

Attachment H
2008 Old Parliament House South East Wing Refurbishment
Heritage Impact Statement

HERITAGE IMPACT STATEMENT

**PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE
SOUTHEAST WING OF
OLD PARLIAMENT HOUSE – STAGE 2**



**Prepared by
Heritage Management Consultants Pty Ltd**

**for
Old Parliament House**

July 2008

**Incorporating comments from Old Parliament House management in response to additional
information required by DEWHA on 19 August 2008**

CONTENTS

| | <i>Page Number</i> |
|---|--------------------|
| 1. Background..... | 1 |
| 2. Report Structure | 1 |
| 3. Consultants | 1 |
| Appendix A: Heritage Impact Statement | 2 |
| Appendix B: Assessment of Compliance with the Provisions set out in the Finalised EPBC Act Referral for Stage 1..... | 33 |
| Appendix C: Full Scope of Proposed Works | 37 |

1. BACKGROUND

Old Parliament House is undertaking a project to refurbish the Southeast Wing of the building for the Australian Prime Ministers Centre (APMC) and to house staff of OPH. Stage 1 of the project, including asbestos removal and to upgrade services, has been approved (deemed not to be a controlled action) under the EPBC Act. Stage 2 of the project involves a range of actions to complete the refurbishment ready to accommodate the APMC and OPH staff.

OPH has commissioned this study to:

1. examine the:
 - OPH Heritage Management Plan
 - Finalised referral under the EPBC Act for the removal of asbestos and the upgrade of services
 - Final sketch plans for the Stage 2 (the proposed changes to the South East Wing to accommodate the Australian Prime Ministers Centre (APMC) and OPH office requirements)
 - Identified requirements of the APMC and OPH staff
 - Heritage Study of the South East Wing (2001)
 - Other relevant documentation including (but not limited to) the draft Interpretation Plan
2. assess the heritage impact of the proposed changes to the South East Wing to accommodate the APMC and OPH staff;
3. assess whether or not the provisions set out in the finalised referral are being followed;
4. provide a written assessment of the heritage impacts – a proforma can be provided; and
5. provide written and (if necessary) other visual representations of recommendations to minimise the heritage impact.

2. REPORT STRUCTURE

This report is in several parts:

- Tasks 2, 4 and 5 are addressed in a heritage impact statement provided at Appendix A; and
- Task 3, an assessment of compliance with the provisions set out in the finalised EPBC Act referral for Stage 1, is provided at Appendix B.

3. CONSULTANTS

This study has been undertaken for Heritage Management Consultants Pty Ltd by Duncan Marshall with assistance from Dr Michael Pearson.



Heritage Impact Statement

**PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE
SOUTHEAST WING OF OLD PARLIAMENT HOUSE – STAGE 2**

Heritage Management Consultants Pty Ltd

July 2008

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Old Parliament House is undertaking a project to refurbish the Southeast Wing of the building for the Australian Prime Ministers Centre and to house staff of OPH. Stage 1 of the project, including asbestos removal and to upgrade services, has been approved (deemed not to be a controlled action) under the EPBC Act. Stage 2 of the project involves a range of actions to complete the refurbishment ready to accommodate the APMC and OPH staff.

OPH has commissioned this study to assess the heritage impact of the Stage 2 works.

A key consideration must be the Significant Impact Guidelines used by the Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts. In particular,

‘Is there a real chance or possibility that the action will:

- permanently destroy, remove or substantially alter the fabric (physical material including structural elements and other components, fixtures, contents, and objects) of a heritage place...’ (DEH 2006, p. 18)

Having considered the proposed works to the Southeast Wing, it is concluded that:

- impacts range from **minor through to moderate to high**;
- in terms of the OPH HMP Zone Statement of Intent and Objectives, the proposed works are **partly consistent**; and
- in terms of the relevant conservation policies and strategies, the proposed works **range from not fully consistent through to consistent**. In addition, a number of matters are **not yet clear** in terms of consistency.

On this basis, it is apparent these impacts may well be considered to be a significant impact within the meaning of the *Environment Protection & Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*. It is noted that Old Parliament House intends to make a referral of the works under the Act.

The term *significant impact* is the key phrase within the Act which triggers the need for a referral. Section 28 of the Act states,

The Commonwealth or a Commonwealth agency must not take inside or outside the Australian jurisdiction an action that has, will have or is likely to have a significant impact on the environment...

This phrase is explained in the Significant Impact Guidelines noted above. However, the action may be taken with an approval from the Minister for the Environment, Heritage and the Arts, and this can be sought by making a referral under the Act.

In addition, these impacts do seem to constitute *adverse impacts* within the meaning of the Act, and certain obligations arise under section 341ZC.

A Commonwealth agency must not take an action that has, will have or is likely to have an adverse impact on the National Heritage values of a National Heritage place or the Commonwealth Heritage values of a Commonwealth Heritage place, unless:

- (a) there is no feasible and prudent alternative to taking the action; and
- (b) all measures that can reasonably be taken to mitigate the impact of the action on those values are taken.

This obligation exists independently of Section 28, and the purpose is to avoid or at least minimise any adverse impacts. It does not necessarily trigger a referral, because the adverse impact would also have to be a significant impact. It is understood the difference between these two phrases, adverse impact and significant impact, is a difference of degree. You may have adverse impacts which are quite small or minor but not necessarily significant. In the case of the current proposals, the impacts appear to be both adverse and significant.

Options that might be worth considering to improve the conservation outcomes, if they have not already been considered, include those mentioned in Table 4 below.

OPH has identified and committed to a range of mitigation measures such as:

- documentation of the wing;
- conservation of a range of individually important or otherwise representative rooms;
- conservation of the courtyard;
- giving due consideration to architectural features;
- retention of examples of services;
- concentrating services;
- interpretation;
- careful design of the new fire exit;
- leaving tell-tale indicators of walls to be removed;
- reinstating window coverings in good condition, and storing those not in such condition;
- reinstating minor items in the 1965 wing, eg. speakers;
- concealing new data and power;
- refurbishing/reconstructing lighting;
- marking new material as new;
- not introducing any new fixed joinery; and
- installing a representative sample of heritage carpet where feasible.

These measures are intended to address OPH's obligations under section 341ZC of the EPBC Act.

INTRODUCTION

Old Parliament House is undertaking a project to refurbish the Southeast Wing of the building for the Australian Prime Ministers Centre and to house staff of OPH. Stage 1 of the project, including asbestos removal and to upgrade services, has been approved (deemed not to be a controlled action) under the EPBC Act. Stage 2 of the project involves a range of actions to complete the refurbishment ready for accommodation.

OPH has commissioned this study to assess the heritage impact of the Stage 2 works.

This assessment is based on a review of the:

- OPH Heritage Management Plan;
- finalised referral under the EPBC Act for the removal of asbestos and the upgrade of services;
- preliminary sketch plans for the Stage 2 (the proposed changes to the South East Wing to accommodate the Australian Prime Ministers Centre (APMC) and OPH office requirements);
- identified requirements of the APMC and OPH staff;
- Heritage Study of the South East Wing (2001);
- Works Assessment for the Southeast Wing prepared by Conservation Works Pty Ltd;
- Master Carpets (ACT) advice regarding carpets in the wing, and a series of emails regarding the carpets; and
- other relevant documentation including the draft Interpretation Plan.

The primary overall heritage guidance for this project is provided by the OPH Heritage Management Plan. In addition, the 2001 Heritage Study of the South East Wing contains much useful detailed information and guidance. The Heritage Study is adopted as a supplementary study to, and is compatible with the OPH Heritage Management Plan.

SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL

The Stage 1 referral dealt with a range of works. The Stage 2 works complete the refurbishment of the wing. While most of the Stage 2 works build on the Stage 1 works, in a few cases, variations are proposed to the Stage 1 works. The Stage 2 works, including variations to the Stage 1 works, are summarised below. Full details are provided in Attachment D.

1940s Wing:

- adaptation of doors where necessary for functional requirements ie. air-conditioning and security - this may involve removal of the sound attenuator from the inside face of the door to allow sufficient airflow through the existing return air grille in the door;
- refurbishing rooms may entail not reinstating all fixed joinery or plumbing fittings, the proportion is unclear, items not reinstated to be stored;
- installation of new service shrouds in all office spaces;
- using more robust finishes/fittings (eg. door hinges);
- a selection of rooms are to be restored;
- double glazing to be installed;
- repainting to match known 1988 scheme;

- pre-1988 carpets to be re-used where possible, or replicas, but only in rooms to be fully reconstructed – other rooms (the majority of the wing) will have modern carpet tiles of a contemporary design;
- the plaster ceiling tiles in the corridors are proposed to be replaced with a new lightweight, suspended metal tile ceiling. The existing plaster tiles are somewhat damaged, and will be stored for later reinstatement, if required for interpretation;
- the external wall bracket lights will be refurbished and retained in-situ. Works include rewiring, re-lamping and painting;
- existing radiators in offices will be removed and those in corridors will be disconnected but left in place;
- refix floorboards in rooms, replace corridor access panels to match existing;
- Lower Floor - a new chairlift and removal of walls to allow installation;
- Lower Floor - a new entry door into the courtyard (actually the reconstruction of a former door);
- Lower Floor - a new fire stair on the south of the wing;
- Upper Floor - conversion of an additional room for plant services; and
- the Works Assessment for the Southeast Wing prepared by Conservation Works Pty Ltd identifies a range of works to be undertaken consistent with the conservation of the wing. OPH has instructed the design architects to implement as many of the recommended works as possible, given the overall objective of achieving a functional and durable office environment. At this stage, it is not clear how much of the recommended works will be possible to undertake.

1960s Wing:

- refurbishing rooms may entail not reinstating all fixed joinery or plumbing fittings, the proportion is unclear, items not reinstated to be stored;
- using more robust finishes/fittings (eg. door hinges);
- a selection of rooms are to be restored
- double glazing to be installed;
- lift car to be replaced;
- former service risers to be removed or modified, new service risers and doors to be installed, toilet entries to be modified;
- a new suspended ceiling of similar character and configuration to the existing will be installed (the Stage 1 referral proposed to install a replica);
- pre-1988 carpets to be re-used where possible, or replicas, but only in rooms to be fully reconstructed – other rooms (the majority of the wing) will have modern carpet tiles of a contemporary design. In addition, a representative sample will be reinstated where feasible. In the Stage 1 referral these were to be re-laid where feasible, noting that only the Upper Floor has pre-1998 carpets;
- Basement – excavation of a larger basement;
- Lower Floor – modification to door at north end of the courtyard;
- Lower Floor – new operable wall to divide L155;
- Main Floor - removal of sections of internal cross walls to suit new uses;
- Main Floor – removal and storage of doors for the installation of glass doors to the corridor to enable views into the APMC;
- Main and Upper Floors - removal of a section of corridor wall;
- Main and Upper Floors – removal of security/attendant station;
- Upper Floor – internal cross wall removals, contrary to the Stage 1 referral, a different pattern of wall removals is now proposed, involving the removal of more fixed joinery as a consequence; and

- Upper Floor – the wall dividing U111 and U112 is to be removed and an operable wall installed.

Generally:

- all new work is to be reversible, if possible;
- the courtyard will require some works to the underground sewerage pipes. After the hydraulic rectification works, the courtyard will be refurbished as per the recommendations in the South East Wing Courtyard Garden Heritage Analysis 2007 by Godden Mackay Logan. Essentially there will be no change to the configuration of the courtyard, and mainly the works will be of a horticultural nature;
- the roof is to be replaced with a new metal deck roof of similar profile;
- new lighting for the new egress point;
- replacement of window glass;
- changes to the stairs, including handrails;
- walls and ceiling will be repainted, and stained timberwork re-finished to the original shade;
- window treatments will be refurbished and reinstated, or new treatments installed; and
- retention of examples of current or redundant services including radiators, division bells, lights, safe in M130 and clocks.

HERITAGE VALUES

Introduction

The significance of Old Parliament House is defined in a number of sources – the National Heritage and Commonwealth Heritage citations, the OPH Heritage Management Plan, and the significance of the wing itself is defined in the Heritage Study of the South East Wing. This report relies on relevant extracts from the National Heritage and Commonwealth Heritage citations, and the Heritage Study of the South East Wing. Extracts from the National Heritage and Commonwealth Heritage citations can be found at Appendix A.1, while the extract from the Heritage Study of the South East Wing is provided below.

Significance

Key aspects of National Heritage and Commonwealth Heritage significance relevant to the wing can be summarised as follows. Underlined text refers to tangible attributes/fabric of Old Parliament House.

Criterion A–Events, Processes

National Heritage Values

Old Parliament House... was central to the development of Australia as a nation from its opening in 1927 until the opening of the new Parliament House in 1988 and demonstrates Australia's [parliamentary] political process...

The building set the pattern of combining the functions of the executive arm of government and the legislative function in the one building...

Old Parliament House is an important place in the story of the creation of the Australian democracy and has associations with several related defining events... The building was also the place of 61 years of national legislation shaping Australian society, the extension of the voting age to 18 year olds in 1973, and the establishment of new political parties such as the Democratic Labor Party in 1950s,

the Australian Democrats in 1977 and the Liberal Party of Australia in 1944-45...

Old Parliament House has a richness of internal fabric and collections that convey the way in which parliamentary functions were conducted and the everyday use of the building...

Furniture and fittings designed or purchased for the extension or alterations to the building, including those items associated with the Senate and House of Representative Wings and the President of the Senate and Prime Minister's suites are of particular value...

Commonwealth Heritage Values

... As the original focus of the Commonwealth Parliament and Government in Canberra, Old Parliament House is intimately associated with the political history of Australia, and the development of Canberra as the capital of Australia, from its opening in 1927 until the opening of the new Parliament House in 1988...

Old Parliament House was the venue for and witnessed both the course and pattern of the nation's political, social and historical development through the major part of the life of the Commonwealth to date... the building bears witness to the physical encroachment of the executive arm of government into the legislature's proper sphere. This was the primary cause for the extensive additions and modifications that had to be made to the building. These additions and modifications are manifested in such elements as the southeast and southwest wings, the northeast and northwest front pavilions, and a great number of internal changes...

Criterion B–Rarity

National Heritage Values

Old Parliament House is uncommon in that it housed both the legislative and executive functions of government. This is reflected in the construction of the House of Representatives (southeast) and the Senate (southwest) Wings, the front pavilions and in a great number of internal changes.

The House of Representatives Wing provides extensive and relatively intact evidence of the accommodation provided for Members and Ministers at various periods and the working conditions of parliamentarians and staff over the period 1943-88...

Commonwealth Heritage Values

Among parliamentary buildings in Australia and in other parts of the western world, Old Parliament House is an uncommon place in that it eventually housed both the legislative and executive functions of government...

Criterion D–Principal characteristics of a class of places

National Heritage Values

... The essential character and symmetry of Old Parliament House have remained intact despite several substantial additions. The design of the building and its layout, its curtilage spaces and its interior rooms all demonstrate the customs and functions of the Commonwealth Parliament.

... The presence of Executive Government staff indicate the major involvement of the Executive in the processes of Parliament in Australia.

The House of Representatives Wing comprises two blocks constructed in three phases: 1943, 1949 and 1965... These building Wings retain much of their internal layout and some fittings. They are an unusual physical record of the difficult working conditions of parliamentarians, staff and press representatives over the period 1943-88...

Commonwealth Heritage Values

... The essential character and symmetry of Old Parliament House have remained intact despite several substantial additions. The design of the building and its spaces, and the movable items associated with its operations demonstrate the customs and functions of the Commonwealth Parliament. The divisions within Parliament and the hierarchical system of government are reflected in the categories and styles of both the rooms and furniture available to individuals of different status.

Criterion G–Social value

National Heritage Values

Specific rooms and spaces within the building are directly associated with events that shaped the political and private lives of prominent individuals in Australia's political and social history. Many of the former parliamentarians' support staff and media representatives retain strong associations with the building and its contents...

Criterion H-Significant people

National Heritage Values

Old Parliament House has an important association with many people, particularly national politicians...

Prominent individuals associated with the Wings include... Dame Enid Lyons... the first women elected in 1943...

