

SCHEDULE OF DOCUMENTS

Schedule of documents				
Document No	Page numbers	Document description	Release	Exemption(s)
1	5	Email from AWM to AWE-dated 16 February 2022 – Attachment: Australian War Memorial Response to Comments by AHC on AWM HMP 11/02/2022	Part- release	Section 22 and Section 47F
2	3	Email from AWM to GML dated 14 December 2021, Email from DAWE and AWM dated 13 December 2021 – Attachment: Comments by the Historic Heritage Pair (HHP), Liz Vines and Helen Lochhead on revised AWM Heritage Management Plan – 10 December 2021	Part- release	Section 22 and Section 47F

Gagan Sahota

From: Gordon Kelly
Sent: Wednesday, 16 February 2022 12:49 PM
To: Gagan Sahota
Cc: Leanne Patterson; Chris Widenbar; David Fitzgerald
Subject: FW: Redraft - AWM - HMP - Feb 2022

Hi Gagan,
Please find enclosed the following advice provide to DAWE regarding the redrafting of the AWM – Heritage Management Plan and subsequent submission to DAWE.
These documents support the redrafting of the AWM –HMP – Feb 2022 (after the AHC review and comments from the 29 Nov 2021 submission)

Let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

My Regards, Gordon K

From: Gordon Kelly
Sent: Wednesday, 16 February 2022 11:26 AM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: Chris Widenbar [Redacted]; David Fitzgerald [Redacted]
Subject: Redraft - AWM - HMP - Feb 2022

Conditional Exemption s47F

Conditional Exemption s47F

Good morning [Redacted] Conditional Exemption s47F

Please find the enclosed the following documents to support the re-drafting of the AWM – HMP – Feb 2022 including the suggestions by the Australian Heritage Council.

- [Redacted]
- [Redacted]
- [Redacted]
- [Redacted]
- [Redacted]
- [Redacted]
- [Redacted]

Conditional Exemption s22

- Response Table – Dec 2021 AHC Comments
- [Redacted] Conditional Exemption s22

Edits / redraft has been undertaken by GML. I have included GML ‘Response Table’ to support the changes / re-draft.

Can you please let me know if you need any other support documents, and is it possible to get some idea of when these document will be provided to the AHC for their review and consideration.

On behalf of the AWM, thank you for your continue support and advice regarding the redrafting of this Heritage Management Plan.

My Regards, Gordon K



Files attached to this message

Filename	Size	Checksum (SHA256)
		97160743ed2845fb46b41df5bebcafbff76b3ec695bffc9312b04916ef94fb6 Conditional Exemption s22
		51f2409786425f9395fbd8067d1740116a87cd9e02b48cfa17b2e18aeabe44b Conditional Exemption s22
		fa2ba2d3f5694de6279f0d102e79abb6d6e36301dfe3be52b9c365ca943c34d Conditional Exemption s22
		5d28e6bec232cbd8f654743c0ab38edfa01cfb01b161361e476d8aaa22f818f Conditional Exemption s22
		d182ab853268cf7d87346ec0bf4852f9701c9d8325f73b560a00fe4724ad0b8 Conditional Exemption s22
		d32c3a4a531718aae3010af4681ddc3a7e1c14b0267d4e7fb1cba21eeea4a38 Conditional Exemption s22
Response Table - Dec 2021 AHC Comments - 11 02 2022.docx	23.5 KB	b2dedcd817392c2aa4c9c2f5d38d16c9177a2fed6b52df6d204c8f186e19cef

[Redacted]

Conditional Exemption s22

[Redacted]

Conditional Exemption s22

[Redacted]

Conditional Exemption s22

[Redacted]

Conditional Exemption s22

Australian War Memorial Response to Comments by AHC on AWM HMP – 11/02/2022

Comments were provided by the AHC at their meeting of 10 Dec 2021 on the 29/11/2021 version of the AWM HMP.

The Memorial's response to the comments is outlined below.

