the Department of Finance wish to sell a lease over Westridge House as they have for, say, Casey House, at the moment the lease provisions wouldn't allow a single residential use. The Authority did indicate that we'd support a single residential use but at this stage we're not convinced that any

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

greater scale of development would be appropriate and hence the view on the DCP.

Andrew Smith: As to the other sites, they're not - as I understand it - we've had no discussions with Finance or CSIRO about that. As I understand it they're not in designated areas and the heritage protection provided through the EPBC Act will still apply if they remain national land.

Female: But then any development application will come to you?

Gary Rake: They stay in designated areas.

Andrew Smith: If it is national land outside of a designated area, both ourselves and the ACT Planning and Land Authority will be involved - well, certainly that will be our intention, and any development proposal will have to comply, once again, with the development control plan which would also be released for full public consultation.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you. The gentleman here.

John Holland: My name is John Horne. I just wish to move the focus from things terrestrial to things aquatic for a little while. The lake is - at certain times of the year, those that use it will know - gets very crowded and there can be some conflict of interest.

I saw a proposal from a fishermen's group and, I think about swimmers also, that the lake be zoned. My feeling is at the moment you've got a course for yachts, you've also got lanes set aside for rowing. Anyone can go into these areas, obviously you don't want to do it when the races are on and things like that, but if you use this word zoning, it sort of implies or means some sort of restriction and that simply won't work when you have so many people trying to use such a small lake.

I thought about this problem and I thought, well yes, for some years now if - things are getting worse and something should be done and you'll find in every state or territory that if you go onto the websites you'll find that in most areas of Australia, of course, you have to get a licence to operate a boat that can go above 10 knots and therefore you have to sit tests and therefore large numbers of

people using these waterways do know the rules, do know about safety.

In Canberra, of course, we don't have that. You'll find that it is only the sailing clubs that teach their members all about safety and the traffic rules on the water. So the majority of people on the water at any one time have got no idea what goes on; we do really have Rafferty's Rules, the main rule being to make sure that you're not hit or you don't get him.

So I looked on - went googling and couldn't find anything, really, for the ACT. I'm not proposing that any tests be held, you just couldn't do that because we've all got mostly smaller craft, but there's nothing on the website to inform people what the traffic rules are on the water. There's nothing there on safety. We have some odd situations crop up at times with safety; if you're barrelling along on yacht or windsurfer and you'll find a head bobbing in the water out of the middle of the lake - somebody is trying to swim across - then you'll find...

A situation, rather amusing, one recently where Brian Pratt pointed out in his fishing column that a fisherman was swimming around the water for ages towing his kayak behind him. HE went off - and because those things aren't seaworthy, you can't get back on them - he thought he was in trouble. He had to swim for an hour to get to shore and he thought that someone would come along and notice his plight. What he didn't know was the basic international signal with your arms, I'm in trouble, in distress, I need help. If he'd done that, of course, somebody would have moseyed over.

So there's those two issues and the fishermen's issue is that - like with all the crowding it makes them difficult. Someone is bound to go by on a kayak or a sailboat or something and disturb their fish. So I think you could also deal with the issue of a code of conduct - the Lake Users Group should be quite capable of coming up with that.

The other issue is a lot of people in Canberra do not know about who is liable for what. For instance, if you're in a kayak bobbing along and a windsurfer slams into you and that person is injured,

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

then you may have to sell your house unless you've got insurance because you are liable for the damage to the windsurfer and to the person who slammed into you. Likewise, if you're in a sailboat and you run over a swimmer, the swimmer, if he survives that experience, he'll be liable for any damage to your keel or your rudder and so it goes on.

So insurance is something which could be put there, too. Now, I know that in NCA you've got not much stuff and not a lot of money but I think it's high time that we joined in with other states and territories and put up on the web those four things that I mentioned about the traffic rules, safety, code of conduct perhaps or etiquette and warnings about insurance and I think that could be easily farmed out to a consultant. I don't think it would cost that much to compile it, put it on the website and maybe in print.

So I just have an observation after this but I also have one question and that question is, you know, did I miss something when I went searching because I couldn't find anything much on NCA. There's something about five years old with some rules coming at the end of a spiel about Lake Burley Griffin and that seemed to be it for the ACT.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you, John. Thank you, Alison.

Alison Walker-Kaye: Thank you for that question. We certainly do take your point and you're obviously aware of the Lake User Group that meets quarterly to look at issues relating to the lake.

The National Capital Authority administers the lake's ordinance on behalf of the minister and that deals with certain issues to do with safety and usage and management of the lake. One of those elements are the conduct of events which obviously we take into account the varying requirements of various lake users and try, where possible, to avoid conflict in that area. The primary enforcers for the relevant legislation are the Water Police and, of course, we are regularly in contact with them and, indeed, they also attend the Lake User Group meetings along with other users from the lake.

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

We try to, at those meetings, deal with issues such as you have raised and we'll certainly take on board the points that you've mentioned tonight and look at those in the future. Where we have been able to issue specific alerts or rules we have done so. Recently we did some on lighting on small vessels. They should be available and easily accessible on our website but we're more than happy to go into a larger community information arrangement if we have to go down that track.

But certainly we'll take on board what you're saying. We recently also discussed, when you're talking about swimmers and potential incidents on the lake. That has come up recently. We have been looking at some options for potential swimming areas -specific swimming areas - that won't raise up conflict with other lake users. We're waiting to hear back from some of the groups in that regard.

John Holland: The swimmers I'm talking about, they go from the widest part of the lake, from one side to the other, and they don't usually wear any fluoro caps. You can't see them until you're on top of them; I've just missed two of them. Also...

Alison Walker-Kaye: That's certainly correct and we have discussed that at the group, yep.

John Holland: Well with the Lake Users Group, don't get too carried away with it. They only represent a very small number of people that actually use the lake. With my observations about what you can find on the internet, if you go to, say, Maritime New South Wales they have an excellent sort of setup there. They have to because people use it to do the tests to get the licence, but that is the sort of thing I had in mind.

The only other thing I wanted to mention - this is just an observation passed on to people there who have planning skills in the NCA. Five years ago there was an event called Victory and Pacific Day. Politically correct, everyone called it Victoria [unclear] Japan Day, of course, VJ Day. It was a brilliant event, it was really well organised and a large number of people turned up there.

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

Now as the day unfolded, the central area which is at the end of where Anzac Parade is, that area is narrow. They put VIP seating and finally people could not go from one side to the other. On one side they had the military bands and all the World War II music and on the other side all these other activities.

Now that became a bottleneck and my observation is this; that if any monument of any kind is put in that area - as I saw also in the *Canberra Times* - for World War I and II, that area is going to be permanently chocked off which means in the future you will not be able to hold major events there unless you - you can hold them on one side of the monuments or the other.

But I know you haven't received the proposals yet but if you do and they look like they have that sort of footprint, that is something that all people who are attending there would experience and that was that it was - finally you couldn't move through that chocked off, narrow area in the centre and that's where it appears that those monuments are going to be.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you.

Gary Rake: Very quick answer to that. Traffic modelling that we do undertake indicates that within the next couple of years we'll be coming back and talking to the community about the intersection of Anzac Parade and Parks Way. That intersection will hit its capacity within the next decade and we certainly won't be sitting here in...

John Horne: Sorry, I was talking about the land.

Gary Rake: Yeah, I know you were talking about the land but that whole area will have to be considered for how people move in to and around that area.

John Holland: I don't think the big monuments are going to [unclear].

Gary Rake: Quite possibly, but there's going to have to be a much bigger thought about that area I would say. That's a very valid point.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you. Could I ask if there are any other registered speakers who would like to speak now so you don't miss out on your opportunity? The lady here and the gentleman there as well, thank you.

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

Suzanne Vidler: My name is Suzanne Vidler.

Lynne Duckham: Would you wait for the microphone please?

Suzanne Vidler: [Unclear] people will be able to hear me, just in case. I'm just a little bit perturbed that there seems to be a major underpinning from the issues raised thus far which hasn't been addressed and I'd like to know what the NCA is doing about it.

Talk of parking problems and transport up Northbourne Avenue and et cetera. Where are we talking about the sustainable population level of this city? There's been no comment whatsoever. Where are people going to live and work and use whatever transport corridors we're able to provide for them and plan for them now? I see an enormous gap in the discussion.

I don't like the idea of 500,000 people here. I don't like the idea that our international reputation and the amenity of this as a bush capital, unique among western nations, will be compromised by what I see as the insignificant and are less important issues.

Thank you.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you. Gary or Don, would you like to...

Don Aitkin: When I was young, Sydney had a green belt around it and there was to be no building outside the green belt. In fact, all the building was to be inside it. Sydney then had a population of about one and a half million. It's now got four and a half million.

I hear what you say and I have friends who say the same and I feel like just shrugging. We don't - Canberra is actually unique in one way, in that we were the first jurisdiction in Australia to actually put the infrastructure in before the people came. Every other city in Australia started with people who built whatever residences they wanted and eventually they got curbs and roads and gutters and sewerage and electricity. We started the other way around.

But I can't see any way of stopping people coming here. When people say, well what are they going to do for water? I say well water will - there will either be more of it or it will be more expensive and people will use it in a different way.

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

When some of you say, well we've got to move them on to public transport as fast as possible, yes. If we're going to do that with light rail then - I think we could distinguish tramways or railways is really what you're on about - the urban tramways of Europe are a good example and I think that is what most people have in mind - the cost of putting them in is actually, I'm pretty sure, a lot more than doing the GDE.

Well we can debate that at coffee. In any case, some government has got to decide to find the money. Currently governments are doing this by getting the private sector to join with them in a variety of relationships, and you know what they are, but we are not prepared to borrow for the future. Until someone is prepared to do one or the other in the ACT, we won't have light rail. We in the NCA will do our very best to make sure that the land allocation provision isn't jeopardised. That's all we can do, really, at the moment.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you.