Commonwealth Heritage Values

As the home of the Commonwealth Parliament from 1927 until 1988, Old Parliament House is significant for its associations with Commonwealth Governments, Oppositions, political parties, individual politicians and the press. Specific rooms and spaces within the building are directly associated with events that shaped the political and private lives of prominent individuals in Australia's political and social history. Many of the surviving parliamentarians, support staff and media representatives feel strong associations with the building and its contents.

... To a lesser extent, it is significant as an example of the work of the Chief Architect of the Department of the Interior, Edwin Henderson, who devised the scheme for adding the southeast and southwest wings in their original two-storey form.

The significance of the wing identified in the Heritage Study of the South East Wing is as follows.¹

The South East Wing is a significant component of Old Parliament House which is, overall, a place of outstanding heritage values. The Wing makes a significant contribution to these heritage values: it has very important historic values related to a number of the principal historic themes of Old Parliament House; the Wing has moderate social values; and it has modest aesthetic qualities which are sympathetic to the overall qualities of the building. These values are detailed below.

The South East Wing is historically significant as a major physical expression of the continuous expansion of parliament over the 61 years of its occupation of the building. The increasing incorporation of executive functions in the building is highlighted in the Wing because of its ministerial accommodation function. The 1943, 1948 and 1965 sections all reflect the growth of departmental support staff for ministers. The 1943 section also has close associations with the expansion of ministers responsible for new departments required for war-time operations, seventeen new departments being added during WWII.

The Wing has some significance as the earlier of the large extensions in the several campaigns which saw the construction of extensions to the four corners of Old Parliament House. The Wing, in retaining much of its internal layout and some fittings, is an evocative and valuable physical record of the working conditions of parliamentarians and staff over the period 1943-88.

The 1948 extensions of the Wing also demonstrate the increase in the number of members by 60%, which took place in that year. The 1965 section of the Wing reflects the continued growth of ministerial support staff accommodated in OPH, and the desire to provide ordinary members with office accommodation. The physical demonstration of this history of expansion is better demonstrated in the South East Wing than in any other part of Old Parliament House (the capacity of the South West Wing to demonstrate this aspect of significance being substantially diminished by recent adaptive work). As the South East Wing provided ministerial and member accommodation, it was integral to the parliamentary operations of the House, rather than just being an overflow accommodation block for staff or other functions.

¹ Southeast Wing Heritage Study 2007 pp 45-46

The South East Wing provides extensive and relatively intact evidence of the accommodation provided for Members at various periods, and also extensive evidence of Ministerial accommodation. The latter reflects the substantial presence of Executive Government in the building, and the South East Wing only rivalled the north east corner of the North Wing in terms of the area of Ministerial accommodation provided. (Criteria A4, D2)²

The South East Wing has close associations with the staff, members and ministers who occupied it. Prominent ministers and members associated with the Wing include Dame Enid Lyons, Arthur Calwell, Jack McEwen, W.M. Hughes, J.H. Scullin, Paul Hasluck, Don Chipp, Doug Anthony, and others. While ministers and members commonly occupied rooms elsewhere in Old Parliament House during their parliamentary careers, the sequence of occupation in the South East Wing is comparatively well documented and some members are particularly associated with the Wing. (Criterion H1)

The South East Wing, as part of Old Parliament House, shares the overall regard which is felt for the place by the Australian community: ie its social significance. There is also a particular association through personal memories of the occupation of the Wing and Old Parliament House generally with the staff, members and ministers who occupied it. These former occupants constitute a substantial group in the community, and their association with the wing and the building generally constitutes a part of the place's social significance. (Criterion G1)

The Wing has modest aesthetic qualities relating to its exterior and interiors. The exterior of the Wing expresses in a simplified way the Inter War Stripped Classical style of the original 1927 building, reflecting the limited budget provided by Parliament to solve its accommodation problems. However, the simple style helps retain the visual unity of the whole building. It embraces classical symmetry and forms without the adoption of the full classical vocabulary, and in this way the Wing expresses a modest but refined architectural style. Key features of the style displayed by the Wing include: symmetrical façade, especially the east elevation; division into vertical bays, through the use of a breakfront design, indicating classical origins; vestigial classical entablature, being the cornice; and simple surfaces.

The wall bracket lights on the 1940s part of the Wing are also features of particular design interest.

The 1943/1948 interiors of the Wing continue the simple Inter War Stripped Classical style interiors found in the 1927 building through the subtle use of moulded render to create skirtings, architraves and picture rails. The 1965 interiors are also simple but reflect contemporary design ideas. As with the 1927 building, stained timberwork reflects the status of the room, but the simple detailing and lighter colouring is a contemporary response.

In addition, there is one other room which is of interest because of its particular architectural character, when considered in the context of the social ranking of rooms within Old Parliament House. This is Room M74 in the 1943 part of the Wing. This room is much closer in design to the 1970s high status rooms in the North Wing with its dark stained, simply detailed timberwork and the suspended ceiling light diffuser.

(Criteria D2 and E1)

² These and other references to criteria relate to the Register of the National Estate criteria.

ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT

The central task of this assessment is to address the question: do the proposed works have, will they have or are they likely to have a significant or an adverse impact on heritage values? This question can be addressed by considering the impact on the identified heritage values.

The Significant Impact Guidelines issued by the then Department of the Environment & Heritage suggest the following questions will help determine whether the impact is significant for a heritage place.

‘Is there a real chance or possibility that the action will:

- permanently destroy, remove or substantially alter the fabric (physical material including structural elements and other components, fixtures, contents, and objects) of a heritage place;
- involve extension, renovation, or substantial alteration of a heritage place in a manner which is inconsistent with the heritage values of the place...
- substantially diminish the heritage value of a heritage place for a community or group for which it is significant...
- substantially restrict or inhibit the existing use of a heritage place as a cultural or ceremonial site?’ (DEH 2006, p. 18)

Impact on Significance

The following discussion of impact considers the heritage significance identified in the National Heritage and Commonwealth Heritage citations, and in the Heritage Study of the South East Wing. In the case of the National Heritage values and Commonwealth Heritage values, the summarised version provided above is used, rather than the full statements of value found at Appendix A.1.

In the following table, the use of terms like minor, moderate and high impact are based on a professional judgement, not on any statutory definitions, which do not exist in any event. The scale of impact runs from no impact to minor impact, moderate impact and high impact.

| Table 1. Impact on Significance | | |
|---|---|---|
| Criteria/Values/Attributes | Impact/Comment | OPH RESPONSE (addressing dot point 3 and 5 of additional information required by DEWHA on 19 August 2008) |
| National Heritage Values and Commonwealth Heritage Values | | |
| Criterion A—Events, Processes | | |
| <i>National Heritage Values</i> | | |
| <u>Old Parliament House...</u> was central to the development of Australia as a nation from its opening in 1927 until the opening of the new Parliament House in 1988 and demonstrates Australia’s [parliamentary] political process... | In a general sense, the proposals will have a minor impact through the loss of evidence related to parliamentary use. This evidence includes changes to room forms by the partial or complete removal of internal walls, loss of some rooms (security/attendant stations), changes of use (one room is to become a plant room), and some loss of fixed joinery and plumbing fittings. Other evidence will be | Mitigation will occur as outlined. |

| Table 1. Impact on Significance | | |
|---|--|--|
| Criteria/Values/Attributes | Impact/Comment | OPH RESPONSE (addressing dot point 3 and 5 of additional information required by DEWHA on 19 August 2008) |
| | <p>concealed by new fittings, which may be removed in future.</p> <p>It is noted samples of some types of rooms are to be fully conserved, and otherwise interpretation may mitigate these impacts.</p> <p>In addition, it is noted there are a range of mitigation measures proposed.</p> | |
| The building set the <u>pattern of combining the functions of the executive arm of government and the legislative function in the one building...</u> | Minor impact – in general, for similar reasons as outlined above, relating to the former ministerial offices in the wing, especially on the Main Floor. | Mitigation through the retention of all the Ministerial suites on the lower floor of the 1965 side and all three floors of the 1940s side. |
| Old Parliament House is an important place in the story of the creation of the Australian democracy and has associations with several related defining events... The building was also the place of 61 years of national legislation shaping Australian society, the extension of the voting age to 18 year olds in 1973, and the establishment of new political parties such as the Democratic Labor Party in 1950s, the Australian Democrats in 1977 and the Liberal Party of Australia in 1944-45... | As above, the proposals will have a minor impact through the loss of evidence related to parliamentary use. | The Wing is currently not in use. This referral will facilitate public access and the telling of the Australian parliamentary and political stories. |
| Old Parliament House has a richness of <u>internal fabric and collections</u> that convey the way in which parliamentary functions were conducted and the everyday use of the building... | Minor impact - in general, for similar reasons as outlined above. The changes will have an impact on the internal fabric, involving some loss of evidence of the everyday use. | Where feasible, internal fabric will be retained, as set out in the referral. |
| <u>Furniture and fittings designed or purchased for the extension or alterations to the building, including those items associated with the Senate and House of Representative Wings and the President of the Senate and Prime Minister's suites</u> are of particular value... | The changes will have a minor impact on the fittings, as noted above. | - |
| <i>Commonwealth Heritage Values</i> | | |
| ... As the original focus of the Commonwealth Parliament and Government in Canberra, Old Parliament House is intimately associated with the political history of Australia, and the development of Canberra as the capital of Australia, from its opening in 1927 until the opening of the new Parliament House in 1988... | As above, the proposals will have a minor impact through the loss of evidence related to parliamentary use. | The Wing is currently not in use. This referral will facilitate public access and the telling of the Australian parliamentary and political stories. |
| Old Parliament House was the venue for and witnessed both the course and pattern of the nation's political, social and historical development through the | Minor impact – in general, for similar reasons as outlined above, relating to the former ministerial offices in the wing, especially on | Mitigation through the retention of all the Ministerial suites on the lower floor of the 1965 side and all three floors of the 1940s side. |

| Table 1. Impact on Significance | | |
|---|--|---|
| Criteria/Values/Attributes | Impact/Comment | OPH RESPONSE (addressing dot point 3 and 5 of additional information required by DEWHA on 19 August 2008) |
| major part of the life of the Commonwealth to date... the building bears witness to the physical <u>encroachment of the executive arm of government into the legislature's proper sphere</u> . This was the primary cause for the <u>extensive additions and modifications</u> that had to be made to the building. These additions and modifications are manifested in such elements as the <u>southeast and southwest wings, the northeast and northwest front pavilions, and a great number of internal changes...</u> | the Main Floor. | |
| Criterion B–Rarity | | |
| <i>National Heritage Values</i> | | |
| Old Parliament House is uncommon in that it housed both the legislative and executive functions of government. This is reflected in the construction of the <u>House of Representatives (southeast) and the Senate (southwest) Wings, the front pavilions and in a great number of internal changes.</u> | Minor impact – in general, for similar reasons as outlined above, relating to the former ministerial offices in the wing, especially on the Main Floor. | Mitigation through the retention of all the Ministerial suites on the lower floor of the 1965 side and all three floors of the 1940s side and interpretation. |
| The House of Representatives Wing provides extensive and relatively intact evidence of the <u>accommodation provided for Members and Ministers at various periods and the working conditions of parliamentarians and staff over the period 1943-88...</u> | Moderate to High impact – this extensive and relatively intact evidence will be substantially modified. | The lower floor of the 1965 side and all floors on the 1940s side will remain intact. |
| <i>Commonwealth Heritage Values</i> | | |
| Among parliamentary buildings in Australia and in other parts of the western world, Old Parliament House is an uncommon place in that it eventually housed both the legislative and executive functions of government... | Minor impact – in general, for similar reasons as outlined above, relating to the former ministerial offices in the wing, especially on the Main Floor. | Mitigation through the retention of all the Ministerial suites on the lower floor of the 1965 side and all three floors of the 1940s side and interpretation. |
| Criterion D–Principal characteristics of a class of places | | |
| <i>National Heritage Values</i> | | |
| ... The essential character and symmetry of Old Parliament House have remained intact despite several substantial additions. The <u>design of the building and its layout, its curtilage spaces and its interior rooms</u> all demonstrate the customs and functions of the Commonwealth Parliament. | As above, the proposals will have a minor impact through the loss of evidence related to parliamentary use. | As above |
| ... The <u>presence of Executive Government staff</u> indicate the major involvement of the Executive in the processes of Parliament in Australia. | Minor impact – in general, for similar reasons as outlined above, relating to the former ministerial offices in the wing, especially on the Main Floor. | As above |

| Table 1. Impact on Significance | | |
|---|--|---|
| Criteria/Values/Attributes | Impact/Comment | OPH RESPONSE (addressing dot point 3 and 5 of additional information required by DEWHA on 19 August 2008) |
| The <u>House of Representatives Wing</u> comprises two blocks constructed in three phases: 1943, 1949 and 1965... These building Wings retain much of their <u>internal layout and some fittings</u> . They are an unusual physical record of the difficult working conditions of parliamentarians, staff and press representatives over the period 1943-88... | Moderate to High impact – this extensive and relatively intact evidence will be substantially modified. This value also relates to the Southwest Wing which has already been substantially modified in recent years. Arguably, the loss of value in the Southwest Wing increases the value of the Southeast Wing. | Mitigation through the retention of all the Ministerial suites on the lower floor of the 1965 side and all three floors of the 1940s side and interpretation. Additionally, the proposed changes are reversible. |
| <i>Commonwealth Heritage Values</i> | | |
| ... The essential character and symmetry of Old Parliament House have remained intact despite several substantial additions. The <u>design of the building and its spaces, and the movable items</u> associated with its operations demonstrate the customs and functions of the Commonwealth Parliament. The divisions within Parliament and the hierarchical system of government are reflected in the <u>categories and styles of both the rooms and furniture</u> available to individuals of different status. | As above, the proposals will have a minor impact through the loss of evidence related to parliamentary use. | |
| <i>Criterion G–Social value</i> | | |
| <i>National Heritage Values</i> | | |
| <u>Specific rooms and spaces within the building are directly associated with events that shaped the political and private lives of prominent individuals in Australia’s political and social history.</u> Many of the former parliamentarians’ support staff and media representatives retain strong associations with the <u>building and its contents</u> ... | Moderate impact – given the known and potential change in character of many rooms, especially the former ministerial offices, or the offices of those that became Ministers or otherwise achieved prominence. | Mitigation through the retention of all the Ministerial suites on the lower floor of the 1965 side and all three floors of the 1940s side. This referral will facilitate public access and the telling of the Australian parliamentary and political stories. |
| <i>Criterion H–Significant people</i> | | |
| <i>National Heritage Values</i> | | |
| <u>Old Parliament House</u> has an important association with many people, particularly national politicians... | Moderate impact – given the known and potential change in character of many rooms, especially the former ministerial offices, or the offices of those that became Ministers or otherwise achieved prominence. | As above |
| Prominent individuals associated with the <u>Wings</u> include... Dame Enid Lyons... the first women elected in 1943... | No impact – given the proposed full conservation of this room. | - |
| <i>Commonwealth Heritage Values</i> | | |
| As the home of the Commonwealth Parliament from 1927 until 1988, Old | Moderate impact – given the known and potential change in | As above |

| Table 1. Impact on Significance | | |
|---|--|--|
| Criteria/Values/Attributes | Impact/Comment | OPH RESPONSE (addressing dot point 3 and 5 of additional information required by DEWHA on 19 August 2008) |
| Parliament House is significant for its associations with Commonwealth Governments, Oppositions, political parties, individual politicians and the press. Specific rooms and spaces within the building are directly associated with events that shaped the political and private lives of prominent individuals in Australia's political and social history. Many of the surviving parliamentarians, support staff and media representatives feel strong associations with the building and its contents. | character of many rooms, especially the former ministerial offices, or the offices of those that became Ministers or otherwise achieved prominence. | |
| ... To a lesser extent, it is significant as an example of the work of the Chief Architect of the Department of the Interior, Edwin Henderson, who devised the scheme for adding the southeast and southwest wings in their original two-storey form. | No impact | - |
| Extract from Heritage Study of the South East Wing | | |
| <p>The South East Wing is a significant component of Old Parliament House which is, overall, a place of outstanding heritage values. The Wing makes a significant contribution to these heritage values: it has very important historic values related to a number of the principal historic themes of Old Parliament House; the Wing has moderate social values; and it has modest aesthetic qualities which are sympathetic to the overall qualities of the building. These values are detailed below.</p> <p>The South East Wing is historically significant as a major physical expression of the continuous expansion of parliament over the 61 years of its occupation of the building. The increasing incorporation of executive functions in the building is highlighted in the Wing because of its ministerial accommodation function. The 1943, 1948 and 1965 sections all reflect the growth of departmental support staff for ministers. The 1943 section also has close associations with the expansion of ministers responsible for new departments required for war-time operations, seventeen new departments being added during WWII.</p> <p>The Wing has some significance as the</p> | Minor impact – in general, for similar reasons as outlined above, relating to the former ministerial offices in the wing, especially on the Main Floor. | As above |