Comment	Response
<p>SETOUT Page 1 – 1.3 heading needs to be on the next page</p>	<p>Addressed</p>
<p>Page 19 –the addition of western precinct memorials is supported but could the dates of these be added in the headings, to make it clear. Some dates are not included making information not as readily understandable. Eg Animals in War (date of installation not included and very unclear) , similarly Elevation of the Senses sculpture</p>	<p>Dates of sculpture installation added.</p>
<p>Page 34 • Impact on Anzac Hall - Option 1 was the only option which involved the demolition of Anzac Hall, however Option 2 would have materially impacted the architecture of Anzac Hall with connections to either side. <i>Comment – It is requested that there is more discussion about how Anzac Hall was referred to in the current management plan, the inclusion of Anzac Hall in the heritage values of the place, and include reference to the Sir Zelman Cowan Award for Public Architecture</i></p>	<p>Updated text added (p 34, updated document)</p>
<p>Text states “The competition jury was supported by a heritage conservation architect, Ms Liz Vines AO the Project’s design manager, a probity lawyer and a quantity surveyor who provided specialist advice on key performance outcomes of each of the competition entries”. – recommended to change as follows: <i>Specialist advice was provided to the competition jury by the Project’s design manager, a heritage conservation architect, a probity lawyer, and a quantity surveyor on key performance outcomes of each of the competition entries.</i> Reason – Either include all the names or none of the names. In the text only Liz Vines is referred to and this is inconsistent as no other names are referred to. Preference is given to deleting Liz Vines name to be consistent with other discussion. Note that if all names are included, then Liz Vines is OAM not AO</p>	<p>Text updated to remove reference to Liz Vines by name (p 38, updated document)</p>
<p>Page 37</p>	<p>Text added (p 38, updated document).</p>

<p>There were three entries that proposed the replacement of the existing Anzac Hall and one that proposed a solution that retained Anzac Hallsuggest adding <i>(that specifically responded to the current Management Plan reference to the heritage values of Anzac Hall)</i>.</p>	
<p>General Comment- Given that the project is well underway, Anzac Hall is now demolished, and the development is going ahead, we request the inclusion of a section which makes some reference to the contentious nature of the development. There is no mention here in the report that the Department, the Australian Heritage Council, the Australian Institute of Architects, and many of the public submissions all recommended retention of Anzac Hall. This is part of the history of the development. We realise that the client may not want this included but this is a linear factual history which is being told here. It is now part of the social history of the place, part of the story of decisions being made about its role into the future. It is inappropriate to have editorial gaps. We would like this included. It could be a short paragraph such as (this is only an example and could be better worded, but the sentiment is to be included)</p> <p><i>This revised Heritage Management Plan was finalised at the end of 2021 when the Redevelopment project was well underway and Anzac Hall had been demolished in (put in correct date here??). As with any major project related to an important heritage site, conflicts can arise. This is not unusual. There was considerable debate and public discussion about the appropriateness of demolishing Anzac Hall. Many key organisations like the Australian Institute of Architects and the Australian Heritage Council opposed the demolition of a seminal award-winning exemplar of contemporary architecture. There was lively debate in the media, including open letters expressing concern by prominent Australians. However it was the key objective for the AWM Council to fulfil the requirements of a detailed and carefully considered brief to ensure that the vision and operational objectives of the Council are met. The AW Council considered that the retention of Anzac Hall would compromise the realisation of the vision and effective operation of the AWM.</i></p> <p>Or something similar – to honestly tell the story of the recent developments of the place.</p> <p>Thank you for considering these comments.</p>	<p>Text added, section 2.5.7 and 2.5.8.</p>

Gagan Sahota

From: Gordon Kelly
Sent: Tuesday, 14 December 2021 2:29 PM
To: 'McCarthy, Therese'
Subject: FW: AHC COMMENTS ON REVISED AWM MANAGEMENT PLAN [SEC=OFFICIAL]
Attachments: 0 - REVISED HL CURRENT GML Heritage_AWM COMMENTS BY HISTORIC HERITAGE PAIR .docx

Hi Therese,

Just a note to advised that we, AWM, have received a number of minor comments from the Historic Experts – and our recent AWM – HMP submission to the AHC.

Please find following advice enclosed.

I am meeting with the development team tomorrow afternoon to discuss and confirm the suggested edits / re-wording.

If you have spare ½ hr, can you review the suggested comments, to understand the context. Obviously the formatting should prove too much of a challenge, however let me get agreement for the other suggested changes / inclusions.

Are you also able to give some idea of the GML office hours leading up to the x-mas shut down and the availability of key personal to review and re-edit the AWM – HMP submission.