Gary Rake: We might not be able to control, at an NCA level, growth in the city or population but there are some things that we have very clear control over and we're guided by the matters of national significance in the national capital plan. To the extent that I can give you some comfort, I would like to read out four out of the five.

The second one on the list is preservation and enhancement of landscape features which give the national capital its character and setting. One of the matters of national significance. The most important thing that guides our decision making.

Respect for the key elements of Water Burley Griffin's formerly adopted plan. Creation, preservation and enhancement of fitting sites, approaches, and backdrops for national institutions, ceremonies, and national capital use. The development of a city which both respects environmental values and reflects national concerns with the sustainability of Australia's urban areas.

So those are four of the five most important things that guide every bit of work that this Authority does and, so, even though we can't

directly control population and growth we can see the challenges that those will present for us and we can be on the front foot thinking about them from this context.

Shelley Penn: Can I add a comment, Lynne? Just - sorry - briefly; in Melbourne not very many years ago - very, very few years ago - a policy was produced, Melbourne 2030, which was about looking at a population of five million in 2030. That was recently updated to a new policy called Melbourne @ 5 Million because it's already projected that we're probably going to be close to 6 million in 2030. So the growth is far outseeing projections and, I guess, on that level that is not necessarily comforting but you're not alone; it's just different scales and they're all very real issues for all of us I think.

One of the things I have noticed there, and I think it's very relevant, is in fact just down the road from me there is a very large [post] industrial site that is about to be developed and a number of the community are concerned and saying there should be no development. But the majority are actually saying that's not a tenable position anymore, we have to accept there will be development. The question is what type, what scale, and what quality.

I think that's the key thing; we have to actually define very clearly and put in place processes to support excellent development and by that I don't mean looks good, I think that is important as well, but it's about well designed, urban, strategic design as far as urban form and so on, appropriate heights, but also quality of architecture, landscape and urban design. I think that way we can actually protect and enhance heritage, preserve the landscape character. It will be difficult but I think that is the only way we can.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you. That's a timely reminder. This gentleman; yes please?

Henry Hatch: My name is Henry Hatch; I'm the one who raised the question about the bus stops at Parliament House. They are currently around the side of the building, probably okay for people who work there but for members of the public you're faced with a 400m, fairly exposed walk around to the front of the house, not very well

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

signposted or anything. It's pretty unpleasant when it is wet and windy. We haven't had too much rain but when it does it is very unpleasant.

I would please appeal to all considering putting in bus stops closer to the front and perhaps in the longer term, given increased population, try and get Parliament House onto the inter-town route, particularly when [oil] starts running out.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you. I can take just one more question at this stage. You were very quick. Would you wait for the microphone, please?

Anne Kent: My name is Anne Kent. I'm just responding to Gary Rake's comment about the fact that he couldn't control population growth. The problem is up until now we've been discussing your proposals on the basis of your assumption that we're going to have a strong [group] population growth, up to a million I think Don kept saying, and we haven't heard the world climate change this evening.

I do think that we have to talk about the impact that that may have on our population growth because your assumptions about population growth are driving your actually planning process.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you. As that was a comment also would we take one more question before we move on to the next? Gentleman over here. Alright, both of you and - you're cutting in to your coffee break, be warned. Thank you.

Jack Kershaw: Jack Kershaw. One thing that has never been written into the National Capital Plan from when it was first written in 1989 deals with something that has been coming up in all the issues and that is the detailed codification of development controls that appear in just about any other municipality in Australia, yet the National Capital Authority has a role that impinges on those municipal developments, be it a hamburger van right through to major buildings.

What we're hearing, from Shelley for instance, is that nice words and meetings of skilled people will deal with it. But really, at the end of the day, it comes down to detailed controls. Andrew has mentioned development control plans that the NCA has

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

introduced. They end up being prepared by the proponent as far as I've been observing the whole issue. Then we have to react to that and I'm not quite sure what status they have.

So I think most people would be looking for the NCA to move on from that vague area where the only control it really has, and any lawyer will identify it in the National Capital Plan, is the works approval. I know from the days when the plan was written that works approval meant building approval; that is the sort of nuts and bolts of building approval and that planning somehow and development controls would take care of themselves.

So I'd really like to see the NCA looking seriously; either working cooperatively with the ACT Government on that or developing serious development controls along sophisticated lines.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you, Jack.

Gary Rake: We would agree with you that we need to start by approving our own standards of codification. On a joint level, though, the working group that we have with the ACT Government to look at improving the planning arrangements is also looking at codification both in terms of harmonising our codification and improving the rigor of it. But I would start by saying we've acknowledged as an authority that we need to improve our own standard of codification.

Shelley Penn: Yeah. It's one of the things as a new coming I've sort of noted and said, this is ambiguous, what does this mean? We're very clear and it's been pointed that, you know, that the Authority has told us as well - we're telling this is ambiguous - we know we have to improve that. I do think, what I was referring to before, was not about replacing clear guidelines as well as clear mandates, where they're appropriate, with groups making assessments.

But I do think that there is a process - I think prescriptive mandates don't actually produce good outcomes. They certainly help you and they're very important, particularly in some areas where you have some sacrosanct aspects but that, combined with good process and expert advice gets you a long way there.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you.

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

- Christine Storry: It is quite possible that this forum enables people to have the opportunity to make strategic decisions or to input on strategic decisions so that you can bring up broader scale issues that will then impact on the way the plans were then developed and then going down onto the finer grain scale.
- Lynne Duckham: Thank you, Christine. Last question, Nora. Can I ask you to keep it short and succinct? Thank you.
- Nora Preston: Yeah, I'm just waiting. The development of the bushland from Woden to Civic is that this area - or is that supposed to come up for a little bit later or is it down at all?
- Gary Rake: The most relevant place would be the proposed review of the Open Space System. There is no current proposal to develop that bushland. What we're talking about is looking at the landscape framework but I'm happy to talk about that a little later.
- Nora Preston: So will I just wait or just finalise it now?
- Gary Rake: I'd suggest holding it.
- Lynne Duckham: Just wait until later would be better. Thank you.
- On that note, there's so many topics that we're concerned about that I would ask you again, when you're asking a question or making a comment, so that as many people as possible can do so would you please keep it as succinct and as to the point as possible so that there is an opportunity for more to speak. It is awful to have to say to you, I'm sorry, because of time we have to move on to the next topic, and I'm doing that again now. So if you could recall that, that would be super.
- The final group of community nominated topics - that's why we're trying to get through them specific - the specific NCA projects. Now, the registered speakers for this are Romaldo Giurgola, Peter Salapatas, Gary Pethbridge, Graham Neil, Noel McCann, Denise Page. They have raised the following issues.
- The York Park Oak Plantation and parking management in the parliamentary zone, Russel, Barton and Majura. I'll start this section with one of the specific matters and that's the York Park Oak Plantation. We have three registered speakers on that

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

specifically and that's Romaldo, Salvatore Zofrea, and Stephanie Claire.

Now, Romaldo, are you here?

Male: He did register.

Lynne Duckham: Okay. Well would either Salvatore or Stephanie like to ask a question? Are either of you here?

[Pause]

Lynne Duckham: That makes it very quick.

Gary Rake: That being the case, before we move on, could I just please read into the minutes a recognition of Aldo and his contribution to the national capital. The topic he wanted to speak about was the York Park Oak Plantation and he's helped us prepare a plan for the rejuvenation of that plantation. The first stage is finished and the next two stages we'll be moving into over the next couple of years. But I think it is worth us just recording Aldo's contribution and thanking him.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you, Gary. Are there any questions on the York Park Oak Plantation at all? Otherwise we'll move straight in to the parking management. Okay. Then I'll ask the NCA to start by giving us an update on their work.

Considering the future of parking arrangement in Russell, Barton, Parks and we know we've addressed some of these already but I would ask you to...

Andrew Smith: Look, I probably gave the update of where we were earlier on this evening so...

Lynne Duckham: Straight to questions?

Andrew Smith: Maybe we go straight to questions.

Lynne Duckham: Are there any questions? This gentleman here and the gentleman in the middle. Thank you, Aaron. The gentleman just down towards the red pole.

Peter Salapatas: Peter Salapatas, Barton resident. The impact of the concentration of work around the parliamentary triangle is such that free car

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

parking for workers has expanded to the reaches of Kingston where people are parking and then walking across to their work.

The NCA has recently - sorry, the Department of Finance has recently put up for sale a car park adjacent to the Edmund Barton building which will further exacerbate the problem.

There are a few issues here and one of them seems to be that dreaded three letter thing called GST - sorry, FBT, that's the other one.

Male: They're both dreaded.

Peter Salapatas: Exactly. The reason that FBT is dreaded is that the government is unlikely to ever have paid parking in the parliamentary triangle because of the FBT implications. Well, there's a simple way; make all government departments FBT exempt and that alleviates the problem.

The other issue, of course, is that all public car parks even around the dreaded red caravan are being used by workers to go through to their offices so that is exacerbating problems for lake users.

A survey was done about two years ago which showed that Barton had a deficit of about 1100 car parks in the area. That will be further added to when the AFP takes over the Edmund Barton building in which 2300 workers will be going in and, to the best of my knowledge, there are 350 parking spots in the building. Where will those people park?

Living in Barton and doing the work that I do, I walk through the car park that is to be developed and I go, one, one, one, one, one, two - two people per car? That's an oddity.

Another simple solution and that could be that we make public transport free. These are the sorts of things that no one is considering and they're looking for working groups to bring up solutions. Whilst you're meeting, life is going on and the problems are getting even larger. Thank you.