³ These and other references to criteria relate to the Register of the National Estate criteria.

| Table 1. Impact on Significance | | |
|---|--|--|
| Criteria/Values/Attributes | Impact/Comment | OPH RESPONSE (addressing dot point 3 and 5 of additional information required by DEWHA on 19 August 2008) |
| <p>earlier of the large extensions in the several campaigns which saw the construction of extensions to the four corners of Old Parliament House. The Wing, in retaining much of its internal layout and some fittings, is an evocative and valuable physical record of the working conditions of parliamentarians and staff over the period 1943-88.</p> <p>The 1948 extensions of the Wing also demonstrate the increase in the number of members by 60%, which took place in that year. The 1965 section of the Wing reflects the continued growth of ministerial support staff accommodated in OPH, and the desire to provide ordinary members with office accommodation. The physical demonstration of this history of expansion is better demonstrated in the South East Wing than in any other part of Old Parliament House (the capacity of the South West Wing to demonstrate this aspect of significance being substantially diminished by recent adaptive work). As the South East Wing provided ministerial and member accommodation, it was integral to the parliamentary operations of the House, rather than just being an overflow accommodation block for staff or other functions.</p> <p>The South East Wing provides extensive and relatively intact evidence of the accommodation provided for Members at various periods, and also extensive evidence of Ministerial accommodation. The latter reflects the substantial presence of Executive Government in the building, and the South East Wing only rivalled the north east corner of the North Wing in terms of the area of Ministerial accommodation provided. (Criteria A4, D2)³</p> | <p>Moderate to High impact – this extensive and relatively intact evidence will be substantially modified. It is noted that representative samples are to be conserved.</p> <p>Minor to Moderate impact – in general, for similar reasons as outlined above, relating to the former ministerial offices in the wing, especially on the Main Floor, and the Members offices on the Upper Floor.</p> <p>Moderate to High impact – this extensive and relatively intact evidence will be substantially modified. It is noted the range of mitigation measures will help reduce the impact.</p> | <p>As above</p> <p>As above</p> <p>As above</p> |
| <p>The South East Wing has close associations with the staff, members and ministers who occupied it. Prominent ministers and members associated with the Wing include Dame Enid Lyons, Arthur Calwell, Jack McEwen, W.M. Hughes, J.H. Scullin, Paul Hasluck, Don Chipp, Doug Anthony, and others. While ministers and members commonly occupied rooms elsewhere in Old Parliament House during their parliamentary careers, the sequence of occupation in the South East Wing is</p> | <p>Moderate impact – given known and potential changes to the character and integrity of rooms.</p> | <p>These rooms have been identified and conservation will be undertaken.</p> |

| Table 1. Impact on Significance | | |
|---|---|---|
| Criteria/Values/Attributes | Impact/Comment | OPH RESPONSE (addressing dot point 3 and 5 of additional information required by DEWHA on 19 August 2008) |
| comparatively well documented and some members are particularly associated with the Wing. (Criterion H1) | | |
| The South East Wing, as part of Old Parliament House, shares the overall regard which is felt for the place by the Australian community: ie its social significance. There is also a particular association through personal memories of the occupation of the Wing and Old Parliament House generally with the staff, members and ministers who occupied it. These former occupants constitute a substantial group in the community, and their association with the wing and the building generally constitutes a part of the place's social significance. (Criterion G1) | Moderate impact – given known and potential changes to the character and integrity of rooms. | Mitigation through the retention of all the Ministerial suites on the lower floor of the 1965 side and all three floors of the 1940s side. This referral will facilitate public access and the telling of the Australian parliamentary and political stories. |
| <p>The Wing has modest aesthetic qualities relating to its exterior and interiors. The exterior of the Wing expresses in a simplified way the Inter War Stripped Classical style of the original 1927 building, reflecting the limited budget provided by Parliament to solve its accommodation problems. However, the simple style helps retain the visual unity of the whole building. It embraces classical symmetry and forms without the adoption of the full classical vocabulary, and in this way the Wing expresses a modest but refined architectural style. Key features of the style displayed by the Wing include: symmetrical façade, especially the east elevation; division into vertical bays, through the use of a breakfront design, indicating classical origins; vestigial classical entablature, being the cornice; and simple surfaces.</p> <p>The wall bracket lights on the 1940s part of the Wing are also features of particular design interest.</p> <p>The 1943/1948 interiors of the Wing continue the simple Inter War Stripped Classical style interiors found in the 1927 building through the subtle use of moulded render to create skirtings, architraves and picture rails. The 1965 interiors are also simple but reflect contemporary design ideas. As with the 1927 building, stained timberwork reflects the status of the room, but the simple detailing and lighter colouring is a contemporary response.</p> | <p>No apparent impact</p> <p>No impact</p> <p>No impact</p> | - |

| Table 1. Impact on Significance | | |
|--|----------------|---|
| Criteria/Values/Attributes | Impact/Comment | OPH RESPONSE (addressing dot point 3 and 5 of additional information required by DEWHA on 19 August 2008) |
| In addition, there is one other room which is of interest because of its particular architectural character, when considered in the context of the social ranking of rooms within Old Parliament House. This is Room M74 in the 1943 part of the Wing. This room is much closer in design to the 1970s high status rooms in the North Wing with its dark stained, simply detailed timberwork and the suspended ceiling light diffuser. (Criteria D2 and E1) | No impact | |

Consistency with Zone Statement of Intent and Objectives for the House of Representatives and Senate Wing Zone

The Southeast Wing is part of the House of Representatives and Senate Wing Zone as defined in the HMP, which provides a statement of intent and objectives for the zone. These are considered in the following table.

| Table 2. Consistency with Zone Statement of Intent and Objectives for the House of Representatives and Senate Wing Zone | |
|---|--|
| Zone Statement of Intent and Objectives | Consistency/Comment |
| <i>Statement of intent</i> | |
| To facilitate new uses consistent with the heritage values of the zone, while conserving and interpreting those values and ensuring the interpretation of former uses. | Partly consistent , although the extent to which conservation of values is achieved varies – refer to the analysis of impact on significance (Table 1). There are a range of situations where conservation is not achieved or not fully achieved. A broad outline of interpretation measures has been indicated. |
| <i>Objectives</i> | |
| 1. To facilitate public access for the purposes of telling the story of Australian democracy and the physical evolution of the place, without adversely impacting on the heritage values. (Refer to Policies 4 & 6) | Consistent . Public access will be routinely provided to the Main Floor and periodically to the other floors. A broad outline of interpretation measures has been indicated. |
| 2. To ensure the significant physical and intangible relationships between the spaces comprising this and other zones are not compromised by inappropriate change or use. (Refer to Policy 5) | Partly consistent – some spatial relationships are changing within the zone, eg. as a result of internal wall removals, and the loss of the security/attendant stations. |
| 3. To ensure that this zone is managed in accordance with the policies contained within the Heritage Management Plan. | Partly consistent - see Table 3 below. Some actions are not fully consistent while others are consistent. There are also some |

| Table 2. Consistency with Zone Statement of Intent and Objectives for the House of Representatives and Senate Wing Zone | |
|--|--|
| Zone Statement of Intent and Objectives | Consistency/Comment |
| | unclear results. |
| 4. To ensure that any change or use is consistent with the place's heritage values and does not detract from the relationship of the place to its wider setting. (Refer to Policies 2 & 5) | Partly consistent - see Table 1 above. Impacts range from no impact through to moderate to high impact. No change to the relationship of the place to its wider setting. |

Consistency with Relevant Conservation Policies and Strategies

The following relevant conservation policy and strategy extracts are drawn from the OPH Heritage Management Plan, as well as the additional guidance provided in the Heritage Study of the South East Wing.

| Table 3. Consistency with Relevant Conservation Policies and Strategies | | |
|--|---|--|
| Relevant Conservation Policies and Strategies | Consistency/Comment | OPH RESPONSE (addressing dot point 2 of additional information required by DEWHA on 19 August 2008) |
| OPH Heritage Management Plan | | |
| 1 Conservation Old Parliament House management must conserve the heritage values of the place in accordance with the EPBC Act and the ACT (Planning and Land Management) Act 1988. Old Parliament House management will recognise and adopt the official heritage values and statements of significance as a basis for management of the place through: applying the Burra Charter; employing competent heritage managers and advisors; undertaking appropriate research and assessment prior to making decisions which may impact upon heritage values; and seeking funds to manage the place based upon a nil decline in the condition of heritage values. | Partly consistent - See Table 1. | See response to table 1 |
| 1.3.1 Conserve, protect and maintain all heritage fabric (attributes of the values) of the building pertaining to the functions and occupation of Parliament including: | As below | See below |
| a the existing external and internal fabric, spaces, objects and servicing; | Partly consistent - See Table 1. | The external fabric will not be changed. As far as possible, the internal fabric, spaces, objects and servicing will be conserved. |
| b the interwar, stripped classical architectural style, symmetrical style, form, massing and details of the building in its open vista setting; and | Consistent | |
| c all rooms of design, architectural and functional interest and their juxtapositions. | Rooms of functional interest are not formally identified. None the less, rooms such as ministerial and Members offices are not fully conserved, therefore, the works are only partly consistent . It is noted that representative samples are to be conserved. | The rooms design and architectural and functional interest will be conserved on the 1940s side on all three floors. Except for the floor coverings in some rooms, all other features will be conserved and protected (see Attachment I of the Referral 2008/4325). The lower floor of the 1965 side will be conserved, except the carpet, which was replaced post 1988 and the services upgrades as outlined in the Referral 2008/4325. Proposed changes to the main and upper floor of the 1965 side will still facilitate conservation of the remaining fabric |

| Table 3. Consistency with Relevant Conservation Policies and Strategies | | |
|--|---|--|
| Relevant Conservation Policies and Strategies | Consistency/Comment | OPH RESPONSE (addressing dot point 2 of additional information required by DEWHA on 19 August 2008) |
| | | and interpretation of the removed fabric, along with the retention of representative sample rooms. |
| 1.4.1 Heritage building fabric (pre 1988) must be retained in situ commensurate with its heritage values and sensitivity to change, unless precluded by legislative requirements, health and safety considerations, threat of vandalism or theft, and/or severely deteriorated. | Partly consistent - See Table 1. | See Table 1 and Table 4 |
| 1.5.1 Where fabric of heritage value is removed as a result of an Action, which has been assessed following the procedures contained in the Heritage Management Plan, this must be preceded by, and carried out with, appropriate documentation and monitoring. | Consistent – it is understood this strategy is intended to be implemented. | Full documentation has been undertaken. Monitoring will occur during and after the refurbishment. |
| 1.5.2 All removed fabric must be assessed and protected in accordance with its heritage values. | Consistent – it is understood this strategy is intended to be implemented. | This will be implemented |
| 1.5.3 All removed fabric which is assessed as possessing heritage value must be stored on site, as far as possible (Burra Charter, Article 33). | Consistent – it is understood this strategy is intended to be implemented. | This will be implemented |
| 1.5.4 In situ evidence of removed fabric of heritage value must be retained where this is consistent with the heritage values of the place. | Consistent – it is understood this strategy is intended to be implemented. | This will be implemented |
| 1.5.5 New/replacement fabric must be labelled and discernable as such on close inspection. | Consistent – it is understood this strategy is intended to be implemented. | This will be implemented |
| 1.6.1 Intrusive fabric must be removed where to do so does not cause greater adverse impact on heritage values than its retention... | Consistent – some of the post-1988 changes are to be removed/reversed (eg, carpeting and services). | Some intrusive fabric will be removed i.e. the communications installation in L100. The post 1988 carpet will be removed (see below for further details). |
| 1.9.3b Where feasible, pre-1988 floor fabric should be conserved, with appropriate finishes. Sample areas of rubber flooring should be retained in use and on display where their ongoing conservation can be achieved. Where rubber or parquet floor materials are unserviceable and it is intended to lay new and different floor coverings (eg carpet in place of rubber), consideration should be given to methods of laying new floor coverings on top of old which might maximise conservation of the earlier flooring. Every effort should be made to conserve in situ at least a sample of original flooring treatments if more extensive conservation is not feasible. If flooring has been assessed by Action Committee for removal due to poor condition, then a replica must be considered the most appropriate alternative (see also policies 1.4.1 and 1.5.5). | Consistent – the situation with the pre-1988 carpets is complex and a multi-layered approach is to be undertaken, in an attempt to re-use as much pre-1988 carpet as possible, and at the least to retain samples. | The relevant text in the referral document has been revised and now reads: "As set out in Referral 2008-3949, where feasible, the floor coverings will be relaid. If, due to the condition of the floor covering, the intended use will involve high traffic loads, or the pre-1988 flooring has been removed and no physical evidence exists or known documentation provides information on the type of floor covering that was in place pre-1988, a contemporary flooring will be used. In these circumstances, a representative sample (100x100mm) will be relaid in each room/area (if known). Pre-1988 flooring exists in the 1965 side in the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> toilet and attendants areas on the lower floor: L139, L140, L141.1, L138, L154 the toilet and attendants areas on the main floor: M111, M118, M127 and |