My Regards, Gordon K

From: [Redacted] Conditional Exemption s47F
Sent: Monday, 13 December 2021 9:38 AM Conditional Exemption s47F
To: Gordon Kelly [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: AHC COMMENTS ON REVISED AWM MANAGEMENT PLAN [SEC=OFFICIAL]

Hi Gordon

Thank you for providing the updated HMP for the Australian War Memorial. The Historic Expert Pair have now reviewed the revised HMP and have a few minor comments/feedback in the attached document that they would like to be addressed.

Please let me know if you'd like to discuss.

Cheers, [Redacted]

[Redacted] | Director | Cultural Heritage Section | Heritage Branch | Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment | [Redacted] John Gorton Building | [Redacted]

Conditional Exemption s47F

COMMENTS BY THE HISTORIC HERITAGE PAIR (HHP), Liz Vines and Helen Lochhead
on revised AWM Heritage Management Plan - 10 December 2021

The HHP compliment the authors for adding to the history of the AWM with a more contemporary historical overlay to better reflect the recent history of the site.

Please note that it may be construed that Liz Vines, has a conflict of interest in reviewing the updated management plan. (Given that she did have some previous input on heritage issues as a consultant to the Government). However, these comments reflect the input of both members of the HHP who have requested that the revised Management Plan objectively reports the new development process. There was conflicting views in this process (to keep Anzac Hall or not) and conflict is often part of any heritage project. In addition to other suggestions, it is recommended that reference is made to this part of the story of the site's development.

SETOUT

Page 1 – 1.3 heading needs to be on the next page

OTHER COMMENTS

Page 19 –the addition of western precinct memorials is supported but could the dates of these be added in the headings, to make it clear. Some dates are not included making information not as readily understandable. Eg Animals in War (date of installation not included and very unclear) , similarly Elevation of the Senses sculpture

Page 34 • Impact on Anzac Hall - Option 1 was the only option which involved the demolition of Anzac Hall, however Option 2 would have materially impacted the architecture of Anzac Hall with connections to either side.

Comment – It is requested that there is more discussion about how Anzac Hall was referred to in the current management plan, the inclusion of Anzac Hall in the heritage values of the place, and include reference to the Sir Zelman Cowan Award for Public Architecture

Page 37 –

Text states “The competition jury was supported by a heritage conservation architect, Ms Liz Vines AO the Project’s design manager, a probity lawyer and a quantity surveyor who provided specialist advice on key performance outcomes of each of the competition entries”.
– recommended to change as follows:

Specialist advice was provided to the competition jury by the Project’s design manager, a heritage conservation architect, a probity lawyer, and a quantity surveyor on key performance outcomes of each of the competition entries.

Reason – Either include all the names or none of the names. In the text only Liz Vines is referred to and this is inconsistent as no other names are referred to. Preference is given to deleting Liz Vines name to be consistent with other discussion. Note that if all names are included, then Liz Vines is OAM not AO.

Page 37

There were three entries that proposed the replacement of the existing Anzac Hall and one that proposed a solution that retained Anzac Hallsuggest adding (*that specifically responded to the current Management Plan reference to the heritage values of Anzac Hall*).

General Comment- Given that the project is well underway, Anzac Hall is now demolished, and the development is going ahead, we request the inclusion of a section which makes some reference to the contentious nature of the development. There is no mention here in the report that the Department, the Australian Heritage Council, the Australian Institute of

Architects, and many of the public submissions all recommended retention of Anzac Hall. This is part of the history of the development. We realise that the client may not want this included but this is a linear factual history which is being told here. It is now part of the social history of the place, part of the story of decisions being made about its role into the future. It is inappropriate to have editorial gaps. We would like this included. It could be a short paragraph such as (this is only an example and could be better worded, but the sentiment is to be included)

This revised Heritage Management Plan was finalised at the end of 2021 when the Redevelopment project was well underway and Anzac Hall had been demolished in (put in correct date here??). As with any major project related to an important heritage site, conflicts can arise. This is not unusual. There was considerable debate and public discussion about the appropriateness of demolishing Anzac Hall. Many key organisations like the Australian Institute of Architects and the Australian Heritage Council opposed the demolition of a seminal award-winning exemplar of contemporary architecture. There was lively debate in the media, including open letters expressing concern by prominent Australians. However it was the key objective for the AWM Council to fulfil the requirements of a detailed and carefully considered brief to ensure that the vision and operational objectives of the Council are met. The AW Council considered that the retention of Anzac Hall would compromise the realisation of the vision and effective operation of the AWM.

Or something similar – to honestly tell the story of the recent developments of the place.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Helen Lochhead and Elizabeth Vines