Andrew Smith: Okay. There are all those issues and more associated with parking. What we do know from the preliminary findings of the survey is that it goes beyond those issues that you've described. It

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

also gets to the management of available car parks. It's true that there are many people who walk distances to park in Barton. It's also true that there are many people who park illegally in Barton. But it is also true that a good number of the basement car parks are half full.

The planning provisions that have been sent in place do not extend to the management of those car parks. So there are spaces in Barton which are not available to the people who commute there so that's an issue that we will have to address.

Public transport supply has recently been improved in Barton and these things take time. In terms of the financial matters to do with FBT, of course the triggers related to that are around the price of parking and if paid parking were introduced in Barton, in the parliamentary zone or in Russell, then FBT would be applied at a certain point, and there's no discussion about...

Male: Paid parking is already in existence. The Wesley Church and [unclear] all have paid parking and there are specific Department of Finance [exemptions on] that area so that FBT is not payable for bureaucrats. So let's talk about...

Andrew Smith: Look, I won't get into the technicalities of FBT, but it does relate to a fee and, in fact, as I understand it, the Realm Hotel; there's been a recent change in the tax office ruling but I'll leave that to the tax office to explain.

The circumstance related to - sorry, did you want to say something?

Lynne Duckham: I was going to say, Andrew, perhaps this is something that we can take up again. Again I'm mindful of time and this is clearly an issue that needs a lot more...

Gary Rake: I think we can go - we can go fairly quickly. I understand that on the first review of that FBT exemption that the tax office has changed its mind and removed it and the Department of Finance was looking to appeal there. Again, I only go from what was in the paper on that one.

FBT would apply to reserved spaces; they don't necessarily apply to public spaces in the parliamentary zone because they're not reserved for employees. Regardless of that, I would take the view that FBT is a matter for the tax office and the employers and it's circular to the Commonwealth Government anyway. I don't think that's a matter that should drive our thinking in whether paid parking should be introduced. What we should be looking at and what we have been looking at is the supply and demand and the potential imbalances and the possibility of price as a rationing mechanism.

Lynne Duckham: Okay. Thank you. The gentleman...

[Aside discussion]

Nick Swain: Thanks very much for that really detailed thing. I'm also a Barton resident and the only thing I would add to that is that there are certain times of the day, like school drop offs and pickups, when the whole traffic management thing gets quite chaotic; when people are leaving work, people are picking up kids, people are parking in driveways, people are parking on nature strips, people are parking underneath trees which are sort of in danger of dying off and so on. So there's an urban forest management issue as well with - and nobody seems to be interested in controlling the parking either or policing it, which is an ACT government issue. That's just a comment.

Lynne Duckham: Could I just ask you to sort of say who you are please?

Nick Swain: My name is Nick Swain.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you.

Christine Storry: There is one possibility that you might like to think some more on and I'm not sure how appropriate it is but it may be a useful thing to put into the toolbox; a park and ride option where you're linking parking and public transport together. So there may be some ways to look at funding by looking over the joint strategy as parking may facilitate more funds than the public transport in the short term but as the public transport becomes more in demand in an inner city area you may be able to shift out the point at which

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

people transfer from parking their cars to linking into a public transport system that is in the inner area.

Female: [Inaudible].

Lynne Duckham: Sorry, can I just remind...

Female: [Inaudible].

Lynne Duckham: Can I remind you that if you wish to speak can you please put your hand up and ask for a mic for two reasons. One so everyone can hear you and secondly, is that as it is being recorded we do have an accurate record of what you're saying. I'm sorry about that. Andrew, you'd like to...

Andrew Smith: I might just rephrase the question or issue that you're raising.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you.

Andrew Smith: That's basically the relationship between the public transport [inaudible] and the pricing of car parking and a way that these two could integrate.

Those issues are the very reason that we've got Territory and Municipal Services as part of our intergovernmental group. They are well aware of the importance of the effective relationship being established between whatever parking management options come out of [IGC's] work and their work in supplementing or improving the public transport system. But the [IGC] is absolutely cognisant of the need to knit these two issues together. That might include a park and ride system; we just haven't got to that point yet.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you. There is time for maybe two more questions or comments. Can I just have a show of hands? Yes, the gentleman up the back. Is there anyone else? Then we'll just take the gentleman up the back. Thank you.

Graeme Evans: My name is Graeme Evans.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you.

Graeme Evans: A couple of times there has been reference to the respective costs of public and private transport, including in relation to parking but also more generally.

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

The thing that I would like an assurance from the Authority on is the way that the respective costing of the two systems of transport will be handled. What is notoriously the case is that the criteria applied to judging the costing of the two and therefore the feasibility of the two is often undertaken very, very badly indeed.

It's very frequently the case that things like accident costs, environmental costs, law enforcement costs and so on are just not taken into account in judging how much a public transport proposal would cost to be implemented yet they're fully taken into account the other way around. I think there must be proper equity in the way the costing is undertaken and proper equity and recognising the analytical outcomes.

Male: We might largely take that as a comment but we are actually just discussing the methodology for the more detailed assessment of the various options that we're going to put out to the public realm at the moment so I've heard what you've got to say, heard your comment and we'll address that when we talk to our consultants.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you. It is now time for a break. All the panel members will be out there. I'd like to remind you that when you come back in, coffee, tea and food is not allowed in the theatre but water is. So if you'd like to take a ten minute break. If you could try and be back here by just after eight o'clock. Thank you.

[End part 1]

[Part 2]

Lynne Duckham: We'll make a start on the second part. We now move into the NCA's nominated topics. We'll start with the NCA's Capital Works Program for the period 2010 to 2013.

You will find a list of the major projects - you all have your books. On page 12 of this information booklet you will find a list of the current NCA Capital Works Program. The NCA also has a short presentation which will appear on here as it happening in front of you. I'll call on Alison Walker-Kaye to give this presentation. Thank you, Alison.

Alison Walker-Kaye: Thank you, Lynne. Can everybody hear me? Yep? Okay. I've been asked to present the Capital Works Program for the NCA for the next three years and I've got ten minutes to do it and that's including comment from the floor. So I've realised that even picking out the key projects only I'm going to have to move through this very, very quickly so excuse me if I seem to move fast from slide to slide. I'm hoping there will be time for any comments at the end. So I'll get started.

Alright. The *Planning and Land Management Act* (1988) legislates our functions and the ones that relate to these Capital Works Programs relate to commissioning and carrying out of works to maintain or enhance the character of the national capital.

We build and enhance the capital. We manage assets ranging from roads, dams, lights, bridges to memorials, land and buildings. In addition to the key projects, we also carry out ongoing replacement for items such as stormwater, lighting, guard rails on bridges, roads, footpaths, et cetera. So these really are just the key items that you're hearing about tonight.

Our Capital Works Program; we really look at improving public amenity, replacing ageing assets with new infrastructure that comply with Australian standards and, of course, it's funded from appropriations from the government.

One of our biggest projects at the moment is the Kings Avenue/Parkes Way overpass; I'm sure you're all very well aware of it. It's a significant piece of infrastructure that is going in at the moment. I'm sure you're all aware that that has been a traffic bottleneck and we do need to look at improving the traffic performance and the design and safety of that area.

There will be controlled pedestrian movement in the new overpass. There will be on-road cycle lanes. Twenty five per cent of traffic will bypass the intersection; in other words via an underpass direct from the city to the airport and vice versa. It is close to the existing footprint. It will strengthen Kings Avenue vista and it will provide a significant gateway to the parliamentary precinct. It's going to be a really nice entry to the parliamentary zone.

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

In finishing that overpass, we're thinking ahead that this is going to obviously create other intersection issues on either side of the overpass. We can certainly speed up in one area of the infrastructure but that may move some of the problems to other areas so we're already looking at the Morshead Drive/Russell Drive roundabout and we're reviewing the traffic performance, carrying out - specialist traffic engineering consultants are being engaged and we're looking at design options and more detailed analysis. We're liaising with RoadsACT on this and we're talking to public and key neighbouring and user group stakeholders.

We are obviously going to time any work that occurs on this roundabout until after the overpass is finished.

York Park Oak Plantation has already come up this evening. It's a formal plantation on the corner of Kings Avenue and State Circle. It needs some protection for the future and we need to upgrade it with urban park facilities.

Stage 1 of this project has already been completed and that's a stone wall perimeter to protect the plantation. What we're looking at for Stage 2 are initial central pedestrian access and some associated horticultural upgrading. But what we really want to do in the near future is to look further at the detailed design of the plantation so that we can make sure that the plantation, when it is finished, is raised to the standard of an urban park, and really complies with the significance of the heritage of the area.

The Australian-American memorial podium upgrade; this memorial has been in existence for quite some time as you can see there. It's on the Commonwealth Heritage List and the Register of the National Estate. The pavers are cracking and the stone is delaminating and it is becoming - the podium part - is becoming a safety issue. We have obviously given it significance; carried out heritage assessments, and we're waiting for reports from the specialist architects and engineers engaged to investigate how best to provide the remedial works.

In association with that we've also asked for an assessment to be carried out of the actual shaft; the actual tower itself, so we can look at that in conjunction with the podium.

Anzac Parade road reconstruction Stage 3. I've presumed you'll all seen States 1 and 2 which have already been completed. That's a full road reconstruction that has occurred. That area is a significant metropolitan traffic area and it's also a major national commemorative way. You've probably noticed that we have done, and will do with Stage 3, ensure that we do not interfere with the ceremonial aspects of that area, particularly on Anzac Day and Remembrance Day. So the works in the main will be carried out between November and April. We will be starting Stage 3 after Remembrance Day this coming November and obviously we'll have it completed by Anzac Day 2011.

The Lindsay Pryor National Arboretum; this was originally planted back in the 50s by Professor Lindsay Pryor. He was an eminent Australian forest scientist, a botanist and landscape architect. Over the years it has been damaged by bush fires, much of it is in poor condition and the effects of drought have really taken their toll. We have been given \$1 million to upgrade that site. A master plan is being prepared and, in fact, that was launched to the public very recently on 18 April and we're looking forward to receiving comments on that.