Table 3. Consistency with Relevant Conservation Policies and Strategies

| Relevant Conservation Policies and Strategies | Consistency/Comment | OPH RESPONSE (addressing dot point 2 of additional information required by DEWHA on 19 August 2008) |
|---|--|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • all rooms and corridor on the upper floor <p>Pre-1988 flooring exists in the 1940s side in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • offices L100, L84, L85 • the north and west stairwell to all floors • offices M77, M78 • all rooms and corridor on the upper floor <p>The contemporary flooring for carpets are proposed to be carpet tiles, in order to reduce the impact of installation on the building and to allow for easy future installation or broadloom or Axminster carpet if required. The rationale for using modern carpet tiles is based on the intended use of the spaces and the OPH interpretation approach. In order to clearly identify to staff and visitors the heritage and new elements of the spaces, a colour palette of grey, purple (aubergine) and orange will, and has been used throughout the building for new carpet. Grey will be the predominant colour for the Wing. This approach is consistent with the OPH Interpretation Plan and the following Policies in the HMP: 1.3.1, 1.4.1, 1.4.3, 1.5.5 and 1.9)."</p> |
| 1.16.1 Ground disturbance must be preceded by an archaeological assessment and, where archaeological potential is identified, carried out in accordance with the assessment’s recommendations for archaeological heritage management. | Consistent – it is understood the creation of an extended basement is to be subject to this strategy. | This will be implemented |
| 5 Existing and Future Uses Old Parliament House management must allow and facilitate only those uses of the place that are compatible with the heritage values of the place. | Consistent – the range of new uses seem consistent with the HMP. | |
| 6 Access, Security, Plant and Services Old Parliament House management must facilitate reasonable public access to the place and the movable heritage with full regard to the requirements to provide for public safety and security. | Consistent – access is proposed to the Main Floor spaces. | |
| 6.1.1 Public access to parts of Old Parliament House, and its movable heritage, is integral to conserving the heritage values of the place and must be facilitated consistent with the identified sensitivity to change, unless precluded by security or health and safety reasons. | Consistent – access is proposed to the Main Floor spaces. | |

| Table 3. Consistency with Relevant Conservation Policies and Strategies | | |
|---|---|---|
| Relevant Conservation Policies and Strategies | Consistency/Comment | OPH RESPONSE (addressing dot point 2 of additional information required by DEWHA on 19 August 2008) |
| 6.5.1 New and replacement plant and plant rooms must be accommodated in existing pre-1988 plant rooms, where this is feasible and where this does not adversely impact on the heritage values of those areas. | Partly consistent – the new plant room is not an existing pre-1988 plant room, but it is not feasible to use an existing plant room to provide mechanical services in this case. The new plant room can be created with minimal adverse impact on the existing room. | The three new plant rooms on the 1940s side were identified in the first referral (2008/3949). The proposal for an additional plant room on the upper floor of the 1940s side is based on further mechanical design advice by the mechanical consulting engineer NDY who identified that the level of environmental conditions for adaptive reuse of this space as offices would not be fully addressed unless a further plant room was used. |
| 6.5.2 Generally, accommodate new plant and plant rooms in areas identified as having a low sensitivity to change in this Heritage Management Plan where existing pre-1988 plant rooms cannot be utilised. | Consistent | |
| Heritage Study of the South East Wing | | |
| New and continuing uses compatible with significance Action 1 Develop proposals that maximise the compatible use of spaces in all sections of the South East Wing involving the following possible uses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • interpretation of original uses; • office accommodation; • meeting rooms or short-term function rooms (as individual or interlinked rooms); • exhibition spaces/gallery use preferably involving individual or interlinked rooms/minimal impact on the Wing; and • storage. | Consistent | |
| Conservation of Fabric | | |
| Action 2 In addition to the general conservation policies provided in the OPH Conservation Management Plan (2000), particular aspects or features of the Wing deserving conservation include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the overall form and extent of the Wing as it evolved to 1988, including the courtyard, which partly demonstrates the manner in which the building grew and its final form when occupied by the Parliament; • representative examples of backbencher's, ministerial and staff accommodation, as they changed over time; • the overall form of the South East Wing; • the symmetrical façades, especially the east elevation; • its division into vertical bays, through the use of a breakfront design; • vestigial classical entablature, being the cornice; • simple external wall surfaces; • external wall bracket lights on the 1940s part of the Wing; • the internal moulded render skirtings, architraves and picture rails; • simply detailed and light coloured stained timberwork in the 1965 part; and • Room M74 in the 1943 part of the Wing with its special character related to dark stained, simply | Generally consistent – while examples of offices are to be conserved, it is not clear that examples 'as they changed over time' will be adequately represented. | All of the particular features outlined will be conserved. The one exception is dot point 2. Representative examples of backbencher's, ministerial and staff accommodation will be conserved based on their 1988 fabric. However, representing them as they changed over time will require substantial additional research and interpretation. This will be addressed at a later date. |

| Table 3. Consistency with Relevant Conservation Policies and Strategies | | |
|---|---|---|
| Relevant Conservation Policies and Strategies | Consistency/Comment | OPH RESPONSE (addressing dot point 2 of additional information required by DEWHA on 19 August 2008) |
| detailed timberwork and the suspended ceiling light diffuser. | | |
| Action 3 Undertake conservation works to address the issues identified in Appendix 1. | Not clear given the state of documentation currently available. | A full comparison has been undertaken by OPH. In summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – For the 1940s side, this Appendix was examined during the Conservation Assessment undertaken in 2007 (see Attachment I of the Referral 2008/4325). – All works outlined for the exterior, including the courtyard garden will be undertaken. – On the 1965 side, unless impacted upon by the referrals such as the removal of asbestos contaminated ceilings and the upgrading of the toilets, the work will be undertaken. |
| Action 4 The consequences of internal and external wall/render cracking should be investigated by a structural engineer. | Consistent – a structural engineer is to advise on this aspect. | Structural engineering advice will be sought. |
| Access to the Wing | | |
| Action 7 A detailed study should be undertaken to identify any access issues for people with disabilities, and it should consider solutions which minimise impact on the significance of the Wing. | Consistent | |
| Action 8 Fire egress from the southern end of the Wing should be further investigated and solutions which minimise impact on significance considered. | Consistent | |
| Retention of current and redundant Building Services Action 9 Examples of current or redundant services that should be retained include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • radiators, if in the future they cannot be maintained in operation; • division bells and lights; and • clocks. | Consistent | |
| Upgrading or Replacement of Services Action 10 Depending on the proposed use of the Wing, upgrade or replace the following services to achieve a reasonable contemporary standard, achieved with careful regard for the heritage significance of the Wing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • electrical; • lighting; • data; • fire/emergency; and • airconditioning. <p>As necessary, such upgrading should be preceded by appropriate professional assessments/studies.</p> <p>Specific issues related to fire services/protection include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • replacing substandard sprinkler heads; • upgrading of fire mains; • relocating the fire valve set; • installing fire doors between the North Wing and the Southeast Wing; and </p> | Consistent With regard to the window fan coil units (airconditioners), these were considered as part of the Stage 1 referral. | |

Table 3. Consistency with Relevant Conservation Policies and Strategies

| Relevant Conservation Policies and Strategies | Consistency/Comment | OPH RESPONSE (addressing dot point 2 of additional information required by DEWHA on 19 August 2008) |
|---|---------------------|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • fire isolation of the upper floor of the Wing from the South Wing. <p>Retain the decommissioned window fan coil units (airconditioners) unless;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there are strong reasons for their removal; • a survey of building services has been undertaken to identify services of heritage significance, and this survey finds that the airconditioners to be of no significance; • the fate of these airconditioners is considered in the context of the other examples of such airconditioners in OPH, including the question of retaining at least a sample. | | |

Comments on the Proposed Works

Refer to Appendix C for the full details of the works.

| Table 4. Comments on the Proposed Works | | |
|---|---|--|
| Proposed Works | Comments | OPH RESPONSE (addressing dot point 1 of additional information required by DEWHA on 19 August 2008) |
| 1940s Wing | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> adaptation of doors where necessary for functional requirements ie. air-conditioning and security - this may involve removal of the sound attenuator from the inside face of the door to allow sufficient airflow through the existing return air grille in the door; | <p>While probably an acceptable adaptation if needed, ideally the attenuators would be retained. At the least an effort should be made to retain samples in situ.</p> | <p>This statement from the referral was revised after the HIS was finalised. The statement on page 7 of the referral reads:</p> <p>"Wherever feasible existing doors will be retained in-situ, and adapted to suit any new functional requirements of the building. If an existing door cannot be adapted for re-use, where no representative sample of that type of door exists, it will be removed to storage, and a new door will be installed in its place."</p> <p>Mechanical design advice provided by NDY Consulting engineers on the airflow capacity retaining the attenuators indicated that appropriate conditions will not be possible if all the attenuators remain insitu.</p> <p>The attenuators will be retained in the following rooms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> L95, L100 M63, M73, M77 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> refurbishing rooms may entail not reinstating all fixed joinery or plumbing fittings, the proportion is unclear, items not reinstated to be stored; | <p>Maximising the extent of reinstatement would obviously be highly desirable.</p> | <p>As outlined in the referral pg 7,</p> <p>"All built-in joinery will remain insitu. Where it is not feasible or consistent with the use of the space, the hydraulics will be disconnected and capped. Where required for functional use, new joinery will be inserted over the existing. This will be done in such a manner that will allow the future removal of any new joinery in order to display the original built-ins."</p> <p>The plumbing in M112 and M123 will require capping.</p> <p>An independent OHS assessment has been undertaken by Eric Martin and Associates noted that the majority of the fixed joinery was found to be a potential risk. If in order to adaptively reuse a space as outlined in the design the joinery is a potential OHS risk, such as overhead bookshelf units, the joinery will be relocated within the space or the location will be made evident by a "tell tale" marking.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> installation of new service shrouds in all office spaces; | <p>In the 1940s wing, if such shrouds are the least impact means of introducing services, it would be preferable to design these to have minimal impact/intrusiveness in the rooms including design, finish and</p> | <p>In Part 3 of the Referral it outlines that: This new element will be a simple folded metal tray, suspended below the existing plaster ceiling, which will conceal all the services cabling and pipe work required for each room (refer Attachment D for sketch). This element will</p> |

Table 4. Comments on the Proposed Works

| Proposed Works | Comments | OPH RESPONSE (addressing dot point 1 of additional information required by DEWHA on 19 August 2008) |
|--|---|--|
| | location. It is noted this is the design intent. | <p>also provide a surface to mount any new components that are part of the building services upgrade including smoke detectors, fire sprinklers, motion detectors, emergency speakers and thermostats.</p> <p>The Referral notes the re-orientation of some of the lights in a small number of rooms will help to conserve the ceilings facilitate the installation of the shroud which will minimise potential future cumulative impact if additional services are required to be installed. This is noted as the design intent by the HIS consultant.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> using more robust finishes/fittings (eg. door hinges); | <p>In principle, if there is a substantive problem then it may be possible to use more robust finishes/ fittings, designed for minimal impact. Have the problems been documented?</p> | <p>The wording in the Referral has been updated. It now reads as follows.</p> <p>“Wherever feasible existing doors will be retained in-situ, and adapted to suit any new functional requirements of the building. For example, the swing of some doors will be changed to meet code requirements an all floors as shown in Attachment C of the Referral. All other rooms will be assessed on a case by case basis. Unless required for safety or security, this will not be undertaken in other rooms. If an existing door cannot be adapted for re-use, where no representative sample of that type of door exists, it will be removed to storage, and a new door will be installed in its place. Attenuators will be retained in L95, L100, M63, M73, M77.</p> <p>On the main floor, 1965 section, it is proposed to remove the doors facing the corridor to rooms M113 to M123 and replace with fixed glazed panels in a manner that will not preclude the original doors from being reinstated in the future, as the original doors will be placed into storage. The glass panels have been presented by the designer as the most effective solution for these spaces. As the public are allowed onto the main floor, this solution is to allow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a secure boundary between the corridor and the APMC reading room, both physically and acoustically, - natural light into the APMC and to create a visual connection between the reading room and the courtyard, - an opportunity for the public visitor to OPH to observe the functions of the building in action, <p>On the main floor, 1965 section, the doors to following rooms will remain in place: M124, M125, M128, M129, and M130. Extensive design development has been undertaken to increase light, and meet the functional requirements for the APMC.</p> <p>On the upper floor, it is proposed that the doors</p> |

| Table 4. Comments on the Proposed Works | | |
|--|---|---|
| Proposed Works | Comments | OPH RESPONSE (addressing dot point 1 of additional information required by DEWHA on 19 August 2008) |
| | | to rooms U100-U107 and U120 to U127 will be removed." |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a selection of rooms are to be restored; double glazing to be installed; | <p>Supported</p> <p>The objective to achieve double glazing deserves to be re-thought if this will involve substantial change to the look and fabric of the windows, as seems likely. Generic environmental objectives should not prejudice heritage outcomes.</p> <p>It is noted that OPH will only install double glazing if it can be done so within the existing window envelope, and with no or minimal impact on the existing visual character.</p> | <p>Double glazing was withdrawn from the scope after the HIS was received. Code compliant single pane glazing will be installed within the existing heritage window frames of all non compliant windows.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> repainting to match known 1988 scheme; | <p>Supported</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> pre-1988 carpets to be re-used where possible, or replicas, but only in rooms to be fully reconstructed – other rooms (the majority of the wing) will have modern carpet tiles of a contemporary design; | <p>The general approach of re-using carpet where possible, or replicas, is supported.</p> <p>While the rationale for the modern carpet tiles is understood, it is suggested the general policy approach should be reviewed in favour of a stronger reconstruction approach.</p> | <p>The relevant text in the referral document has been revised and now reads:</p> <p>"As set out in Referral 2008-3949, where feasible, the floor coverings will be relaid. If, due to the condition of the floor covering, the intended use will involve high traffic loads, or the pre-1988 flooring has been removed and no physical evidence exists or known documentation provides information on the type of floor covering that was in place pre-1988, a contemporary flooring will be used. In these circumstances, a representative sample (100x100mm) will be relaid in each room/area (if known). Pre-1988 flooring exists in the 1965 side in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> toilet and attendants areas on the lower floor: L139, L140, L141.1, L138, L154 the toilet and attendants areas on the main floor: M111, M118, M127 and all rooms and corridor on the upper floor <p>Pre-1988 flooring exists in the 1940s side in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> offices L100, L84, L85 the north and west stairwell to all floors offices M77, M78 all rooms and corridor on the upper floor <p>The contemporary flooring for carpets are proposed to be carpet tiles, in order to reduce the impact of installation on the building and to allow for easy future installation or broadloom or Axminster carpet if required. The rationale for using modern carpet tiles is based on the intended use of the spaces and the OPH interpretation approach. In order to clearly identify to staff and visitors the heritage and new</p> |

Table 4. Comments on the Proposed Works

| Proposed Works | Comments | OPH RESPONSE (addressing dot point 1 of additional information required by DEWHA on 19 August 2008) |
|---|---|--|
| | | elements of the spaces, a colour palette of grey, purple (aubergine) and orange will, and has been used throughout the building for new carpet. Grey will be the predominant colour for the Wing. This approach is consistent with the OPH Interpretation Plan and the following Policies in the HMP: 1.3.1, 1.4.1, 1.4.3, 1.5.5 and 1.9.” |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the plaster ceiling tiles in the corridors are proposed to be replaced with a new lightweight, suspended metal tile ceiling. The existing plaster tiles are somewhat damaged, and will be stored for later reinstatement, if required for interpretation; | <p>It is noted this is an issue which has been investigated extensively at OPH in the past, and that any attempt to alter the existing tiles will cause them to deteriorate.</p> <p>None the less, it is suggested an additional option be explored - to attach the existing tiles as a veneer to a new frame or panel, not relying on the structural capacity of the existing tiles.</p> | <p>Further investigation since the first referral resulted in advice that attempts to fix or attach the existing plaster tiles will result in the deterioration of the tiles.</p> <p>The mechanical services design for this part of the wing has consolidated services to the corridors. This is one of a number of mitigation strategies to conserve the room ceilings.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the external wall bracket lights will be refurbished and retained in-situ. Works include rewiring, re-lamping and painting | Supported | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> existing radiators in offices will be removed and those in corridors will be disconnected but left in place; | <p>It is noted the radiators in the rooms preclude the maximum use of many of the spaces, and significantly reduce the overall office population. None the less, ideally the radiators would be left in place.</p> <p>It is also noted the boilers which feed the radiator loops are in poor condition and do not have the capacity to add the SE wing. None the less, this might be an argument to replace or augment the boilers, and to use the radiators for heating.</p> <p>The discarding of all but a representative sample would appear to prejudice future conservation options.</p> | <p>Mechanical design advice provided by NDY Consulting engineers on the environmental conditions for the adaptive reuse of the Wing as offices, as well as the design requirements to maximise energy efficiencies to the House’s operations could not justify the recommissioning and use the existing radiators as part of the mechanical solution.</p> <p>There is a recommissioned working circuit of radiators in the North Wing main and lower floor corridors and Kings Hall.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> refix floorboards in rooms, replace corridor access panels to match existing; | Supported | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lower Floor - a new chairlift and removal of walls to allow installation; | As an adaptation for disabled access this relatively minor work seems acceptable. | The chair lift will be installed within the structure of the existing room (L82), requiring a new penetration on the East wall as noted on the plan at Attachment C of the referral. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lower Floor - a new entry door into the courtyard (actually the reconstruction of a former door); | If possible, this should not be undertaken and existing doors should be used. It is noted this is a BCA issue. | As revised in Section 3 of the Referral, it has been determined that modifications to room L95 to create an external doorway to the courtyard is no longer required. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lower Floor - a new fire stair on the south of the wing; | As an adaptation for fire safety this relatively minor work seems acceptable. It is understood the stair would not rise above the plinth, and | The new fire stair will be installed in the 1965 side of the Wing. This aspect was covered by the initial referral (2008/3949). Additional information was provided in this referral (2008/4325). Since |

| Table 4. Comments on the Proposed Works | | |
|---|--|---|
| Proposed Works | Comments | OPH RESPONSE (addressing dot point 1 of additional information required by DEWHA on 19 August 2008) |
| | will be detailed to be unobtrusive. | then, design has determined the code compliant approach be to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> run the required fire stairs parallel with the eastern face of the Wing (see revised plan at Attachment C and visual representation at Attachment D of the referral) construct concrete stairs with a powder coated/steel railing to match the exterior face of the building. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upper Floor - conversion of an additional room for plant services | As an adaptation for mechanical services in the wing this relatively minor work seems acceptable. It is understood the glazed walls of the room will be left and the glass made opaque/obscure. | The glazed walls will remain insitu and will be made opaque. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of the works identified in the Conservation Works report to the extent possible given other changes | OPH has instructed the design architects to implement as many of the recommended works as possible, given the overall objective of achieving a functional and durable office environment. At this stage, it is not clear how much of the recommended works will be possible to undertake. It is desirable to maximise the implementation of the recommended works. | The works identified by Conservation Works that will be undertaken are outlined in a new attachment to the Referral (Attachment I). |
| 1960s Wing | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> refurbishing rooms may entail not reinstating all fixed joinery or plumbing fittings, the proportion is unclear, items not reinstated to be stored; | Maximising the extent of reinstatement would obviously be highly desirable. | <p>The text in the Referral has been revised and now reads:</p> <p>"All fixed joinery such as pinboards and bookshelves will be removed from the Wing to protect it during asbestos removal and construction works. It will be labelled and stored as per the requirements of the OPH HMP. Where feasible, it will be re-instated into its original location. Fixed joinery in the following rooms will not be reinstated:</p> <p>Lower floor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> former services panel in north corridor <p>Main floor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> M110, M112, M114, M117, M118, M123, M120, and the former services panel in north corridor <p>Upper floor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> U115, U116 (covered by referral 2008/3949) U98, U103, U104, U105, U111, U112, U121, U122, U123, U124, U125, U126, U129 and the former services panel in north corridor <p>All rooms and all joinery units have been documented through the Wing measured draw and digital images."</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> using more robust finishes/fittings (eg. door hinges); | In principle, if there is a substantive problem then it may be possible to | The wording in the Referral has been updated. It now reads as follows. |

