



Mr Shane Rattenbury MLA
ACT Legislative Assembly

Email: rattenbury@act.gov.au

13 May 2016

Dear Minister Rattenbury

Thank you for letter of 5 May. We appreciate that you have taken the time to respond to our questions. Your responses as written will be noted.

The Guardians is taking this opportunity to provide further discussion to your responses on the various questions and clarify some information for you.

Question 1

The gazetted 1918 Plan by Griffin, shows designed roadways in the lakeside for accessible public open and recreational spaces and vistas. In the Central Basin northside, Griffin provided the well-spaced cultural and sporting institutions in the parklands. The Guardians supports the Griffin concept but recognises the extant and heritage Lake Burley Griffin followed a delineation based on the 1963 plan. The Guardians also support the desire by the community today to have some coffee shops and restaurants within the lakeside the public parklands but we do not support the infill of West Basin and a privately owned building estate, both inconsistent with Griffin's vision.

Question 2

The Guardians appreciates your support for a Master Plan and Management Plan for the Lake and its landscape. We also strongly support your point on the inclusion of the tributaries and wetlands to a Lake Burley Griffin management plan and we are aware of the \$85M to water quality studies in the catchment. A healthy lake ecology and environment is noted in our Objectives.

Question 3

Thank you for raising the national heritage listing for Canberra with Minister Gentleman and we sincerely hope to see the consultation on the management for the assessment concluded, noting that it is now 3 years since negotiations commenced.

Question 4

Your response is noted.

Question 5

The Guardians believe there have been and remain considerable flaws in the consultation process for the West Basin development that occurred from 2006 on. We have set out these flaws in the following comments along with other comments on the points you raised relating to this question.

- The consultations in 2006 were severely limited in time, obscured by the suite of NCP Amendments 56, 59 (City Hill), 60 (Commonwealth Avenue) and 61 (West Basin) and denied adequate information upon which views could be formed, There was expert opposition¹ in the public submissions but these were scarcely taken into account (or just set aside). The Joint Standing Committee of the National Capital and External Territories (JSCNCET) recommended disallowance² but the amendments were expedited through the Parliament, in breach of standard procedures without reference to the JSCNCET. When tabled in Parliament, Senator Brown moved a motion of disallowance – a serious procedure; the major parties voted against and all sat together on the Opposition benches whilst the 6 or so Greens sat on the Government benches. The amendments were passed by Parliament due to strong lobbying by the Chief Minister at the time, the NCA Chief Executive, Senator Gary Humphries, the Federal Territories Minister, and the Central Canberra Taskforce which represented the interests of investors and developers.
- The 2013 public consultation for the City to the Lake³ clearly states public desires for recreation uses in West Basin with parking and also opposition to the proposed building development. It is difficult to understand how this report can be read as supporting the development of the Building Estate.
- The more recent consultation process was disingenuous in breaking the entire development into stages and seeking development approval in the first instance, only for the Foreshore Development. There was almost no explanation of the infill of the lake and the Building Estate for apartments and businesses that will ensue as a result of the infill between the Lake and the City. The Guardians believe the public is not aware of the consequences of the proposed sale of its public parkland, the extent of the lake infill area and the density of the Building Estate which is why we are requesting a review.
- We note that the proposed two small parks will only benefit the new residents of the estate, there will be little to no free space for art shows, markets, recreation, visitor parking and only one lake entry area for triathlon and lake swimmers at the north west corner. With an increasing need for recreation space into the next century the proposal will be scarcely adequate.
- The Guardians does not understand how the proposed development can frame vistas and iconic landmarks given the proposed dense building footprints.
- We note that you support some parking areas within the West Basin development. The Land Development Agency (LDA) has informed us that public parking will be available north of Parkes Way in a proposed building in the existing clover leaf space.
- At a recent meeting of LDA officers and Guardian representatives, the LDA officers noted that the lowering of Parkes Way, essential for vehicular access to the Foreshore development, and crucial to the City to the Lake proposal, is now considered too difficult and expensive. New approaches for bridging the road are

¹ http://www.griffinsociety.org/News_and_Events/pdfs/wbg%20society_Canberra060929.pdf

² http://www.aphref.aph.gov.au_house_committee_ncet_griffin_report_fullreport.pdf

³ [20130924_-_Canberra_City_Plan_-_Engagement_Report.pdf](http://www.aphref.aph.gov.au_house_committee_ncet_griffin_report_fullreport.pdf)

being investigated indicating a lack of adequate initial planning with community involvement. This is a key concern not only with the Guardians and Canberrans. We stress that if a public park is to be appropriated then the public must be heavily involved as in a deliberative democracy consultation or similar process.

- Any development, including works for the Foreshore infill, undertaken before bridging Parkes Way, will create unacceptable traffic congestion on Commonwealth Avenue.

Question 6

The ACT Government has divided Grevillea Park into 4 boat shed sites 29m x 29m with 10m between each. The park is used a great deal by the public for informal activities and like you the Guardians support diversity of use. Although the NCA has imposed sound design criteria for the boat sheds, the Guardians believe the 2 boat shed sites at the eastern end of the lake should be deleted from the proposal as this area is where there is a beach and space for public informal use that should not be obstructed by boat sheds.

In summary

The Guardians consider that West Basin can be a major feature of City to the Lake as a park that offers a great environment for people seeking a change from urban high rise. It can continue the lakeside Menzies walk to the National Museum, continue having recreation activities of biking, lake swimming, walking and barbequing. It has space for an imaginative children's playground (such as at the Arboretum), free space for markets, concerts and art exhibitions, space for some community recreation and cultural buildings including the aquatic centre, space for lake shore cafes and space for large canopy trees to mitigate urban heat build up and some parking *all without infilling the lake waters, constructing the Foreshore and constructing the Building Estate.*

We thank you for your submission to the Lake Burley Griffin Guardians and your support for many of the Guardians' principles. We hope to have provided you with additional information primarily related to failures in consultation.

Sincerely



Juliet Ramsay
Convenor, Lake Burley Griffin Guardians

Phone: 0498 034 555
Contact address:
13 Lincoln Close
Chapman ACT 2611