The road from Kings Avenue to East Block; that is the subject of discussions between ourselves and the National Archives of Australia. It's regarding improvements to the actual address and the accessibility of the Archives. It's a little bit counterintuitive how you reach the archives, the front entrance of it. So we're looking at perhaps reinstating an access road with a direct connection from Kings Avenue right through to the entrance of the Archives. Obviously we're working in consultation with the ACT Territory and Municipal Services and we're looking at that work, once the studies have been completed, to occur in 2010-2011.

The Bowen Drive crossing; I think everybody is aware that this has significant design, operation, and safety shortcomings. It's part of

the pedestrian and cycle route around the central basin of Lake Burley Griffin and there's weaving traffic in amongst pedestrians and cyclists trying to cross the road.

We have been looking at traffic studies on alternatives and we've been working with RoadsACT on this. We've identified seven options which we're looking for preliminary advice on the heritage aspects, the costs, the traffic, and the safety implications. Once we've explored all those options in more detail we'll be looking at consultation with stakeholders and we'll obviously have to go through parliamentary approval for whatever is put in that place.

Arts and Civic Campus; the idea of campuses came up from the parliamentary zone review that was completed in 2000 which was really about trying to make the spaces around the national institutions - probably to put it simply, more user friendly; that people found them easier to manoeuvre, people found it more easy to manoeuvre between the national institutions. There was actually some sense to the different campuses themselves.

We're looking at developing a master plan for the Arts and Civic Campus which will be obviously around the High Court, the National Gallery, and the National Portrait Gallery and we're looking to minimise the surface car parking areas, enhance pedestrian circulation and accessibility and trying to rationalise car and coach parking.

We're obviously talking with the national institutions on that and looking at preliminary designs. This work is going to happen over the next three years.

Anzac Parade; I'm sure you're aware down the median strip of Anzac Parade there are planter beds. There's 28 of them and they're planted with hebes which are symbolic of the New Zealand part of the ANZAC tradition. They have been needing some work for quite some time. The hebes are needing to be replaced. We want to make sure that we replace them with, obviously, a New Zealand Hebe, it's symbolic of the area, but we're looking at species that might better suit the Canberra climate.

We have, at the moment, identified in consultation with various experts in the area, six different species which we will be trialling and we're starting that very shortly on two of the planter beds. So we'll trial the six species, we'll try at different planting patterns and obviously we'll be looking at the irrigation because that is a major problem of those planter beds, is the irrigation that needs to be replaced.

So we'll be trialing those. After that trial we'll then be obviously making decision on which Hebe we go for, what irrigation works best for the area and the types of planning patters and then all the planter beds will be upgraded. This will be staged during 2011 and 2012.

Finally, the Scrivener Dam hydraulic upgrade. Every year we have a maintenance plan for Scrivener Dam where we look at renewal of various key components of the dam and safety issues that need to be addressed and in the coming months we need to replace the flap gate, hydraulic systems and the components. This is to make sure we comply with Australian Standards and also maintain the life of the asset.

It's particularly in relation to the reliability and the safety of the dam, in particular at the times of flood release. That will be happening very shortly in the coming months. Thank you. I think I did that in record time.

Lynne Duckham: You did, thank you Alison. Yes, I think that deserves - are there any questions about this at the moment? Yes. Wait for the microphone please. Thank you.

Suzanne Vidler: Suzanne Vidler. In order of the items on page 12, the York Park Oak Plantation, I hope there would be some attention given to public education by way of signage, informative signage. The Lindsay Pryor National Arboretum renewal, I wonder if consideration will be given to retaining those aspects of the Weston CIT campus site where there are horticultural and historical merit in preserving that as an arboretum site or including it as, maybe, some other named arboretum.

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

The last is Arts and Civic Campus. Now, civic in Canberra has a particularly connotation. Do you mean civics because there is a court there or - and that smacks to me of quite a different cultural context. Civics is a subject of study of the American of the United States. Thank you.

Gary Rake: The arboretum at the Weston CIT campus - I hate saying it every time, it's not land that we manage. It is land managed by the ACT. If there are themes there that we could reflect in the work that we do at Lindsay Pryor Arboretum that might appropriately capture stories and [preservement] for the future, we'd be very keen to hear about that.

Yes, we do mean Arts and Civics Campus. It is the area between and around the National Gallery of Australia, the National Portrait Gallery, and the High Court.

Female: [Inaudible].

Gary Rake: It is a term that was adopted in the parliamentary zone review of several years ago now. So the area - Questacon and the National Library is the humanities and science campus. There's the parliamentary executive - there are four or five precincts in the parliamentary zone and each have a descriptive.

Female: [Inaudible].

Lynne Duckham: Thank you.

Graham Neil: Graham Neil from Landmark Apartments at Barton. In about 2002 I understand that - oh, this question relates to Bowen Place. In 2002 I understand that NCA was supporting a move to close Bowen Place altogether. I'm just wondering, is that one of the seven options that are being looked at at the moment? That's the first question.

The second question relates to when are we likely to see anything about future plans for the south western shore of Lake Burley Griffin from the existing area near Commonwealth Place all the way through to Kingston Foreshore because when that area goes through, at present - and if Bowen Drive remains where it is - at present there's about a three metre space between the lake and

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

that road and its really going to constrict public access in the future.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you.

Gary Rake: The removal of Bowen Place wasn't one of the original options that we put. We perhaps should give a little bit more detail about the progress on Bowen Place Crossing. We convened a meeting of representative key stakeholders late last year to help us identify major issues with a range of options and that's the seven that we've mentioned there.

We had representatives of pedestrian groups, cycling groups, heritage groups, motoring groups - as broad a group as we could. In particular, we wanted to get the cyclists and the heritage groups together because we figured, in all likelihood, the cyclists would say, build a big ramp of some kind off the side of Kings Avenue and get us down to the bike path as quickly as we can without stopping and that at the other end there might be some heritage concern about building such a structure hanging off the side of Kings Avenue. We thought, we'll let's get them to the table.

We've collected views on each of the options from all of those stakeholders and when we come out to the community to consult on whatever option we end up looking at, and we're a month or two away from that, we're going to present all of the views that they gave us as part of that consultation. So you'll hear what we heard.

At that group they did suggest that we had the option of removing Bowen Place and so we'll bring that out as one of the options but it is not one that the Authority is actively pushing for at the moment.

Plans for further development along the south-western shore of Lake Burley Griffin - south-eastern, sorry. Nothing beyond Kings Avenue Bridge from us at the moment and the only thing that we've got anywhere towards Kings Avenue Bridge is this proposal for the crossing.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you.

Anne Forrest: Anne Forrest. Just a very quick comment about the National Archives. I work in the parliamentary triangle and I get off the bus in National Circuit.

Just a very - possibly an easy, interim solution for the National Archives is to alter the timing of the lights on Melbourne Avenue and National Circuit because they're appalling. They favour the road Melbourne Avenue running up to the Australian Parliament and sometimes there's no traffic on it and the cross traffic into our old Parliament House area is all banked up along National Circuit. That should be a very simple solution for the time being. And better signage on those major roads for tourists trying to find their way in.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you, Anne. I'll take that as a comment.

Gary Rake: I think we take that into account within the project.

Lynne Duckham: We have time, as I said when you came back in, we're hurrying things up a wee bit but we have time for two more questions. Are there two more questions from the floor on this or shall we go to the next topic?

Next topic? There's a gentleman who would like to go home at nine. Okay, we will because there is no show of hands. Thank you for that. The next topic is revision of the NCA consultation protocol. Do you all have - have you all received a copy of this book as you came in? Is there anyone who does not have one because we will make sure you get one. Okay.

This is the Commitment to Community Engagement and those of you who attended the first public forum will recall several community members asking the NCA at the event to commence an immediate revision of the consultation protocol. So let's start by asking the NCA to give us a quick summary of what they've actually done since then.

Gary Rake: Those of you who were at the forum will recall me saying at the time that I didn't think I could get it done. My colleagues put me straight on that and we have managed to get it done.

I'll speak very briefly. What we've tried to do is bring together a document that covers more than basic consultation. We've tried to cover a document that sets out the way we hope to engage with the community and so we've called it Commitment to Community Engagement. It's in four parts.

The first part is entirely new and it deals with our planned approach to being proactive in making information available to the community. As a first step and as a first principle, we think if we've got knowledge that would be useful to the public, let's use our best endeavours to get it out there.

The second part deals with the consultation protocol as a formal notion. It replaces, or would replace, our previous consultation protocol. Our general approach in revising that has been to reduce the number of processes, make it simpler, reduce the number of exclusions from consultation. Previously there was quite a large exclusion for works approval - in consultation on works approval - we've tightened that up.

The third section brings in a separate document; our service charter for dealing with works and development matters. The fourth one is entirely new; it's a formal process for dealing with feedback and complaints.

In this exposure draft we've deliberately left at the start of several sections some drafting comments. Just in case our intent didn't come through in the words, we've tried to explain what we had in mind when we drafted these things. If you don't think that we've fulfilled our intent, please let us know.

In terms of how we would move forward with this document, tonight is, I guess, the official launch and we would be keen - at the launch of the exposure draft - we would be keen to get feedback over the next month and we will take public submission through until the end of May. From the close of that, I think the Authority would be keen to finalise this document in June if we can and have it apply from the beginning of the new financial year. We need to move that quickly. Other members may have a comment or two?

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

Peter Core: I think, Lynne, that a lot of us on the board of the Authority have been involved in the development of the revised protocol that is being put together here tonight as an exposure draft. But there are a couple of elements that I think are particularly important that I'd want to stress.