Table 4. Comments on the Proposed Works

| Proposed Works | Comments | OPH RESPONSE (addressing dot point 1 of additional information required by DEWHA on 19 August 2008) |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>use more robust finishes/ fittings, designed for minimal impact. Have the problems been documented?</p> | <p>"Wherever feasible existing doors will be retained in-situ, and adapted to suit any new functional requirements of the building. For example, the swing of some doors will be changed to meet code requirements on all floors as shown in Attachment C of the Referral. All other rooms will be assessed on a case by case basis. Unless required for safety or security, this will not be undertaken in other rooms. If an existing door cannot be adapted for re-use, where no representative sample of that type of door exists, it will be removed to storage, and a new door will be installed in its place. Attenuators will be retained in L95, L100, M63, M73, and M77.</p> <p>On the main floor, 1965 section, it is proposed to remove the doors facing the corridor to rooms M113 to M123 and replace with fixed glazed panels in a manner that will not preclude the original doors from being reinstated in the future, as the original doors will be placed into storage. The glass panels have been presented by the designer as the most effective solution for these spaces. As the public are allowed onto the main floor, this solution is to allow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a secure boundary between the corridor and the APMC reading room, both physically and acoustically, - natural light into the APMC and to create a visual connection between the reading room and the courtyard, - an opportunity for the public visitor to OPH to observe the functions of the building in action, <p>On the main floor, 1965 section, the doors to the following rooms will remain in place: M124, M125, M128, M129, and M130. Extensive design development has been undertaken to increase light, and meet the functional requirements for the APMC.</p> <p>On the upper floor, it is proposed that the doors to rooms U102-U107 and U120 to U125 will be removed."</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a selection of rooms are to be restored | <p>Supported</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • double glazing to be installed; | <p>The objective to achieve double glazing deserves to be re-thought if this will involve substantial change to the look and fabric of the windows. It may be possible to achieve double glazing in this wing however, the detailing needs to be reviewed to assess the impact.</p> <p>Generic environmental objectives should not prejudice heritage</p> | <p>Double glazing was withdrawn from the scope after the HIS was received. Code compliant single pane glazing will be installed within the existing heritage window frames of all non compliant windows. The Referral has been updated to reflect this.</p> |

| Table 4. Comments on the Proposed Works | | |
|--|--|--|
| Proposed Works | Comments | OPH RESPONSE (addressing dot point 1 of additional information required by DEWHA on 19 August 2008) |
| | <p>outcomes.</p> <p>It is noted that OPH will only install double glazing if it can be done so within the existing window envelope, and with no or minimal impact on the existing visual character.</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> lift car to be replaced; | <p>In general, replacement of the machinery/ structure of the lift car is acceptable adaptation. While the intent is to provide a contemporary design fitout, it is arguable that the finishes should be restored/reconstructed.</p> | <p>The lift has reached the end of its serviceable life and is being replaced as part of this project.</p> <p>New finished must be used as the lift car will be replaced. However, they will be consistent with the OPH HMP and the OPH Interpretation Plan approach.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> former service risers to be removed or modified, new service risers and doors to be installed, toilet entries to be modified; | <p>While probably acceptable adaptation, it would be preferable to retain the former service risers on all floors at the north end of the wing, even if these are not used.</p> <p>The new riser doors should blend into the wall and be as invisible as possible.</p> <p>Ideally the existing arrangement of the toilet entries would be kept.</p> | <p>The project design intent retains the existing location of the service risers and rationalises the existing space to increase the capacity for use.</p> <p>The design intent supports this position.</p> <p>This was investigated. In order to satisfy the adaptive reuse of the Wing code compliant access and toilets within the existing spaces was not able to be achieved by retaining the existing entries.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a new suspended ceiling of similar character and configuration to the existing will be installed (the Stage 1 referral proposed to install a replica); | Supported | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> pre-1988 carpets to be re-used where possible, or replicas, but only in rooms to be fully reconstructed – other rooms (the majority of the wing) will have modern carpet tiles of a contemporary design. In addition, a representative sample will be reinstated where feasible. In the Stage 1 referral these were to be re-laid where feasible, noting that only the Upper Floor has pre-1998 carpets; | <p>The general approach of re-using carpet where possible, or replicas, is supported.</p> <p>While the rationale for the modern carpet tiles is understood, and the suggestion of possible reinstatement of representative samples is appreciated, it is suggested the general policy approach should be reviewed in favour of a stronger reconstruction approach.</p> | <p>The relevant text in the referral document has been revised and now reads:</p> <p>“As set out in Referral 2008-3949, where feasible, the floor coverings will be relaid. If, due to the condition of the floor covering, the intended use will involve high traffic loads, or the pre-1988 flooring has been removed and no physical evidence exists or known documentation provides information on the type of floor covering that was in place pre-1988, a contemporary flooring will be used. In these circumstances, a representative sample (100x100mm) will be relaid in each room/area (if known).</p> <p>Pre-1988 flooring exists in the 1965 side in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> toilet and attendants areas on the lower floor: L139, L140, L141.1, L138, L154 the toilet and attendants areas on the main floor: M111, M118, M127 and all rooms and corridor on the upper floor <p>Pre-1988 flooring exists in the 1940s side in the following areas:</p> |

Table 4. Comments on the Proposed Works

| Proposed Works | Comments | OPH RESPONSE (addressing dot point 1 of additional information required by DEWHA on 19 August 2008) |
|--|--|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • offices L100, L84, L85 • the north and west stairwell to all floors • offices M77, M78 • all rooms and corridor on the upper floor <p>The contemporary flooring for carpets are proposed to be carpet tiles, in order to reduce the impact of installation on the building and to allow for easy future installation or broadloom or Axminster carpet if required. The rationale for using modern carpet tiles is based on the intended use of the spaces and the OPH interpretation approach. In order to clearly identify to staff and visitors the heritage and new elements of the spaces, a colour palette of grey, purple (aubergine) and orange will, and has been used throughout the building for new carpet. Grey will be the predominant colour for the Wing. This approach is consistent with the OPH Interpretation Plan and the following Policies in the HMP: 1.3.1, 1.4.1, 1.4.3, 1.5.5 and 1.9)."</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basement – excavation of a larger basement; | <p>Acceptable adaptation – refer to comments elsewhere about the need to comply with the HMP strategy regarding archaeological issues.</p> | <p>Further investigation has been undertaken after the HIS was received and it has been determined that basement excavation is not required. This has been removed from the scope outlined in the Referral.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower Floor – modification to door at north end of the courtyard; | <p>While probably a minor and acceptable adaptation, ideally no change would be made.</p> | <p>The plan at Attachment C of the Referral notes proposed modifications to the existing door at the North end to comply with code requirements. The modification will entail adjusting the width to the egress to satisfy BCA compliance requirements. The Referral has been updated to reflect this.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower Floor – new operable wall to divide L155; | <p>While probably a minor and acceptable adaptation, ideally no change would be made.</p> | <p>Further investigation has been undertaken after the HIS was received and it has been determined that operable wall is not required. This has been noted in the Referral.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main Floor - removal of sections of internal cross walls to suit new uses; | <p>Ideally, such removals would be avoided or further minimised.</p> <p>It is noted most of the wall changes are actually wall penetrations or partial wall removal only.</p> | <p>Extensive design development has been undertaken to reduce the requirement for wall penetrations whilst achieving the functional requirements for the APMC.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main Floor – removal and storage of doors for the installation of glass doors to the corridor to enable views into the APMC; | <p>It is understood a secure environment is sought for the APMC. Ideally, glass panels would not be used at all, and the existing doors would be left in place. While it is noted that the panels will allow daylight into the APMC from the west (there are also windows to the east), why not limit the number of panels such that about half the doors remain in place?</p> | <p>The doors to the following rooms will remain in place: M124, M125, M128, M129, and M130. This has been noted in the Referral.</p> <p>Extensive design development has been undertaken to increase light, and meet the functional requirements for the APMC. The glass panels have been presented by the designer as the most effective solution for these spaces.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main and Upper Floors - removal of a section of corridor wall; | <p>Ideally, such removals would be avoided or further minimised. Where walls are removed, telltale indicators will be left in the fabric to</p> | <p>As part of the adaptive reuse of this area, the design requires the walls constituting U98 and U99 will be removed in order to expand the entrance.</p> |

Table 4. Comments on the Proposed Works

| Proposed Works | Comments | OPH RESPONSE (addressing dot point 1 of additional information required by DEWHA on 19 August 2008) |
|---|--|--|
| | indicate the former presence of the wall. | <p>The removal of the wall to M112 and the walls constituting the attendants booth (M110) on the Main Floor have been presented by the designer as the most appropriate solution for creating an inviting and light filled entrance to the APMC.</p> <p>The adopted mitigating strategies here is that an attendants booth will be retained on the lower floor and 'telltale' indicators will be left in the fabric to indicate the former presence of the wall.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Main and Upper Floors – removal of security/attendant station; | Ideally, the stations would be kept – even adapted if necessary. | See comments above |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upper Floor – internal cross wall removals, contrary to the Stage 1 referral, a different pattern of wall removals is now proposed, involving the removal of more fixed joinery as a consequence; | Ideally, such removals would be avoided or further minimised. Where walls are removed, telltale indicators will be left in the fabric to indicate the former presence of the wall. | On further examination of the office configuration of the Upper Floor, contemporary functional use can only be achieved if the proposed wall removal occurs. Telltale indicators will be left in the fabric to indicate the former presence of the wall. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upper Floor – the wall dividing U111 and U112 is to be removed and an operable wall installed. | Ideally, this change would not be undertaken. | Further investigation has been undertaken after the HIS was received and it has been determined that operable wall is not required. However, it is still proposed that the wall is removed to provide an appropriate amount of usable meeting space on the upper floor. Telltale indicators will be left in the fabric to indicate the former presence of the wall. |
| General | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> all new work is to be reversible, if possible | Supported | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the courtyard will require some works to the underground sewerage pipes. After the hydraulic rectification works, the courtyard will be refurbished as per the recommendations in the South East Wing Courtyard Garden Heritage Analysis 2007 by Godden Mackay Logan. Essentially there will be no change to the configuration of the courtyard, and mainly the works will be of a horticultural nature | <p>Generally supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> any excavation work should be kept to the minimum possible disturbance of mature trees or shrubs should be minimised advice of an expert arborist/horticulturalist should be sought if mature trees or shrubs are to be disturbed <p>It is noted a horticulturalist will be engaged to provide advice on the implementation of the 2007 Courtyard Garden Heritage Study.</p> | All work was covered in the initial referral (2008/3949). It will be undertaken in accordance with the South East Wing Courtyard Garden Heritage Analysis 2007 by Godden Mackay Logan. A horticultural firm has been engaged to provide advice and undertake necessary work. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the roof is to be replaced with a new metal deck roof of similar profile | Supported | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> new lighting for the new egress point | Acceptable adaptation – though needing careful design to achieve minimal impact. | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> replacement of window glass | Acceptable adaptation. | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> changes to the stairs, including handrails | Acceptable adaptation – it is noted the 1940s handrails will be retained and modified by the addition of a new handrail above. While it is | Due to current code requirements, the 1960s stairs require modification. Expert advice on fire and access compliance was sought and the design intent reflects this advice. |

Table 4. Comments on the Proposed Works

| Proposed Works | Comments | OPH RESPONSE (addressing dot point 1 of additional information required by DEWHA on 19 August 2008) |
|---|--|--|
| | understood the 1960s handrails cannot be modified to suit, perhaps further review might develop better options. | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> walls and ceiling will be repainted, and stained timberwork re-finished to the shade as at 1988 | While repainting is supported: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> any significant wall marks, graffiti or other features should not be over-painted the colours chosen will be based on a historical scheme generally as at 1988, following research into the actual colours used, unless there are strong reasons otherwise | Paint analysis will be undertaken to ascertain the correct 1988 colour scheme for each side. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> window treatments will be refurbished and reinstated, or new treatments installed | Supported, except new treatments should be reconstructions. | New treatments will be reconstructions where feasible. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> retention of examples of current or redundant services including radiators, division bells, lights, safe in M130 and clocks | Supported – although retention of all such services would be preferred, in particular retention in situ, not just in storage. | Where feasible, services will be retained in-situ as stated above. All clocks will be retained, the safe in M130 retained and redundant corridor radiators retained. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> prior to the refurbishment, minor items on existing walls such as speakers, switches, controls will generally be removed and stored. These will be reinstated once the refurbishment is complete. | Supported | |

Other Comments

An ongoing issue for Old Parliament House is that of cumulative impacts – the overall impact of many small changes, as well as some quite large changes made over time. What will OPH look like in 20 years or 50 years? How intact will it be?

Despite the existence of various conservation documents, the last 20 years since Parliament left the building there have seen numerous changes. In some cases, OPH is now re-working changes made in that period.

The current works should not be considered in isolation. This is made clear by comparing the situation of the Southeast Wing with the Southwest Wing. At one stage both wings were relatively intact and able to portray their part in the overall story of the place. Changes to the Southwest Wing have substantially reduced this capacity.

OPH needs to be very careful about cumulative impacts.

CONCLUSIONS

A key consideration must be the Significant Impact Guidelines used by the Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts. In particular,

‘Is there a real chance or possibility that the action will:

- permanently destroy, remove or substantially alter the fabric (physical material including structural elements and other components, fixtures, contents, and objects) of a heritage place...’ (DEH 2006, p. 18)

Having considered the proposed works to the Southeast Wing, it is concluded that:

- in a general sense, the proposals will have a **minor impact** through the loss of evidence related to parliamentary use. This evidence includes changes to room forms by the partial or complete removal of internal walls, loss of some rooms (security/attendant stations), changes of use (one room is to become a plant room), and some loss of fixed joinery and plumbing fittings. Other evidence will be concealed by new fittings, which may be removed in future;
- it is noted samples of some types of rooms are to be fully conserved, and otherwise interpretation may mitigate these impacts;
- there will be a **minor impact** relating to the former ministerial offices in the wing, especially on the Main Floor;
- there will be a **minor impact** because the changes will have an impact on the internal fabric, involving some loss of evidence of the everyday use;
- there will be a **moderate to high impact** because the extensive and relatively intact evidence of the accommodation provided for Members and Ministers at various periods, and the working conditions of parliamentarians and staff over the period 1943-88, being a National Heritage value, will be substantially modified. This value also relates partly to the Southwest Wing which has already been substantially modified in recent years. Arguably, the loss of value in the Southwest Wing increases the value of the Southeast Wing;
- there will be a **moderate impact** given the known and potential change in character of many rooms, especially the former ministerial offices, or the offices of those that became Ministers or otherwise achieved prominence;

- there will be a **minor to moderate impact** relating to the Members offices on the Upper Floor;
- in terms of the OPH HMP Zone Statement of Intent and Objectives, the proposed works are **partly consistent**; and
- in terms of the relevant conservation policies and strategies, the proposed works **range from not fully consistent through to consistent**. In addition, a number of matters are **not yet clear** in terms of consistency.