The first is that all of us that have lived in Canberra for a long time can look back but it's also important that we look forward. In looking forward it's tremendously important, from my perspective, that the operations of the National Capital Authority are as transparent as possible so that when you have a board meeting we now, for the first time, have issued and put on our website the public record of the discussions and the decisions that came out of the February board meeting.

We will have a board meeting tomorrow and after the processes of recording those discussions are ratified by the chairman they will be put on there - up on the website. I use that just as a particular example so that people that are stakeholders and concerned about the national capital can get a potential early warning of the nature of decision making that is going on inside the Authority.

We've talked about - and Gary has just mentioned - greater transparency and consultative processes that are involved in works approval. We've heard earlier this evening that, in some senses, a lot of the difficult issues are embedded in the works decisions that are taken.

Inside the Authority board we've talked about, well, life has moved on. We now have very substantive technologies that the Authority is not using for social networking platforms. We should be having lists where key stakeholders that are involved in the National Capital Authority are alerted to changes in website context so that people can get an understanding like our colleague from Yarralumla that things may be moving down there so that there's an early warning sign about developments where they might want to put their hand up and flag.

So there's a great desire on our part, I think, to significantly upgrade the transparency of decision making of the National

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

Capital Authority. Secondly from that, this exposure draft is about the rules of engagement that come from particular options for decision making. So these are codified in this exposure draft and they are, in a sense, a compact between the National Capital Authority and its stakeholders.

We use - as we've discussed these matters inside the Authority over the last months - we've talked about this being an annual forum of information exchange and then planning key strategic issues for much more substantive engagement than you can have in one evening's session. The two that we put down that we thought were very important and guided much of significant agenda is the open spaces agenda and the building heights agenda.

We see these key strategic issues cycling back through our annual forum processes. So it is true that we've put out the exposure draft here tonight. We're in the hands of our community partners about how quickly we bring this to an operative framework and I think we should be listening to the advice that we get. We've given it our best shot from last November when we had the open forum through to the February board meeting gone and through to now to develop this revised framework of engagement but we've very keen to hear the reactions of people from the community and then to move for it to being the operative framework for the future. Thanks, Lynne.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you, Peter. It's good to hear the stresses of the transparency information exchange. As we said at the beginning this is what this process is and the continuing exchange.

We also have some registered speakers on this topic. In particular Di Johnstone, Brett Odgers and other members of the Walter Burley Griffin Society. Would any of you like to ask a question or make a comment about the exposure draft? Thank you, up the back. Are there any other hands, just so I can have an idea of timing? Yes, and anyone else? You're pretending. Thanks okay. Thank you.

Di Johnstone: I'd like to warmly commend the NCA for a sea change in its attitude to public consultation as expressed in this document and to congratulate you on getting it out in that short timeframe and for the proposed key stakeholder register, the information subscription service, the plan for online engagement, the commitment to public release of NCA board decisions and the annual forum.

The test, of course, will be in how this document is applied. Having said this, however, I do have a major concern and this relates to the public consultation process - or public consultation period for works approval.

Now it is my understanding there are about 300 of these each year and the period has remained unchanged in this document from the previous consultation protocol. Some of these works approvals involve relatively minor matters, such as siting a park bench, but others are very big developments indeed, such as the 17 storey Acton Tower and the ASIO building. In both those cases the NCA was severely criticised for allowing insufficient time for public consultations.

Now the NCA has made a welcome commitment to assess all works approvals as to whether their impacts are high, medium, or low. But I would ask what is the point of this if the public consultation period remains unchanged, whatever the scale of their impact? Why not require public consultation for 30 business days, not the current 15, as required now for draft amendments, for those developments that are rated high or medium impact. I look forward to your reply.

Gary Rake: Sure.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you, Di.

Gary Rake: Let me start by just drawing people's attention to the relevant provisions. Section 2.7 on page 8 of the blue document deals with the provisions of the development assessment requirements. Figure 3 on page 12 and 13 sets out graphically the process.

I'd welcome submissions on the consultation period that we apply for works approval. We have kept it at 15 days. We've tried to find

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

a balance between the commercial imperatives attached with development and the opportunity to have a say. The first thing that I would say is to point out how much this has been strengthened. Of the 300-odd works approvals that we process each year, in the past probably 10 per year of those would be subject to public consultation.

It was previously only the case that the public consultation applied, or was undertaken, where it was a mandatory requirement of the National Capital Plan or of the enabling legislation. What we've done here is said we have to find a better balance. Yes, there are some things such as replacing a street sign or a piece of footpath that are likely to be uncontroversial and should proceed without going out to public consultation. But there are other matters - the ASIO building is the prime example where there was no formal requirement for us to undertake consultation under the plan.

There are a number of national security concerns about the level of consultation that we might have undertaken but what we're suggesting here is that we could have undertaken public consultation on the shadow of the building; the external form that wouldn't necessarily compromise national security. It would enable the community to have a say. That's the sort of assessment - I would have rated that medium or high, I don't think I would rate it low - it would be captured.

Female: [Inaudible].

Lynne Duckham: Thank you. Just in case you didn't hear that, I would ask again that if you have comments to make then please respect the fact that other people have also got comments to make.

Gary Rake: So all of the timelines are in here. It's an exposure draft. Everything is able to be commented on. That doesn't mean that everything is able to be changed to the extent that will make everybody happy; I suspect there will be a bit of debate.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you, Gary. Wait for the mic please. Thank you.

Bruce Kent: Bruce Kent. With the...

Lynne Duckham: It's actually not on. Wait. No, it just died. There you are. Thank you.

Bruce Kent: I'm speaking, really, on behalf of Brett Odgers who is ill - worn out actually. The consultation protocol was something which was very dear to Brett's heart. I've only looked through it very briefly but it seems to reek of the consultation protocol of July 2007. I don't know in what way this is different from the July consultation protocol of 2007. I'm concerned about that because the main objective and the stated objective of the consultation protocol of July 2007 was to formalise, streamline, and speed up consultation production lines.

What's added here is technology. We appeal to technology as a way of getting a trickledown effect to the community from the decision making process of the National Capital Authority board.

At the meeting in November last year I put forward a modest proposal to the effect that we should try to make sure that what came out of the pipeline trickled down, as it were, with occasional stops if things weren't allowed to trickle - should be improved up at the top of the, shall we say, the bladder of the pipeline where through consultation before the preliminary decision had been made in each case.

Especially if they were big decisions, through a National Planning Consultative Council, the NPPC - a modification of that body which had been set up by the all power NCDC which treasured consultation by a body of about 12 people who were appointed to filter major projects of the then NCDC before they got to the trickledown effect.

Has anything happened to that? I see no mention of a substitute [NCPC] and I'm just worried that what we've got here is just - what I'll ask is how does this consultation protocol differ from the July 2007 consultation protocol which sent Brett Odgers into shivers.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you, Bruce.

Gary Rake: I am disappointed to hear that you still have those concerns. One of the things I took was some direct correspondence from Brett

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

Odgers as part of our work in redrafting this and we also reviewed previous submissions made, in particular by the Walter Burley Griffin Society and Brett Odges in comments about the previous consultation protocol.

You've raised a couple of issues there. The first thing I'd like to go through is two of the big areas that Brett criticised in the previous consultation protocol was that there were too many processes and that it was too complex. That in relation to some of those processes, there were three different processes for amending the National Capital Plan; one for a general amendment, one for a site specific amendment and one for a minor amendment and the amount of time available for the community comment reduced in each of those.

One of Brett's very clear criticisms in his correspondence to me was why is a minor amendment or a site specific amendment any less important than a general amendment and why is less time made available? We've standardised it and we've standardised it at the higher end so the highest of the previous provisions now applies to the lot.

The second major criticism that Brett made was that there was too little consultation on works approval and that there were far too many exclusions. Previously, as I said, consultation on works approval was only taken where clearly required by the plan - explicitly required - and that would mean that the vast majority were not even considered. We've tightened that up. We've put in quantitative provisions.

If it's more than 6 million it will go to consultation. If it is a mandatory requirement, of course, it still goes to consultation. If it is in or adjacent to a residential area it will go to consultation and then we'll sit down and also do an assessment of the perceived risk of us misreading the community and if we think there is a medium or high risk of us really misreading community vibe on it, it will go to consultation.

If we look back at that Capital Works Program that we had [on the side] not that long ago, I don't think we'd do community

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

consultation for the replacement of pavers for like at the basement of the Australian-American Memorial but we would certainly do consultation on the options around the Bowen Place Crossing.

There is still an element of trust there. We are still saying that we're going to undertake those assessments but within here there's a requirement for the Authority to publish on its website a list of all works approval applications considered and approved, including the brief assessment that we made of the likelihood of us misreading community interest in the project. So we'll disclose that risk rating.

Over time that will become an adaptive tool. If we continually assess things as being low and you see them on our website, I'm sure we'll hear from you and over time we'll realise well, no, the community is interested in footpath replacement if that becomes a prominent topic and we'll adapt our behaviours accordingly.

We've got these public forums scheduled for each year. If we're continually getting it wrong I'm sure people will come forward and tell us really quickly. So I do think we've made strong improvements here.

The reason we didn't adopt the NCPC planning committee idea - there is still a proposal being considered by the Commonwealth Government for a National Capital Consultative Committee. We'd like to see what the scope of that is and how it would interplay. We'd also be cautious about moving too much consultation power into the hands of the small few when this gives us a framework to consult with the broad.

Shelley Penn: Can I add a comment? Sorry, just in response to the little point about technology which I think is something very important and as a board we discussed it as not actually about providing another means of getting information out to everybody - although that is an important role, of course, to inform people - but what is fantastic about new technology is they enable us to get stuff back from you and to engage with that in a much more real way. So Peter mentioned blogs and things like that. Apparently I've looked at and contributed to a number of those and I don't even know that I have.