On this basis, it is apparent these impacts may well be considered to be a significant impact within the meaning of the *Environment Protection & Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*. It is noted that Old Parliament House intends to make a referral of the works under the Act.

The term *significant impact* is the key phrase within the Act which triggers the need for a referral. Section 28 of the Act states,

The Commonwealth or a Commonwealth agency must not take inside or outside the Australian jurisdiction an action that has, will have or is likely to have a significant impact on the environment...

This phrase is explained in the Significant Impact Guidelines noted above. However, the action may be taken with an approval from the Minister for the Environment, Heritage and the Arts, and this can be sought by making a referral under the Act.

In addition, these impacts do seem to constitute *adverse impacts* within the meaning of the Act, and certain obligations arise under section 341ZC.

A Commonwealth agency must not take an action that has, will have or is likely to have an adverse impact on the National Heritage values of a National Heritage place or the Commonwealth Heritage values of a Commonwealth Heritage place, unless:

- (a) there is no feasible and prudent alternative to taking the action; and
- (b) all measures that can reasonably be taken to mitigate the impact of the action on those values are taken.

This obligation exists independently of Section 28, and the purpose is to avoid or at least minimise any adverse impacts. It does not necessarily trigger a referral, because the adverse impact would also have to be a significant impact. It is understood the difference between these two phrases, adverse impact and significant impact, is a difference of degree. You may have adverse impacts which are quite small or minor but not necessarily significant. In the case of the current proposals, the impacts appear to be both adverse and significant.

Accordingly, OPH is also obliged to meet the requirements of section 341ZC. It is noted OPH has outlined the operational and functional requirements for the proposed actions, and developed measures to avoid or reduce adverse impacts.

Further options that might be worth considering to improve the conservation outcomes, if they have not already been considered, include those mentioned in Table 4 above.

The design of the works have evolved to try to avoid or at least minimise impacts, consistent with obligations under section 341ZC of the EPBC Act. This includes the mitigation measures.

APPENDIX A.1: HERITAGE VALUES

Old Parliament House

The following text is the official National Heritage and Commonwealth Heritage values of Old Parliament House. Tangible attributes, that is fabric, are shown underlined and this is drawn from the OPH Heritage Management Plan.



Criterion A—Events, Processes

National Heritage Values

Old Parliament House as the Provisional Parliament House was the first purpose-built home for the Australian Parliament. It was central to the development of Australia as a nation from its opening in 1927 until the opening of the new Parliament House in 1988 and demonstrates Australia's [parliamentary] political process.

Old Parliament House is a site that has provided a physical focus for events that reflect Australian democratic values, and political and social rights. It also stands for the right to argue and dissent, and reflects the orderly succession of governments through the democratic process, as reflected by the seven changes of government that took place during the years in which Parliament sat in the building.

The building set the pattern of combining the functions of the executive arm of government and the legislative function in the one building. This commenced with the provision of ministerial offices at the design stage followed by Prime Minister James Scullin moving Cabinet meetings into the building in 1930-31. These actions initiated the major expansion of the building to house both the legislative and executive functions of government, a pattern that continued in the design of Parliament House.

The North Wing has historic importance as the main venue for parliamentary functions from 1927-88. The Senate Chamber, House of Representatives Chamber, and King's Hall are highly significant as venues for the debates, petitions and votes associated with 61 years of Australian legislature.

Old Parliament House is an important place in the story of the creation of the Australian democracy and has associations with several related defining events. Landmark political events associated with the building included legislation in 1942 adopting the Statute of Westminster 1931 and the declaration of War in 1941. The building was also the place of 61 years of national legislation shaping Australian society, the extension of the voting age to 18 year olds in 1973, and the establishment of new political parties such as the Democratic Labor Party in 1950s, the Australian Democrats in 1977 and the Liberal Party of Australia in 1944-45.

Old Parliament House saw the growth of Commonwealth responsibility for Aboriginal affairs. Key events included the Bark Petition sent by the Yirrkala community to the House of Representatives in August 1963 protesting bauxite mining in Arnhem Land, and the Referendum in 1967 that overwhelmingly supported Commonwealth power to legislate for Aboriginal people. Amongst other developments, the Referendum result led to the Aboriginal Land Rights (Northern Territory) Act 1976, proclaimed on Australia Day 1977. With the new responsibilities arising from the 1967 Referendum, the Commonwealth Parliament became the focus of Aboriginal political protest. The siting of the Aboriginal Tent Embassy outside Parliament House in 1972 was a part of this protest.

The front façade of Old Parliament House and the immediate grassed area to its north have been the scene of numerous events, gatherings, protests and demonstrations. Significant events included the formal opening of the Provisional Parliament House in 1927 and the address by the former Prime Minister, Gough Whitlam, on the front steps of the building after his dismissal by the Governor-General, Sir John Kerr, in November 1975.

Old Parliament House, in particular King's Hall and Chambers, has been the venue of important ceremonial events including the public mourning for the deaths of Prime Minister John Curtin in 1945 and former Prime Minister Ben Chifley in 1951; state receptions held in honour of Queen Elizabeth II in 1954 and 1963; and events associated with Royal visits in 1927, 1935, 1945, 1954, 1963, 1974 and 1977.

Old Parliament House has a richness of internal fabric and collections that convey the way in which

parliamentary functions were conducted and the everyday use of the building. In particular these features include the purpose-designed furniture and furnishings that maintained their original setting and purpose for over sixty years.

King's Hall and the Chambers have features that reflect both the austerity of the time and a dignified formality. These features include the decorative skylights, elegant pendant lights, and parquet flooring, as well as the high ceilings accentuated by the raked galleries, the timber wall panelling, and the extensive, restrained and subtle decoration. The Hall features bas-relief busts of prominent personalities (related to Federation, the judiciary and of the first Parliament in 1901) on its colonnades, and portraits of former Prime Ministers as well as a statue of King George V. The Chambers demonstrate (through their fabric, furnishing and objects) the growth of Parliament over 61 years, including the evolution of communications technology applied to the reporting of parliamentary debates and events to all Australians.

Significant furniture of Old Parliament House includes the John Smith Murdoch designed furniture and fittings; the HMAS Australia table; the Country Party Table (Murdoch's original cabinet table from West Block) and the Cabinet table (used by the Whitlam, Fraser and Hawke Cabinets). Furniture items which underlie the significance of Australia's role initially as a member of the British Empire and later as a member of the Commonwealth of Nations include the President of the Senate's Chair (presented by the Dominion of Canada) and the Speaker's Chair (presented by the United Kingdom Branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association). Furniture and fittings designed or purchased for the extension or alterations to the building, including those items associated with the Senate and House of Representative Wings and the President of the Senate and Prime Minister's suites are of particular value.

Old Parliament House has a rare record (documented in the Old Parliament House) which is made up of both furniture and a variety of documents related to the furniture. The documents include initial design concepts, specifications, quotes and detailed drawings for manufacture. The Old Parliament House Library is of heritage significance, in particular, the remaining features of the original library and the later additions or changes to the library up to and including the 1958 extension are of value.

Commonwealth Heritage Values

Australia's first Federal Parliament building was designed as the grandest element and central focus of a fully planned capital city. Old Parliament House is a place of outstanding heritage values related to its history, design, landscape context, interiors, furnishings, courtyards and gardens, collection of movable items, social values and associations.

As the original focus of the Commonwealth Parliament and Government in Canberra, Old Parliament House is intimately associated with the political history of Australia, and the development of Canberra as the capital of Australia, from its opening in 1927 until the opening of the new Parliament House in 1988. The Old Parliament House was the second home of the Parliament which was located in the Victorian Parliament House in Melbourne from Federation in 1901 until 1927, and was the first purpose-built home for the Australian Parliament.

Old Parliament House was the venue for and witnessed both the course and pattern of the nation's political, social and historical development through the major part of the life of the Commonwealth to date. The movable items associated with the building are also intimately associated with these events. Apart from serving as the seat of Commonwealth Parliament, the building bears witness to the physical encroachment of the executive arm of government into the legislature's proper sphere. This was the primary cause for the extensive additions and modifications that had to be made to the building. These additions and modifications are manifested in such elements as the southeast and southwest wings, the northeast and northwest front pavilions, and a great number of internal changes.

The relocation of the Parliament to Canberra was the focus of an intense period of development of the nation's capital. The opening of Parliament heralded the symbolic birth of Canberra as the capital. The intended importance of Old Parliament House is reflected in its design, its prominent siting in the landscape of the Parliamentary Triangle, and in the treatment of the areas around Old Parliament House, particularly the Senate and House of Representatives Gardens, and the National Rose Gardens.

Criterion B–Rarity

National Heritage Values

Old Parliament House is uncommon in that it housed both the legislative and executive functions of government. This is reflected in the construction of the House of Representatives (southeast) and the Senate (southwest) Wings, the front pavilions and in a great number of internal changes.

The House of Representatives Wing provides extensive and relatively intact evidence of the accommodation provided for Members and Ministers at various periods and the working conditions of parliamentarians and staff over the period 1943-88.

The former Members' Private Dining Room contains the remains of the 1927 hand-painted wall features. These decorative features are rare. They are the only examples of these features in the building and are also rare within the ACT.

There are important records of both furniture and its documentation relating to initial design concepts, specifications, quotes and detailed drawings for manufacture.

Commonwealth Heritage Values

Among parliamentary buildings in Australia and in other parts of the western world, Old Parliament House is an uncommon place in that it eventually housed both the legislative and executive functions of government.

Research carried out to date suggests that the furniture in Old Parliament House is part of a rare, intact surviving record comprising both furniture and documentation. The documentation (held by others) relates to initial design concepts, specifications, quotes and detailed drawings for manufacture of items.

Criterion C–Research

National Heritage Values

Old Parliament House has a significant collection of documents which are associated with the place. This collection is an important source of historical information. The documents include plans, photographs and files that are directly related to the design, construction, use, and alteration of the Chambers and King's Hall. An inventory of the collection is documented in Old Parliament House.

Criterion D–Principal characteristics of a class of places

National Heritage Values

Old Parliament House is a primary example of the Inter War Stripped Classical style of architecture. This style was dominant in Canberra's government architecture of the 1920s-1940s. It is also an example of how this style was varied in Canberra during the 1920s-1940s. This style variation was a major stylistic feature of Federal Capital Architecture in Canberra.

The Inter War Stripped Classical style of architecture was varied to include the influence of Garden City ideals. In the case of Old Parliament House, this included courtyards with loggias and pergolas, verandahs, internal courtyards and adjacent gardens. Despite these influences the central stylistic expression of the building remained its classical orderliness.

The characteristics of the building's style and their expression in Old Parliament House's exterior and interior, are due to the design work of the Commonwealth's first government architect, John Smith Murdoch. Murdoch's design is modest, embracing classical symmetry and forms, having balanced masses with projected bays with arched bronze framed windows. The architectural detail between the storeys (spandrels) also emphasises the verticality of the elevations.

Old Parliament House and its curtilage also forms the central feature of a precinct. This precinct includes the two Secretariat buildings (East and West Blocks), the Old Parliament House Gardens, Constitutional and Magna Carta Places and the National Rose Gardens. There is some commonality in the design of early buildings within this precinct. This precinct reflects a period when there was an increase in Commonwealth Government power and an increase in the public's interest in Canberra.

The essential character and symmetry of Old Parliament House have remained intact despite several substantial additions. The design of the building and its layout, its curtilage spaces and its interior rooms all demonstrate the customs and functions of the Commonwealth Parliament.

The building's Chambers reflect the roles of the House of Representatives and the Senate. The seating arrangements particularly indicate the formal and adversarial nature of debate. The Public and Press Galleries illustrate the nature of public and press access to formal Parliamentary processes. This access is further demonstrated by the spaces allocated to the recording of Parliamentary sittings. The presence of Executive Government staff indicate the major involvement of the Executive in the processes of Parliament in Australia.

The House of Representatives Wing comprises two blocks constructed in three phases: 1943, 1949 and 1965. The Senate Wing comprises two blocks and these were constructed in three phases: 1943, 1949 and 1972. These building Wings retain much of their internal layout and some fittings. They are an unusual physical record of the difficult working conditions of parliamentarians, staff and press representatives over the period 1943-88.

Early surviving interiors of the building include King's Hall, the Library, Senate Chamber, House of Representatives Chamber, Dining Rooms, Senate Opposition Party Room, Ministerial Party Room, Clerk of the Senate's Office, Member's Bar, Senate Government Party Room and Leader of the Government in the Senate's Office.

King's Hall and the Chambers are important for reflecting the austerity of the times and the building's style. The rooms tend to be simple spaces with little decoration and have subtle and repeated classical references. For example, the use of Greek key patterning is evident in the Chambers and in the external metal and rendered balustrades. Some of the rooms have a certain grandeur resulting from generously proportioned spaces with clerestory windows. The use of timber for wall or ceiling panelling and furniture also distinguishes some rooms. These variations in interior detail highlight the hierarchy of parliament.

The importance given to the Parliamentary Library as a source of information for Parliament is demonstrated by its position within the building. The key positional features are its location on the central axis of the building, its close proximity to both Chambers and its access to and from King's Hall. Its designated importance is also demonstrated by the design and fit-out of the Library rooms which feature extensive timber panelling and fittings. These fittings were normally reserved for high-status spaces such as the Chambers, the Party Rooms, and office holders' rooms.

The building is also of interest for surviving features consistent with, if not influenced by, Garden City ideals. These features include the courtyards with loggias and pergolas and the courtyards with verandahs. These features express aspects of the garden city principles and in particular the typical linking of internal spaces with the landscape setting. The adjacent Senate and House of Representatives gardens are a part of this landscape setting. These gardens have been substantially redeveloped but they contain the original garden layout.

Commonwealth Heritage Values

Old Parliament House is a good example of the Inter-War Stripped Classical style of architecture. The building reflects the embracing of classical symmetry and forms without the adoption of the full classical vocabulary and in this way it expresses a modest but refined architectural style. Key features of the style displayed by the building include: symmetrical facade, division into vertical bays indicating classical origins, vestigial classical entablature (being the horizontal decoration towards the top of the walls including the cornice), simple surfaces and spandrels (the panel between the top of a window on a lower level and the bottom of a window on a higher level) between storeys subdued to emphasise verticality.

The essential character and symmetry of Old Parliament House have remained intact despite several substantial additions. The design of the building and its spaces, and the movable items associated with its operations demonstrate the customs and functions of the Commonwealth Parliament. The divisions within Parliament and the hierarchical system of government are reflected in the categories and styles of both the rooms and furniture available to individuals of different status.

Criterion E–Aesthetic characteristics

National Heritage Values

Old Parliament House is an iconic national landmark that has a major role in the symbolic physical representation of democracy in the Parliamentary Triangle. This landmark importance has been strengthened by the setting and design of the new Parliament House building. These two buildings are read together as part of the land axis vista and they are also a part of the planned aesthetic qualities of the Parliamentary Triangle.

Old Parliament House is a major component of public and familiar views of Canberra. In particular, Old Parliament House is appreciated for its crisp lines, stark white colour, pronounced vertical patterns and classical form. It makes a major contribution as a viewpoint towards the Australian War Memorial and in the other direction to Parliament House. The building is highly valued by the Australian community. This value is reflected in the popularity of its image, as documented in countless tourist and other imagery. These popular images include those made since the construction of Parliament House, completed in 1988. These

post 1988 images of Old Parliament House are enhanced by the presence of Parliament House.

Commonwealth Heritage Values

The Old Parliament House is an important landmark in Canberra, Australia's national capital. It is part of the significant cultural landscape of the Parliamentary Triangle, partly reflecting Griffin's design which placed the Government Group of buildings in this corner of the Triangle. This scheme represents in physical form on the ground the conception of the principal components of parliamentary government - the legislative, executive and judicial - the strict separation of these components and the hierarchical relationship between them. Old Parliament House is highly significant as an integral part of this scheme and, standing near the apex of the Triangle, symbolises the primacy of parliament or the legislature over the other two components.

The building also occupies a prominent and strategic location at the southern end of the main Land Axis of Griffin's city design, and contributes to the planned aesthetic qualities of the Parliamentary Triangle. The axis is arguably the pivotal feature of the design. The Old Parliament House is one of four buildings sited on the axis. The other buildings being the Australian War Memorial, Anzac Hall and the current Parliament House. Accordingly, the Old Parliament House makes a major contribution as a viewpoint towards the Australian War Memorial which, together with the reverse view, are some of the most important views in the planned city. Its landmark status was recognised and enhanced by the design and siting of New Parliament House which integrated the building as part of the terminal feature of the North South vista along the Land Axis.

The success of the building in fulfilling this landmark role is due in part to its stark white colour and symmetry, its privileged siting on the Land Axis and the open landscaping between the building and the lake. The role of the Old Parliament House as a national icon is reinforced by its central location in the nation's capital.

Criterion F—Creative or technical achievement

National Heritage Values

Old Parliament House is a significant landmark in Canberra. It is a major component of Walter Burley Griffin's designed landscape of the Parliamentary Triangle which was designed to hold the principal components of parliamentary government. In particular the Griffin design sought to demonstrate the strict separation of the legislative, executive and judicial components of government and the hierarchical relationship between them. Old Parliament House demonstrates a high degree of achievement in combining built features into a designed landscape to achieve an aesthetic purpose.

Erected at the base of the former Camp Hill on the main Land Axis, Old Parliament House symbolised the primacy of Parliament (or the legislature) over the executive arm of government. In this way the building contributed to the planned democracy symbolism of the Parliamentary Triangle now fulfilled with the construction of Parliament House on Capital Hill. This new Parliament House upholds Griffin's design intention and embraces the Old Parliament House as an integral feature of the Land Axis vista.

The success of Old Parliament House as a landmark is also due in part to its modest scale and aesthetic qualities, and the open landscaping and gardens between the building and the lake. Intended as a provisional structure, Old Parliament House was deliberately designed as a simple yet dignified building possessing appropriate exterior aesthetic and formal qualities for its use and location.

It is a significant component of the designed vista along Canberra's Land Axis. The Land Axis is one of Griffin's main city design components which sets the order of the Federal Capital's design.

Although manifesting building failures in the past, with a constantly leaking roof, Old Parliament House demonstrates a high degree of achievement in combining built features into the designed landscape to achieve an aesthetic purpose.

Commonwealth Heritage Values

Old Parliament House also represents a significant creative achievement. Intended as a provisional structure but occupying such a prominent location, it was deliberately designed as a plain yet dignified structure so that it possessed appropriate aesthetic and formal qualities for its location, but not to such an extent that it would enhance the possibility of the building becoming a permanent fixture in the landscape.

Criterion G–Social value

National Heritage Values

Specific rooms and spaces within the building are directly associated with events that shaped the political and private lives of prominent individuals in Australia’s political and social history. Many of the former parliamentarians’ support staff and media representatives retain strong associations with the building and its contents.

The importance of Old Parliament House to the Australian community was demonstrated when organisations and individuals rallied to support the retention of the place when it was threatened with demolition in the 1970s.

Commonwealth Heritage Values

Old Parliament House has been a strong symbol of Commonwealth Government in Australia, and of Canberra itself, for many generations of Australians. While its original function has shifted to the current Parliament House, the earlier building remains an important and familiar feature because of the memories of its former role, its new roles in the public realm, and its major contribution to the most familiar views in Canberra, from and to the building along the Land Axis. Elements of the building that particularly reflect this value are the front façade, the entrance portico, King’s Hall and the Chambers. The façade of the building is significant as a widely recognised symbol of Commonwealth Parliament and Government from 1927 to 1988. The façade is also important as the backdrop for media interviews, protests and other events associated with the Parliament and Government. These events include the establishment of an Aboriginal Tent Embassy in nearby Parkes Place in January 1972 and the address by Prime Minister Whitlam on the front steps of the building after his sacking by the Governor-General, Sir John Kerr, in November 1975.

Criterion H–Significant people

National Heritage Values

Old Parliament House has an important association with many people, particularly national politicians. Prime Ministers of Australia who served their term in Old Parliament House include:

| | | | | |
|-----------------|------|------------|--|------------|
| Stanley Bruce | from | 29/10/1922 | to | 22/10/1929 |
| James Scullin | from | 22/10/1929 | to | 6/1/1932 |
| Joseph Lyons | from | 6/1/1932 | to | 7/4/1939 |
| Earle Page | from | 7/4/1939 | to | 26/4/1939 |
| Robert Menzies | from | 26/4/1939 | to | 29/8/1941 |
| Arthur Fadden | from | 29/8/1941 | to | 7/10/1941 |
| John Curtin | from | 7/10/1941 | to | 5/7/1945 |
| Frank Forde | from | 6/7/1945 | to | 13/7/1945 |
| Ben Chifley | from | 13/7/1945 | to | 19/12/1949 |
| Robert Menzies | from | 19/12/1949 | to | 26/1/1966 |
| Harold Holt | from | 26/1/1966 | to | 19/12/1967 |
| John McEwen | from | 19/12/1967 | to | 10/1/1968 |
| John Gorton | from | 10/1/1968 | to | 10/3/1971 |
| William McMahon | from | 10/3/1971 | to | 5/12/1972 |
| Gough Whitlam | from | 5/12/1972 | to | 11/11/1975 |
| Malcolm Fraser | from | 11/11/1975 | to | 11/3/1983 |
| Bob Hawke | from | 11/3/1983 | and continued beyond 1988 when Federal Parliament moved to the new building. | |

Prominent individuals associated with the Wings include Senator Neville Bonner AO, the first Aboriginal parliamentarian elected in 1972, and Dame Enid Lyons and Senator Dorothy Tangney, the first women elected in 1943.

The building is the most prominent example of the work of the Commonwealth’s first government architect, John Smith Murdoch.

Commonwealth Heritage Values

As the home of the Commonwealth Parliament from 1927 until 1988, Old Parliament House is significant for its associations with Commonwealth Governments, Oppositions, political parties, individual politicians and the press. Specific rooms and spaces within the building are directly associated with events that shaped the political and private lives of prominent individuals in Australia’s political and social history. Many of the surviving parliamentarians, support staff and media representatives feel strong associations with the building and its contents.

Old Parliament House is also significant as the most prominent example of the work of the Commonwealth's first government architect, John Smith Murdoch. To a lesser extent, it is significant as an example of the work of the Chief Architect of the Department of the Interior, Edwin Henderson, who devised the scheme for adding the southeast and southwest wings in their original two-storey form.

⑥

**ASSESSMENT OF COMPLIANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS SET OUT IN THE
FINALISED EPBC ACT REFERRAL FOR STAGE 1**

The following table assesses the compliance of the currently proposed works with the measures to avoid or reduce impacts detailed in the Stage 1 referral.

| Table 5. Assessment of Compliance with the Provisions set out in the Finalised EPBC Act Referral for Stage 1 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| No. | Measures to avoid or reduce impacts detailed in the Stage 1 Referral | Compliance Comment | OPH RESPONSE (addressing dot point 4 of additional information required by DEWHA on 19 August 2008) |
| 1. | The entire wing has been fully documented with a highly detailed measured draw of each room/area with corresponding photographs of every internal elevation, to assist in reconstruction. This information will be stored in OPH's collection database. | Complies – it is understood this has been completed, although it has not been sighted. | This has been completed and is accessible via the OPH KE EMu database. Attachment B of the Referral is an example of the measured draw undertaken at a floor by floor level. The images in Attachment D of the Referral are an example of the photographs taken of each room/area. |
| 2. | Undertake the removal of asbestos in a way that minimises the extent of fabric disturbance. The removal of the asbestos, walls, joinery, and the reconstruction and conservation process will be fully researched and documented. If the extent of fabric removal required as a result of the extent of asbestos contamination within joinery, service ducts and feature wall panel cavities is more than anticipated, the reconstruction process will be more extensive. | Not clear – no details sighted. | The asbestos removal process had not commenced at the time of this HIS. The works are still in progress. The contaminated ceilings have been removed and serviced ducts. In order to mitigate against impact of the removal works all joinery was removed and feature wall protected prior to the works commencing. |
| 3. | During the removal of asbestos from the 1965 side, recognition will be given to the designation of suites of rooms for Ministers. Suites will be retained or reconstructed as entire units where feasible on all floors, in particular: | Partly complies – generally ministerial suites will be retained/partly reconstructed on all floors, with a lesser degree of retention/reconstruction on the Main Floor. In addition, several suites will be fully reconstructed. | No wall removal has been necessary as part of the asbestos removal. |
| 3a. | Lower Floor – Suite 1 (Rooms L141-L143) suite for the Minister for Interior Doug Anthony | Partly complies – while the room layout will be retained/reconstructed, it is not yet clear how much of the joinery/fittings will be restored. | This suite will be retained and conserved/reconstructed if asbestos contaminated. |
| 3b. | Main Floor, Suite 10 (Rooms M128-M130) suite for the Attorney General, Billy Sneddon in 1965. Room M130 also contains a safe which will be retained in-situ | Complies | |
| 3c. | Upper Floor – Rooms U61-U63 former suite for the Minister for the Army & Navy in 1950, then a suite for the Attorney General in 1959. | Complies | |

| Table 5. Assessment of Compliance with the Provisions set out in the Finalised EPBC Act Referral for Stage 1 | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| No. | Measures to avoid or reduce impacts detailed in the Stage 1 Referral | Compliance Comment | OPH RESPONSE (addressing dot point 4 of additional information required by DEWHA on 19 August 2008) |
| 4. | Where walls are proposed for removal on the 1965 side and the 1940s side, a nominal amount (about 50 mm) will be retained against existing walls. This will be finished off and painted to match wall. | Complies – it is understood this is the intention. Note – the detail should be carefully designed such that the nib does not look like a 1940s/1960s detail. | The note on design will be addressed. |
| 5. | Where joinery is proposed for removal in rooms U115 and U116 on the 1965 side, a representative sample of all unique elements will be documented and stored (unless contaminated by asbestos) | Complies – it is understood this is the intention. | This will be undertaken. NOTE: a different scheme of wall and joinery removal has been put forward in the second referral (2008/4325). |
| 6. | A number of individual rooms accommodated significant people in the history of Parliament up to 1988. These rooms will be conserved and interpreted using the methods outlined below and include: | See below | |
| 6a. | Lower Floor – L86 W.M Hughes office in 1950 | Partly complies – while the room layout will be retained/reconstructed, it is not yet clear how much of the joinery/fitings will be restored. | There is no evidence of fixed/built-in joinery in this room. The fittings: door furniture, clock, will be conserved. |
| 6b. | Main Floor – M67 Dame Enid Lyons the Vice President of the Executive Council and M68 with the Minister for Social Services and his Secretary in 1951. In 1959 these rooms housed the Minister for Primary Industry and his staff. By 1965 these rooms were part Suite 11 from M66-M68 housing the Minister for Social Security, Ian Sinclair and his staff | Complies | |
| 6c. | Upper Floor – U113 – Don Chipp 1965 | Complies | |
| 6d. | Upper Floor – U53 – Arthur Calwell 1950 | Complies | |
| 7. | During the retention or reconstruction process, consideration will be given to the architectural intent of the interior and exterior of the Wing including the: | See below | |
| 7a. | Overall form and extent of the Wing as it evolved to 1988; | Complies | |
| 7b. | Symmetrical facades, especially the east elevation; | Complies | |
| 7c. | The vestigial entablature (the cornice); | Complies | |
| 7d. | External wall bracket lights on the 1940s side; | Complies | |
| 7e. | The internal moulded render skirtings, architraves, and picture rails; | Complies – it is understood these elements will be conserved. | These elements will be conserved |
| 7f. | Simply detailed and light coloured stained timberwork in the 1965 side; | Complies – it is assumed these elements will be conserved. | These elements will be conserved |
| 7g. | The external air-conditioning units (by maintaining a representative sample on the Southern external wall); | Complies | |
| 7h. | Room M74 in the 1943 part with is special character related to dark stained, simply detailed timberwork and suspended ceiling light diffuser. | Not clear | This room and the special characters will be conserved |
| 8. | Retention of examples of current or redundant services including, division bells, lights and clocks. | Not clear | Examples will be retained and conserved |
| 9. | Upgrade of services after appropriate professional assessments. Redundant services such as power | Complies | |

| Table 5. Assessment of Compliance with the Provisions set out in the Finalised EPBC Act Referral for Stage 1 | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| No. | Measures to avoid or reduce impacts detailed in the Stage 1 Referral | Compliance Comment | OPH RESPONSE (addressing dot point 4 of additional information required by DEWHA on 19 August 2008) |
| | points will be safely terminated and wiring to light switches reconfigured to work from other existing switches. | | |
| 10. | All areas will be interpreted appropriately to ensure the former uses and associated heritage values are identified and displayed. The appropriate interpretation methodology will be applied based on the location within the building and relevant audience. | Complies – the Interpretation Plan recognises the need for interpretation in the wing, including staff and APMC areas. A broad outline of interpretation measures has been indicated. | |
| 11. | Existing window coverings will be removed and cleaned. Those in good condition will be reinstated. Others will be placed in store and new coverings installed. | Not clear | This will be undertaken |
| 12. | On the 1965 side, prior to the asbestos removal minor items on existing walls such as speakers, switches, controls will generally be removed and stored. These will be reinstated once the asbestos removal is complete. | Partly complies , at least – it is understood items will be removed and stored, however, the extent of reinstatement is not clear. | <p>All minor items have been removed, labelled and stored. Reinstatement will be in full on the lower floor.</p> <p>If the second referral is approved fixed joinery and some minor items in the following rooms will be removed:</p> <p>Lower floor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> former services panel in north corridor <p>Main floor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> M110, M112, M114, M117, M118, M123, M120, and the former services panel in north corridor <p>Upper floor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> U115, U116 (covered by referral 2008/3949) U98, U100, U101, U103, U104, U105, U111, U112, U121, U122, U123, U124, U125, U126, U127, U128, U129 and the former services panel in north corridor <p>This has been reflected in Section 3 of the Referral.</p> <p>All rooms and all joinery units have been documented through the Wing measured draw and digital images.</p> |
| 13. | Where required, new data and power will be installed and concealed. | Complies | |
| 14. | The floor treatments will be addressed as outlined below once the asbestos removal is complete: | See below | |
| | | 1965 side | |

| Table 5. Assessment of Compliance with the Provisions set out in the Finalised EPBC Act Referral for Stage 1 | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| No. | Measures to avoid or reduce impacts detailed in the Stage 1 Referral | Compliance Comment | OPH RESPONSE (addressing dot point 4 of additional information required by DEWHA on 19 August 2008) |
| | - Upper Floor (pre-1988) – relay carpet where feasible, source a replica or similar in areas that are in a poor condition | Partly complies – some/large areas are to have modern carpet tiles of a contemporary design | The compliance comment relates to the second referral (2008/4325). |
| | - Main Floor (pre-1988) – relay carpet where feasible, source a replica or similar in areas that are in a poor condition | Partly complies – some/large areas are to have modern carpet tiles of a contemporary design | The compliance comment relates to the second referral (2008/4325). |
| | - Lower Floor (post-1988) – lay new or similar floor covering to that used in 1988 | Complies | |
| | - New floor treatment will be required in the modified toilet areas. The choice of tiles will be compatible with existing. | Complies/may not comply? Details not sighted. While the approach is acceptable where some existing tiles are to remain, if all old tiles are removed, a different approach may be preferable consistent with the approach to carpets. It is understood this will be the case. | This will be undertaken The compliance comment on the carpet approach relates to the second referral (2008/4325). |
| | 1940s side | | |
| | - Upper Floor (pre-1988) – relay carpet where feasible, source a replica or similar in areas that are in a poor condition or where wall removal has occurred | Partly complies – some/large areas are to have modern carpet tiles of a contemporary design | The compliance comment relates to the second referral (2008/4325). |
| | - Main Floor(pre-1988) – relay carpet where feasible, source a replica or similar in areas that are in a poor condition or where wall removal has occurred | Partly complies – some/large areas are to have modern carpet tiles of a contemporary design | The compliance comment relates to the second referral (2008/4325). |
| | - Lower Floor (post-1988) – lay new replica or similar floor covering to that used in 1988 | Complies | |
| | - New Floor treatment will be required in the proposed new kitchen and plant rooms. The choice of tiles will be compatible with existing. | Does not comply – new tiles will not match existing in order not to be confused with pre-1988 fabric. Such an approach is supported. | The compliance comment relates to the second referral (2008/4325). |
| 15. | Lights on the 1940s side will be re-lamped and cracked/missing diffusers repaired or replaced to provide lighting to meet standards. On the 1965 side, lighting will be replicated. Some variation may be required in order to meet current standards for office accommodation. | Complies | |
| 16. | The toilets on the 1940s side will be conserved. The proposed changes to the toilets on the 1965 side will be undertaken in a style that is sympathetic with the 1988 style. | Complies? Details not sighted. The 1965 toilet blocks will have all new fabric. While this will be done in a manner that can clearly be identified as post-88 fabric, it will still be in keeping with the character of the wing. In any event, there may be an apparent policy mis-match | This will be undertaken. The compliance comment relates to the second referral |