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

What a lot of new technologies allow is for people to engage in a meaningful way information - we need consultation because it helps us to make better decisions. So it's not just about us bombarding you with information. So that is a genuine ambition of that technology being part of what we're doing. There are many forms of new technology. We're not proposing to adopt all of them. It will be what is most effective and relevant to stakeholders as well as us to enable us to make good decisions, but that is the intention of it.

Lynne Duckham: Bruce, can you just wait for the mic, please?

Bruce: I'm glad about your point that they're still considering something like an NCPC; you get the top end of the decision pipeline. That's where I think it's the most important thing.

Gary Rake: The other thing I should say is that in the past there has been a practice of the Authority giving in principle approval [sic] to developments. Consultation has got to occur before that. It can't occur so far down the line that we say, look, we're locked in, we can't change now.

Lynne Duckham: Okay, thank you. We have time for just two more questions and I'll take both of them next to each other so that the panel can answer them otherwise we will be here all night. Do we have two questions? Yes, the gentleman up there and John, thank you.

Chris: G'day. My name is Chris [Erit]. I've welcomed the commitment to greater consultation; obviously I haven't had a chance to look through the document yet. I guess my question is in relation to how that will actually work. I use as an example the Russell roundabout. I might have missed it but as far as I am aware the initial consultation was through the Parliament Public Works Committee where it was pretty much the final proposed design that was presented. So it was basically all over. There was some subsequent National Capital Authority information sessions which basically advised the community what had already been decided.

So I guess the question is, certainly with these major works, will there be a consultation process as the solutions are developed

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

rather than when the solution has been finalised so that people can make a meaningful contribution I guess.

Gary Rake: Yes there will be. It's covered at Section 2.8 and it's where we say that any National Capital Authority project or proposal - and we've deliberately construed that broadly - will be subject to the same sort of risk assessment; what is the risk of us misreading community interest in this project and if it is medium or high, we're out to public consultation on it ourselves.

There are projects underway at the moment that were approved in previous time. We can't retrofit that now but certainly on the list of projects that we ran over earlier, those we haven't started. We'll start working as though this is binding. I don't imagine that anyone is going to come back and say no, no, strike provisions out. If anything, it will get stronger. So we'll start working as though it applies.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you. John, thank you.

John Holland: John Holland, once again. Just, you know, if we go back to the Immigration Bridge, it was sort of suggested by NCA and then it went ahead and then all the VIPs got on board and then some sort of consultation took place, then people started raising practical issues like it was going to be a death trap and it was bad for vistas. It really became - then parliamentary inquiry - huge numbers of hours spent by people writing and lobbying to get the thing killed off.

Finally what saved the day was your own heritage report. If it hadn't been for that, we'd still be going with it because there was enough in that to kill it off. That was sheer luck and it saved so much work.

Now, okay, something like that became a nightmare that unfolded. Fortunately people will be safe now for perpetuity because of the heritage report. If something like that came up now, like a project where somebody had been behind the scenes getting all the VIPs on board and that kind of thing, if you could just briefly explain what you would do now?

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

What would you do initially? It seemed to be if the initial consultation had gone ahead and people had realised that it was a great danger [unclear] put up, as well as all the other issues that went around it, okay, then maybe nobody would have suggested a bridge in that place - there.

Now that means that you have to really go back - as Bruce is saying - to the very seminal idea and consult around that point. Do you think that your process that you've got now will solve that problem for any proposed new projects that don't fit in - that haven't been planned some years ago to be implemented?

Lynne Duckham: Thank you, John.

Gary Rake: The earliest involvement that the Authority officially had in relation to Immigration Bridge was that a proposal was put before the Authority in 2001 - 2002 and the Authority board agreed, in principle, the notion of a bridge. Under the Commitment to Community Engagement that we have here, that decision would be recorded in the public record of our authority minutes. So straight away there is a mechanism for the community to understand right at the top that there's a proposal floating around. Before the Authority gave in principle approval - sorry, in a works approval sense - so the first one was an in principle support, I guess we'll call it; support for the notion, in principle approval of the works consultation would apply here. Straight away that comes in to the works assessment requirements that we have here. Our decision making, even on preliminary concepts, where they come before the board, that will be reflected in the public record of minutes.

I'm sure our friends from Questacon won't mind me mentioning there is an example that you can read in the public record of the February board meeting where Questacon have proposed the idea of some outdoor exhibits in the parkland between the library and Questacon. It was considered by the Authority. We think it's a good principle, it's a good idea. We're keen to know more. There will be a formal works approval process as well but straight away

people can read the records of the minutes - the record of that meeting - and see that there's an idea there.

John Holland: How would people tap into that initial phase? Are you going to rely on, sort of, people regularly using the web to find out these...

Gary Rake: The information subscription service we've got here, it is essentially an RSS feed or something similar. So people could - registered stakeholders - register their interest in a range of topics. One of them might be updates to Authority board meeting minutes and every time we put something new on the web they will get an automatic alert. They might also be interested in matters relating to planning, however constructed, in the national capital. Any time there is an update to that part of our website they'll automatically be told.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you, Gary. Our final topic for this evening is the NCA's proposal to conduct two major conversations with the community during the next year. These will be a review of building height and a review of the National Capital Open Space System.

I understand the main aim of this section in the public forum is simply to make a start on these conversations and to do so by agreeing on a process for conducting the review.

We have several people registered to speak or ask questions on this topic and these are - Jean, I apologise if I get your last name incorrectly pronounced by it is Jean [Goy]. Thank you. Hannah [Jerrer]. Now there is a Mr or Miss Morrison and again, I'm sorry but I don't have a first name. [Waltraud Pix], Jordan Smith, Narelle Sergeant and [Jeannette] Ruxton.

Now to get us started, on page 6 and 7 of your green book you will find a draft process proposed by the NCA and I will ask the NCA to actually run us through their thinking on this topic and then we'll go to comments and questions from the floor. Gary.

Gary Rake: Thanks. The figure that is put before you on page 6 and 7 sets out - 6 and 7 of the green book.

Male: The middle?

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

Gary Rake: Could I have that presentation back, please? Sets out a standard process for a key issue dialogue; a major discussion with the community and we think that it's the appropriate process to use for the review of building heights and open space.

The first stage that we would suggest for any such dialogue is that we agree a process for having the discussion; making sure that we've got enough stages, enough opportunity for community input, enough opportunity to share ideas and enough time to think and do the analysis needed.

To get us rolling we've proposed a process for the building heights and open space review and we're keen to get feedback on this process. Broadly, it would have three stages. We would evaluate current conditions, define a vision for the future, and then if there is to be a change in any regard, develop an implementation plan.

Within each of those three stages we see a number of very similar steps; we call for initial comments, we gather information and prepare a discussion paper for release to the community. For those of you who have been in town for a few decades, you will recall the NCDC was very good at preparing discussion papers and put a lot of rigorous analysis into it. It's something that we'd like to reinvigorate. It gives us a record of posterity about the matters considered, the way the debate progressed, the rationale for any ultimate decisions.

Discussion paper would be released for public comment; we'd hold a public round table, finalise the paper and move into the next stage.

To help us run through this process we'd like to invite a stakeholder advisory group and we'd like that group to bring the broadest range of views to the table. As I mentioned earlier, on a process like this we could foresee a stakeholder advisory group of seven members; two independent experts and then representative stakeholders of local residents, the ACT government, community interest groups, business and industry and professional bodies.

Within the detail, each time we come out to the community we're prescribing a number of criteria. When we're seeking initial views we will give at least 20 working days for people to pass on those views. If we're dealing with a draft discussion paper, we'll extend that out to 30 business days and we will hold a public information session within the first 10 days so that people can have a chance to talk to us about it and still have another four weeks to prepare their thoughts and send them through to us.

We're very conscious that for interested community groups in particular and even the professional associations there are regular meeting cycles and it is not possible to get people together on two or three days notice and respond to something that only has a short open period so we've deliberately looked for longer open periods.

Beyond that, as Lynne said at the start, what we're hoping to agree here is the process and I'd be keen to hear some views. I note a bunch of students that are very interested in the National Capital Open Space System at the moment and thank you for your interest.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you. Thank you, Gary. First of all, are there any questions or comments about these proposed reviews, firstly from the registered speakers? Can you raise your hand if you'd like to speak? We'll have the gentleman in the middle. Keith will come back. All three. Just one moment. All registered speakers please. Yes, Jean.

Graham Anderson: Graham Anderson is my name. A simple question. Why is a review of building height limits required?

Lynne Duckham: Thank you.

Gary Rake: It is part of assessing the landscape character of the city. We're seeing pressures for the city - there's a range of reasons. On the one hand we see a potential pressure coming over the horizon; greater population, pressure to increase development in the city and at the moment we don't think the framework is as well articulated and thought about as it could be.

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

Our very early analysis and some of the items that we would put in for consideration for the first discussion paper is to look at the pattern of existing building height limits around town and certainly in the area that we have detailed planning control.

We see a mish mash of arrangements. Even within Barton there are two or three different height descriptors, different frameworks, the codification is all over the place. The outcome that we see on ground - the codification might have a similar intent but the outcome it is going to get at the end is not. So there's a need to clean up the way we describe building height limits.

Within that, we haven't had a contemporary debate about the landscape setting and framework of the city. We see calls for increased densification around, variously, town centres, transport corridors and not at all. This is an opportunity to have that debate and to bring all of those together.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you. Jean.

Jean Geue: Jean Geue speaking. Right up here. Is that better?

Lynne Duckham: A bit closer. As an ice-cream. It works as an ice-cream.

Jean Geue: It's a very threatening process to be challenging our open space because Canberra's open spaces - one of the things that makes this is a city like no other and it's that competitive edge in attracting people to come to Canberra and to live in Canberra and to stay in Canberra.