Table 5. Assessment of Compliance with the Provisions set out in the Finalised EPBC Act Referral for Stage 1

| No. | Measures to avoid or reduce impacts detailed in the Stage 1 Referral | Compliance Comment | OPH RESPONSE (addressing dot point 4 of additional information required by DEWHA on 19 August 2008) |
|-----|--|--|--|
| | | <p>between the approach taken to the 1965 toilets and that taken regarding new carpets. In the former case we have finishes in character with the wing, and in the case of the carpets there will be modern carpet tiles of a contemporary design.</p> | <p>(2008/4325). The rationale for using modern carpet tiles in the second referral is based on the intended use of the spaces and the OPH interpretation approach. In order to clearly identify to staff and visitors the heritage and new elements of the spaces, a colour palette of grey, purple (aubergine) and orange will, and has been used throughout the building for new carpet. Grey will be the predominant colour for the Wing. This approach is consistent with the HMP and the OPH Interpretation Plan.</p> |

FULL SCOPE OF PROPOSED WORKS

The following text has been provided by Old Parliament House.

EXTERNAL

In general, the external works to the Wing are limited to repairs. Apart from a new fire exit on the southern façade, no other changes are proposed to the exterior of the SE Wing.

Facade

The only penetration in the external fabric is to be for a new egress point on the southern face. This is a requirement of fire code, as the Wing currently only has one egress point. The new egress point is designed so the penetration is within the red brick base of the building, with stairs coming up to street level. This will mean there is no impact on the white rendered face of the building and a minimal impact on the southern elevation of the building.

Roof and Guttering

Due to the removal of major plant from the roof and the number of patches and penetrations, the existing metal deck roof is in poor condition. It is to be replaced with a new metal deck roof of similar profile. Insulation will be added under the roof sheeting. All new works will be below the existing parapet and will not change the existing structure or configuration of the roof line. The existing guttering will also be replaced as part of the roofing works.

Lights

No change to the existing lighting configuration. The only addition lighting will be the required lighting for the new egress point. All existing lights will be refurbished (re-wired and re-lamped).

Courtyard

Sub-surface rectification works are required to the sewerage pipes that run under the courtyard. This will involve some minimal excavation to access the underground pipes. Upon completion of the hydraulic works, the courtyard is to be refurbished as per the recommendations in the “South East Wing Courtyard Garden Heritage Analysis 2007” prepared by heritage consultants Godden Mackay Logan. Fundamentally there will be no change to the configuration in the courtyard, as primarily the works will be of a horticultural nature. To comply with access requirements, modifications to the door at the North end will be required. If this is not possible due to proximity to basement stairs, a door will be created in L95.

SERVICES

All the building services in the SE wing are to be either replaced or upgraded in order to meet current code requirements in terms of fire safety, occupant safety, energy efficiency and operational functionality. In the previous referral... upgrades to the 1965 section toilets, on all three floors, was approved in order to comply with relevant codes. After further design investigation it is proposed to reconfigure the layout of the toilet block in order to best utilise the space and achieve the optimum in meeting the functional requirements. The reconfiguration will occur entirely within the envelope of the existing toilet block and primarily involves reconfiguration of the entry point and the internal

layout.

All of the building services upgrade works are to be undertaken with a minimum impact on the existing fabric of the base building itself. This is achieved through a general strategy to use, wherever possible, the original service penetrations in the building, in routing all new building services.

Furthermore a strategy to minimise ongoing deterioration to the existing building fabric is to carefully coordinate the layout of the building services so that ongoing maintenance and future upgrades can occur without disrupting areas of high sensitivity to change. The services design intent is to consolidate the major services into risers contained in the north and south ends of the Wing. These 'service cores' will become the main connection points for the Wing and locations where maintenance activities can occur. The new doors required for the services cores will clearly be identifiable as introduced elements, but will be in keeping with the character of the 1965 section.

The existing service skirtings in the 1965 side will be utilised.

Another example of this strategy is the new services shroud that will be introduced to the ceilings in the 1940's section. This new element will be a simple folded metal tray, suspended below the existing plaster ceiling, which will conceal all the services cabling and pipe work required for each room (refer **Attachment D** for sketch [not included]). This element will also provide a surface to mount any new components that are part of the building services upgrade including smoke detectors, fire sprinklers, motion detectors, emergency speakers and thermostats.

Electrical and Communications

Replacement of all of the existing electrical services. Much of the electrical cabling, especially in the 1940's section, consists of VIR cables which pose a large fire hazard. Also the existing electrical infrastructure is not capable of accommodating the requirements of a modern office environment. A communications room is to be provided, on each floor, in the southern service core.

Mechanical

Replacement of all mechanical plant and ductwork due to contamination with asbestos. The plant in the basement will become redundant as the SE wing will be connected to OPH's central cooling and heating plant. In the 1940's section the new mechanical services will utilise the existing penetrations and grilles. As the ceiling is being replaced in the 1965 section, new air conditioning registers will also be installed. Currently there is a unique approach to the arrangement of services on the ceilings in the 1965 section where all the lighting, fire and mechanical services are clustered into groups and fixed to a metal pan in central locations in each room. This same design philosophy will be utilised in the layout of services for the replacement ceiling.

Hydraulic

In upgrading the fire services, new sprinkler pipe work is to be introduced into the Wing. In the 1940's section, all sprinkler pipe work is currently suspended below the fibrous plaster ceilings. This approach will be retained in the rationalisation of the fire system design. It is not intended to disturb the existing fibrous plaster ceiling by concealing the sprinkler pipes.

Fire

Full implementation of the OPH Fire Safety Strategy components relevant to the SE Wing. This includes installation of new thermal and smoke detectors, fire hydrants and hose reels and alterations to the existing fire sprinkler layout and the fire mains.

Radiators

The existing radiator heating system in the 1940's section is currently disconnected from the main hot water loop. The radiators within the individual offices will be removed and, where no representative sample exists, placed into storage. The existing radiator pipe work will also be removed. The radiators in the corridors will be disconnected, filled with an inert rust protection solution and retained in-situ as representative examples

Lifts

The existing lift, in the northern service core, is not compliant with OH&S and access code requirements. A new lift car is to be installed in the existing shaft. The existing lift openings at each floor can be used without modification and no further change to the base building fabric is required to accommodate a new car.

A new platform lift will be installed in L83 in order to provide wheelchair access to the offices in the 1940's section. This will require the partial removal of the wall to the corridor to create a compliant circulation path.

INTERNAL

It is proposed that the upper and lower floors of the Wing will be used for office accommodation in preparation for expanding the interpreted areas of the North Wing, currently occupied by OPH staff, to the lower floor as set out in the HMP proposed use plan.. The lower floor will accommodate contemporary office fit-out without any need for wall removal and utilising the location of existing amenities. The spatial requirement for APS team based operation and effective organisational collaboration is the basis for the proposed wall removal on the upper floor (1965 side). The permanent location for the APMC will be on the main floor. This will include: a public area with a reception space; library area; collection storage; and a staff area with an oral history recording room, meeting rooms, kitchen facilities and accommodation for APMC staff and Fellows.

Floors

The floors in the 1965 sections are concrete and require no refurbishment.

The 1940's section is constructed of pine timber floorboards on hardwood joists. Generally the floor is in poor condition with many boards lifted from the joists. Rather than complete replacement, major remedial works will be carried out on the floor to refix the floor boards to the joists. The corridors are constructed of a number of timber access panels which are also in poor condition. These panels will be replaced with new timber panels of a similar nature and labelled as new.

Walls

Primarily the extent of works to the internal walls is to be remedial in nature. It mainly consists of repairing flaking and peeling plastering. Wall removal is principally limited to the 1965 section on the main and upper floors and only the lower floor in the 1940's section (refer above to **Lifts**). No wall removal is proposed in areas identified as having high sensitivity to change.

In order to provide for the functional requirements of the APMC on the main floor, a

coherent space for accommodating the library collection is required. In keeping with the design intent, the project architects have proposed an innovative solution. As the ministerial offices are already organised into suites of three offices with interlinking door ways, the method of creating the required space is with the judicious partial wall removal between the suites. This greatly reduces the impact on the existing building fabric.

In the previous referral... the removal of every second wall on the upper floor (the walls without fixed joinery) of the 1965 section had been approved. Further design development has demonstrated that this solution will not provide a functional office environment for small workgroups, as the rooms are too small to be able to accommodate more than two staff with the existing joinery in-situ. This has a major impact on the potential total staff capacity of the upper floor. Therefore it is proposed to revise the design to remove the walls that have the fixed joinery and retain the opposite wall.

In order to minimise the impact of loss of fabric, two suites of offices are being retained as representative samples with no walls to be removed and fixed joinery to be re-instated. These are offices U108-110 and U117-119.

Where partial wall removal is required, the mitigating measure is to retain a 150 mm minimum nib will be retained at the wall and ceiling to evidence the existence of a wall.

The reception booths at the north end of the main and upper floors are also proposed for removal to adapt the northern entry to the Wing into a functional lift lobby and reception area. The reception booth on the lower floor is to be restored and retained as a representative sample

Windows

Most of the glazing in the Wing does not comply with safety codes and requires replacement. This will be undertaken by replacing the glass only and retaining the existing window frames. This type of work has successfully been undertaken previously in OPH.

Ceilings

As the original suspended plaster tile ceiling in the 1965 section will be removed due to asbestos contamination, a new suspended ceiling will be introduced. This will be of a similar character to the original plaster tile ceiling in language. The design intent is a 600 mm x 600 mm square grid, centred to each room with a minimal set plasterboard perimeter.

In the 1940's section minimal intervention is intended with the existing fibrous plaster ceiling. Only the light fittings will be fixed to the ceiling, as they currently are. All other building services will be fixed to a new service shroud which will be suspended below the existing ceiling.

Fixed Joinery

All fixed joinery will be removed from the Wing to protect it during asbestos removal and construction works. It will be labelled and stored as per the requirements of the OPH HMP. Where feasible, such as in rooms proposed for representative samples, it will be re-instated into its original location. New semi-fixed joinery is proposed for the staff kitchen/lunch room on the lower floor of the 1940's section, LCR2. This new item will be placed against the eastern wall and will be designed as a floor standing unit which is only fixed to the wall for stabilisation. It will be able to be removed at a future date with minimal impact on the surface of the eastern wall.

Built-in Joinery

All built in joinery will remain in-situ. Many of these joinery units have taps and sinks incorporated in them. Where it is not feasible or consistent with the use of the space, the hydraulics will be disconnected and capped. Where required for functional use, new joinery will be inserted over the existing. This will be done in such a manner that will allow the future removal of any new joinery in order to display the original built-ins.

Doors

Wherever feasible existing doors will be retained in-situ, and adapted to suit any new functional requirements of the building. If an existing door cannot be adapted for re-use, where no representative sample exists, it will be removed to storage, and a new door will be installed in its place.

On the main floor, 1965 section, it is proposed to remove the doors facing the corridor to rooms M113 to M123 and replace with fixed glazed panels in a manner that will not preclude the original doors from being reinstated in the future, as the original doors will be placed into storage. As the public are allowed onto the main floor, this solution is to allow:

- a secure boundary between the corridor and the APMC reading room, both physically and acoustically,
- natural light into the APMC and to create a visual connection between the reading room and the courtyard,
- an opportunity for the public visitor to OPH to observe the functions of the building in action,

Skirting and Trims

No changes are proposed to the existing skirting, architraves, picture rails and stained timber in the Wing. All of these existing elements will be protected during the construction works and refurbished as part of the project.

Stairs

The stairs in the Wing do not comply with Building Code of Australia requirements for emergency stairs, which they are all classified as. The requirements include fire rated materials, appropriate height and safety measures for railings and consistent tread coverings to all floors.

The existing southern stair in the 1965 section will be made compliant through replacement of the handrail and tread covering.

Both the timber stairs in the 1940's section will have a section added to the handrail to raise the height and the treads replaced with a material of a higher fire rating. Where feasible, the original tread covering will be retained.

FINISHES

Floors

As set out in Referral 2008-3949, where feasible, the floor coverings will be re-laid or replicas installed. In office areas and areas of high traffic, contemporary design/coloured carpets will be installed. These are proposed to be carpet tiles, in order to reduce the impact of installation on the building and to allow for easy future installation or broadloom or Axminster carpet if required. Replica carpets are likely to be installed into rooms which are to be heritage representative samples. This approach is consistent with the following

Policies in the HMP: 1.3.1, 1.4.1, 1.4.3, 1.5.5 and 1.9.3 (refer **section 3.4** of this document [not included])

Walls and Ceilings

All walls and ceilings will be repainted as part of the refurbishment. The colour palette will be consistent with the rest of OPH and in keeping with the known 1988 scheme and character of the Wing. Where exposed timber work existing, such as panelling, picture rails and other elements, it will be sanded and re-stained to its original shade.

Window Treatments

Where feasible the existing window treatments, which will have been refurbished, will be reinstated. Where reinstatement was not possible, new window treatments will be installed.

Loose Joinery

All new loose joinery will be of a consistent and contemporary finish, which will clearly identify it as a newly introduced element.



28 August 2008

Ree Kent
Manager, Heritage
Old Parliament House
King George Terrace
Parkes ACT 2600

Dear Ree

Southeast Wing Refurbishment Project – Heritage Impact Statement

I write to clarify a few matters raised by DEWHA regarding this HIS. DEWHA asked OPH to,

Confirm whether the heritage consultants' rating of heritage impact (Table 1 Attachment H) takes into account the proposed mitigation measures and whether it includes consideration of cumulative impact.

With regard to the mitigation measures proposed by OPH and noted in Table 1, yes, these have been taken in to account in the conclusions reached.

On the question of cumulative impacts, the conclusions offered in Table 1 do not generally consider such impacts, except regarding changes already made to the Southwest Wing and the implications of such changes on the significance of the Southeast Wing. The HIS generally considers only the impacts related to the proposed works, but it notes there is an ongoing issue for OPH with cumulative impacts. Part of the difficulty in addressing such impacts is deciding the point in time to start assessing impacts, and having a reliable picture of the changes made from that time. OPH has been changing since 1988, and this relatively long period is matched by many large and small changes. It seems worthwhile addressing the issue although the conceptual framework has yet to be developed to enable meaningful consideration.

Yours sincerely



Duncan Marshall
B.Arch (Hons), BA, MICOMOS
Heritage Consultant

Copy: Dr Michael Pearson, Heritage Management Consultants Pty Ltd