I think the only good that could come out of this enquiry is if it is set in perpetuity and properly in perpetuity because the Territory Plan is not strong enough to protect our nature reserves. It is far too easy to change things and not only do we have this absolutely magnificent open space in Canberra but we have quite intensive biodiversity in this open space. This has been absolutely invaluable for the universities we have in Canberra.

I'm really mindful that we lost one of our biodiverse orchid spots to the Gungahlin freeway; the one where that had been doing all those interesting studies about the sexual deception of the orchids and that went behind Calvary Hospital.

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

So there are a lot of people who are using Canberra Nature Park as well as the sporting fields in Canberra. It is very important for the health and wellbeing of our people. It is an invisible use because the people do not gather together in great numbers in the Bruce Stadium. They walk in small groups or they walk individually and this is very good for the people of our community. If we have a service base in this community and we pride ourselves as having intellectuals and ideas, we do need this open space.

If we have to have more people in this area, open space becomes more valuable. So it is imperative that the NCA plays a role in ensuring that this feature of the Canberra Plan is preserved.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you, Jean.

Male: I think those were all really good points.

Gary Rake: I would disagree that the Nature Park is not already well enough protected by the Territory. I will jump to the chief minister's defence on this one because the current chief minister has added more to the environmentally protected areas so I think his record stands there.

I would draw you back to the matters of national significance and preservation of landscape features, sustainable and environmental values. Those are going to be our starting point for any of this. Your points about recreation are particularly good. The National Capital Open Space system, without wanting to give a lecture, represents a number of values. Recreation is an important one of those but there have probably been changes in our patterns of use of the recreation areas.

In 1970-odd, Robert Boden did a study and found that on a sunny summer Sunday in Canberra 20 per cent of the population would be found by one of the two - as it was then - two lakes or in the river corridors recreating. If we pulled that forward today, that would be 70,000 people every Sunday. I don't think we see that in the river corridors or by the lake but we may elsewhere in the

nature reserve or national park. So we might need to look at whether some of those recreation habits have changed.

We certainly understand more about environmental and ecological values now than we did in 1970 and it might be that some of the underpinnings we had in mind - our predecessors had in mind then - need to be updated and reflected.

Having these two reviews together, as I've said a number of times and Professor Ken Taylor is not here tonight but he has also sent through some comments - they do create a contemporary review of the landscape framework and setting of the national capital and they do allow us to have all of these topics in one debate; environment, recreation, public amenity, urban density, living, working, recreating habits and patterns.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you. Could I have a show of hands for those who wish to make comment or ask a question so I know how many we are - whoa. Then I will ask very sincerely, and I really ask you to do this, please make it quick, succinct, so that - if it is a comment, make it quick. If it is a question, also make it quick. Can I see those hands again and I'll number you.

Gary Rake: And where possible, we'll just take them as comments and I'll shush.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you, Gary. Alright. We did have a lady over here. You're number one. Di, you're number two. You're right now? Okay. Then Di, you'll be number one. The gentleman there, number two. Sorry, Di Johnstone, you're number three. Nora, you had waited, thank you, you're number four. Please remember your numbers. This gentleman over here will be number five. Do we still have hands up? It is currently 17 minutes past 9 so be very mindful of this, please.

The gentleman in the middle with the glasses, you're six. Thank you, seven. Number eight. Number nine. Number 10 and number 11. That's it. Okay.

Dianne Firth: My comment is [not] the hills, ridges and buffers, it is the difficulty of the National Capital Open Space System, it's the other

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

landscape bits. I'll take two examples for instance. One is Molonglo and the separation from Weston Creek. At the moment it is a blend so that the landscape corridor - because it is not a hill, ridge or anything else, that landscape buffer was burnt out and now Stromlo Village has gone in. It looks like it is part of Duffy, the planting will take 50 years to grow and so we are losing the landscape amenity.

The other one is at Deakin between the Deakin commercial area, the horse paddocks, and the flow through. Those views from the mint that we had across to the mountains was a green space link between Deakin and separated Curtain. Very important in this concept of the new towns where the north and south Canberra separated from the Woden/Weston Creek development; that has all diluted.

So, again, how do we keep that visible intactness of the National Capital Open Space System even though it is not the bit that is actually marked on the National Capital Plan? Thank you.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you. Because of time, if you don't mind, we take them on notice and will be addressed in the way that we suggested earlier. Number two? This is testing memories.

Les Landau: Thanks. Hi, my name is Les Landau. We seem to have moved a bit away from the process but I'd like to bring it back to the process because I am a bit concerned about a couple of things.

I congratulate you on the development of it. Also, in particular, the electronic information of interested people. I am concerned that you can find one local resident or even one professional body representative that can adequately represent the range of views and everything else that is involved in this. I also understand that you can't have a committee of 500 people.

But one way around that might be instead of having a one way dissemination of information, particularly at the early stages, would you consider that as possibly being two way? I know later on in the process you allow people to put in submissions but if you

would allow, early in the process, a two way dialogue then that might get around that.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you. Di?

Di: Like Les I am very concerned about how you'll select the community representative to be on this steering group. That's going to be an absolutely key person for the entire Canberra community. I'd be interested to know what thoughts you have on that.

My personal view is that that person needs to be representative in some way and maybe to come from a representative body. There are a number of representative bodies, resident bodies, around at the moment and that's certainly one option. Another is the one that Les mentioned but such a person needs to be able to fully and accurately represent the views of the Canberra community.

Gary Rake: I think that one is worth a quick response if I may. [We will be] calling for nominations because we want that broad view. We'll ask people to demonstrate how are you going to bring the broad views to us and I think if somebody came forward and said, I can attach a written nomination that is supported by the Gungahlin Community Council and the Inner North and the Yarralumla Residents Association, we would find that fairly appealing versus somebody else that said, look, I've got a lot of friends and I will speak on behalf of them.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you. Number four. Who can remember their number?  
Thank you, Nora.

Nora Preston: It's back to the developing bushland from Woden to Civic. I'm really concerned about all this bushland going with the majority...

Male: Name?

Nora Preston: Oh, Nora Preston, Founding President, Wildlife Carers Group. We've had the majority already state that they want to maintain the bushland and the bush capital and developing all of [that along]. I agree with the [unclear] being developed, there's a lot of endangered species in there that will be driven to extinction if that does go ahead.

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

The same will happen here with the developing bushland from Woden through to Civic as well. It's very precious land, precious wildlife, native flora, and fauna through there. So I'm just wondering how you can avoid actually continuing the developing because we feel that it is really overdeveloped already.

Lynne Duckham: With all of these, as I said earlier, so that we can actually hear all your comments and your questions they will be, as the NCA has said, published - the question and their answer - on a dedicated part of their website and it will be there by Friday of next week. That is the plan. So don't consider any question less than any other or any comment or that you're not getting an answer. It's just a time issue now so that people can actually go home eventually and with 11 we will be running for quite a while.

So thank you for that and as you can keep them as short as possible, that is also useful. Thank you.

Tim Savage: Tim Savage, University of Canberra. My comment is in relation to building heights. One thing we have seen over the last few years, particularly in relation to ACT planning, is the buildings getting bigger and bigger and the setbacks getting smaller. Will the process, if building heights increase under NCA controlled area, also look at increasing the size of the setbacks as the buildings get bigger?

Gary Rake: Let's leave the big ifs in there. Those are the sort of views that we need put into this process.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you. Number six. Thank you. Who was number seven so we have both mics? Thank you.

Graham Anderson: Thank you. Graham Anderson. I'd like to make a point about the proposed development on the St John Ambulance site in Canberra Avenue.

The point I have relates both to building height and also to consultation. The last topic was consultation protocol; this has more to do with consultation practice I would say. I raised concerns that we had about this proposal at the November forum. It had to do with the fact that other multi-storey redevelopments in

that area have been limited to four storeys. This one was proposed to go to six.

Gary undertook to look at this and get back to me. In early March I rang the NCA to find out what the status was. Gary rang me back and we talked about it briefly and at his request I forwarded copies of quite detailed earlier submissions that we'd made on the matter to both ACT Planning and the NCA. I said to Gary in particular at the time that we were particularly keen to have the opportunity to talk about the matter before decisions were made.

When I noticed that building heights were on the agenda for this evening's discussion I rang ACT Planning to check the status of the development application. I was advised that NCA had forwarded some adjustments to the development control plan and that the proponent, as a consequence, had been asked to revise his proposal. It was evident from the discussion that the six storey height limit had not been changed and it was also evident that we would have no opportunity for consultation before the ACT Planning Authority made its decision.

This, to my mind, makes a fairly hollow interpretation of the NCA's claim to be keen and, indeed, to want to consult. One of the key points that I note from the protocol, the draft protocol, is that when submissions are made by the public one of the points will be that the NCA will provide feedback. That hasn't happened in this case and I'm left with the question, to take Gary's words, that maybe it's just too late in the process to make any change.

Gary Rake: I've dropped the ball on that. When you and I spoke in March you told me that you were about to head off on a holiday and I should have taken a note on when you were due back.

The clarification - the DCP on that site was decided by the Authority quite a while ago. When I received your correspondence and looked over it, Andrew and I reviewed it and we found there was an inconsistency in the way we described building height limits on that. There was no explanation of how building heights would transition across the site. There was no adequate description within the DCP about how the provisions of four storey

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

would apply at the Canberra Avenue side and how they would move.

I must admit to being caught as to the exact technicalities of the change we've sent back to ACTPLA.

Andrew Smith: Yeah, I might just follow up on that. The ambiguity is, I guess, in our conversations with ACTPLA related to building heights on Canberra Avenue, not to the building heights per se. Really, in the discussion we had with ACTPLA was that our intent was to reinforce the four storey height limit along Canberra Avenue but in the centre of the site for a taller building to be permitted. That information has been relayed to ACTPLA and to the proponent and, as I understand it, their proponent are looking to revise their design as a result.

But the height limit that went out to public consultation 12 months ago has remained unchanged.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you, Andrew.

Suzanne Vidler: Pages 8 and 9 of the Consultation Protocol; I wonder if consideration could be given to the insertion of the following value. You list environmental heritage or landscape values. I would suggest that social values are also important. After all, we're talking about people and where they work and where they play and where they live. So there's three instances; the last para of page 8, dot points on the top of page 9 and under 2.8 on page 9. So the inclusion of social values.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you.

Waltraud Pix: My name is Waltraud Pix. I am the coordinator of the Friends of Majura Park Care Group. There were several comments about the values of the bush and the bush capital. I have a similar question and that relates to Canberra Nature Park which is entity and these are the urban nature reserves.

I would like to ask whether these are included or excluded in this review of the National Capital Open Space System because they are part of this open space system but I would like to make one point on top of all the other points which have been made tonight.

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

That is there is significant investment in this [unclear] nature park system by volunteers, by the community and by the ACT government. Thanks.

Gary Rake: May of the nature parks fall - Canberra nature parks largely fall within the National Capital Open Space System so they are relevant to the review but I imagine when we sat down to assess values, is there a great threat of a piece of Canberra Nature Park being built on? I would have thought that highly unlikely because of the existing protection that they get through the legislation that the ACT Government have in place.

Remembering this is a shared city; the ACT and the Commonwealth both have very strong and legitimate interests and we'll be working very closely with the ACT Government both in terms of the bureaucracy and the Commissioner for Environment and Sustainability when it comes to the open space system. The commissioner has a review of Canberra nature parks on foot at the moment and we're already in the process of exchanging correspondence to say, look, let's share the workload, let's share the knowledge, share the learning and hopefully get a better outcome because of that.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you. Numbers eight and nine. Who is number eight? You're number eight? Nine and 10, my apologies.

Anne Kent: Anne Kent. Have you conducted any scientifically based population projection which takes into account increasing climate change projections by international bodies that inland cities in the eastern states of Australia will suffer increasing aridity and drought? In short, to use Peter Core's expression, in looking forward do you know what you are looking forward to?

My concern is that both these proposed reviews are based on an assumption of a rapidly increasing population. For instance, Gary Rake has just now justified a need for a review of height limits by reference to Canberra's growing population. Thank you.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you.

Alan Kerlin: Alan Kerlin from Gungahlin Community Council. First, I said at the last forum that you were trying to pack too much into too long a meeting. You've done it again and the most contentious issue is left to the very last so it can't have a thorough discussion and it undermines the previous topic, let me say. It undermines the credibility towards...

Gary Rake: I'm sorry to hear you say that. We deliberately put the community topics at the front because we were worried that we would have exactly that criticism if we put, for example, Brodburger at the back. I'm not sure that there's a perfect balance. We've only put topics on the first half of the agenda if they were nominated by the community.

Alan Kerlin: Probably shorter meetings and more of them, Gary. I think you've got too much on the agenda that people want to talk about.

On topic. During the media discussions your initial points put forward about this; there has been a lot of talk about densification along primary transport routes and obviously people are pretty concerned about that.

Let me make the point that there is a very big difference between densification of town centres and densification along primary public transport and transport routes. To my mind, the main feature of Canberra is that it is built around the concept of satellite cities and satellite cities will only work if you can get between the nodes very quickly. We've got the working model of densification of public transport routes happening right now on Flemington Road between Gungahlin and the city.

Despite the government's attempts to put in rapid public transport along there, running every 15 minutes, they just can't get up to speed because they're stopping every 400 metres during the initial start of it. If that sort of densification continues along the entire route, you cannot guarantee an express link between the nodes in the satellite city.

So I would say to you by all means have a thorough investigation of how to densify the cities and get appropriate populations back

into the city centres but leave the connections between them alone so we can get some high speed public transport happening.

Thank you.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you.

Gina Pinkus: Gina Pinkus. Two hats. First, personally as a recreation planner. I've been in Canberra since 1966 and I assure you that the area that Robert Bowden looked at has expanded greatly since then. If you go anywhere in the national capital open space in those nature parks you'll see far more users than you ever saw in 1970.

Gary Rake: The count that Bowden did was just in the river corridor. It was basically waterside recreation.

Gina Pinkus: So, my point...

Gary Rake: I think what I was saying is there's a movement in trends.

Gina Pinkus: Yeah. My point is that I think that Canberra Nature Park is far more used than it was in 1966 even though it was much smaller then. The point I'd also like to make is I think you need to define what your study is going to look into because that way you'll get a lot of people who are anxious now less anxious hopefully.

By having such a broad brush I think that everybody will come out of their nooks and crannies. I assure you that the ACT Labor Party had as its platform that the Canberra Nature Park would not be developed. That was a platform when Labor got into government in the ACT. So you might like to note that in your studies for a start.

Now getting on to Woden Valley Community Council, we would like to know if you're going to be looking at the heights in the town centres because currently there isn't a height limit on the town centre. There were policies originally under NCDC which affected the town centre.

If any of you care to go to Woden, and I encourage the board to go to Woden and look at some wonderfully awful iconic buildings that have popped up which will remain nameless but - and now we have ACTPLA doing a spot variation to the Territory Plan to allow

an eight storey building - which is actually nine - [unclear] a residential area.

We don't mind densification in Woden. What we do mind is ad hoc individual development without precinct plans and without height plans. So I hope you're going to include the town centres in some of these reviews so we get good planning with a nice, urban aspect. We don't mind densification; we just wanted it to look good. Thank you.

Gary Rake: I'll just accept the comments.

Lynne Duckham: Okay. Alright. My apologies. You were number seven, you got lost in the [unclear].

Female: [Inaudible].

Lynne Duckham: Well can I ask you to be very, very quick with your comment please?

Bruce Kent: I'll be very quick. Just that the three obvious areas where this debate is going to be relevant. There's the central symbolical area then there's the arterial areas along the Avenues and now we've got the town centres. So there are three different problems or areas for discussion.

In the symbolical area at the centre the argument is very strongly against any variation I think. Firstly because RL617 - is it 617 - RL617, that is the height about sea level in metres which is permitted currently in Canberra - is very relevant to the central areas. It's also relevant to the - but it is doubly relevant in the central areas because of the symbolical thing of not overshadowing the central governmental area.

The other point to RL617 is, of course, that you're not supposed to smother trees and [unclear] the landscape wherever you are in Canberra and that goes for the Avenues and the town centres as well as the central area.

I think those two things that are there in the original plan, the symbolical nature of Canberra as the capital - the governmental capital - and the thing which Don Aitkin - the phrase which Don Aitkin used and which Gary Rake reproduced about the

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.

harmonious integration of the buildings with the landscape; that is one of the objectives of this city. If you fiddle around with RL617 you're in trouble.

Gary Rake: Could I just - before we scare anyone - can I just say that RL617 does not apply right throughout the central national area, there are a number of areas where there are lower thresholds; Barton in particular where there was a proposal last year or the year before to allow higher than RL591 on the site behind the Ottoman and the Authority took a decision that those towers would not be appropriate and we brought it down to RL591. Just so the people don't think RL617 is suddenly the benchmark right through the central national area. It's not the case now.

Bruce Kent: I wasn't implying that. I'm very grateful for what you did with those.

Gary Rake: Belts and braces.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you.

Rosemary Willett: I would just like to add a comment to what Bruce has said and it is in relation to the form and function of the landscape in the way that Griffin regarded it. One of the things that is unique about Canberra is that natural land forms are used to terminate vistas, namely Mount Ainslie and Black Mountain. The scale relationships of buildings in the central area are enormously important to keep the - well, so as not to reduce may be the better way of putting it - the relative heights of those mountains.

I mean, they can shrink when you put tall buildings beside them. The same applies to the lake, the basins of the lake. The spatial relationships that you get looking across the water can shrink with tall buildings beside it. I'd just like to put those two ideas into the pot when one is considering height relationships, particularly in the central area. That's all I've got time for.

Lynne Duckham: Thank you. I will thank all of your for you input and I will point out, yes, point taken but this, fortunately, has taken us for forty minutes so we actually have spent more time on this which is why I am hurrying people along.

At this stage I would actually like to call on the Chairman of the National Capital Authority to make a short closing statement, please.

Don Aitkin: Bernard Shaw was once asked after a very long lunch if he would now make his address and he gave his address as 14 [Unclear] Road, [Unclear] and sat down. I feel a bit the same.

But I do want to thank you all for coming and engaging with us. We do not live in a mistake free world. We make errors. We are trying to make fewer of them by involving you in some of the thought processes we're going through. We will answer all of - we will make comments on all the questions in this last area because if we tried to do it orally we would be here for another 20 minutes.

If we need to do more frequent public forums, and there may be an argument for doing that, we will see how we can organise our resources to do it. It's not resource-free doing this and you would understand that. No so much in money but in the time of our staff and our chief executive.

But it is very important and it is a new start for us. I want you to take comfort rather than shock horror at our proposal to discuss things which people regard as treasured parts of our existence. They're treasured to us, too. We're not trying to get rid of them, we're trying to re-examine them in the context of the early 21st century thinking about what sort of national capital do we want to have at the end of this century. Thank you all.

Lynne Duckham: Just before you go I would like to - since you've all been looking at your books - within your books there is an evaluation form and I would ask that you complete it if you can and hand it in to the NCA staff who will be collecting them.

The other thing I would like to say is thank you very much for your consideration of other people's views, for actually being here tonight and being part of this public forum. Thank you and have a safe journey home.

## **END OF TRANSCRIPT**

[Unclear] words are denoted in square brackets and time stamps may be used to indicate their location within the audio.

Distribution of this transcript requires client authority and is subject to the provisions of the National Privacy Principles.