

Tom Lockley
PO Box 301
Pyrmont NSW 2009

0403 615 134, tomlockley@gmail.com

This email is a comment on the letter from Ms Watson as per the details below. Please direct it to the appropriate people.

Ms Amy Watson
Team Leader Key Sites Assessments
as delegate for the Planning Secretary
NSW Department of Planning and Environment

7 August 2022

Subject : SSD application SSD-32927319

Reference: Your letter of 28 July 2022 to Mr Thomas Klobucar Project Director Department of Premier and Cabinet online at
<https://majorprojects.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/prweb/PRRestService/mp/01/getContent?AttachRef=EXH-44618317%2120220727T224626.126%20GMT> Please forward this letter to all appropriate people.

As you can see from the submissions, there is massive objection to the project itself.

This letter raises the matter of the fitness of this project to be even considered for an SSD, ignoring for the moment the merits or otherwise of the project.

Because the CMP consultations were not carried out as promised, and because of the deficiencies of process throughout the whole project since it was announced on 26 November 2014, I submit that this project is not worthy of being considered for a SSD approval.

1. False information given about the consultation process employed

There have been several major 'consultations' regarding this project, and typically, input has been wrongly reported. This is outlined more fully in the next section, but on this occasion we got an undertaking from Alan Croker, heritage architect specially employed to guide the discussions, as follows: (email Mon, 21 Mar 2022 at 18:35 to me)

... the process will proceed as advertised, the consultations will proceed according to the steps of the Burra Charter, the process will be accurately reported, this will lead to a Conservation Management Plan and that the CMP would inform the design brief for the work to be done at THE Powerhouse MUSEUM.

This was echoed at an information meeting I attended at the Powerhouse Museum on Thursday 14 July when I raised this matter with Ms Vinton of Curio Projects. She said that the input from the consultations would influence the CMP.

Yet the 567-page Conservation Management Plan draft was released on 21 June. It is obvious that it has been in construction for at least several months, and it is also obvious that the thrust of the consultation input was not a significant factor in its development. For example, reports from those attending indicate that no time during the consultation was

there any recommendation, or even support, for the idea of removing such things as the Wran building or the Steam Revolution display. None of the published submissions support this type of action and the overwhelming majority . Yet we are told that 'the 1988 adaptive re-use of the Power House Buildings into the Powerhouse Museum, including the construction of the Wran Building, further obscured rather than enhanced the industrial history of the site'. (CMP 5.3.1). This completely ignores the massive public support for the museum, and the considered opinion of all people with museum qualifications and experience that we can find.

Far from being a conservation management plan for the preservation of the remains of THE world-class Powerhouse MUSEUM, this document effectively sanctions its destruction.

2. Lack of appropriate process during the whole period 2014 to date.

Throughout the past five years, my associates and I have produced evidence that

Alternatives were never properly investigated. No significant expert input was involved. There was no consultation on basic issues with any significant stakeholders. These deficiencies have persisted over the 7+ years since the basic announcement. The Government has imposed excessive secrecy and taken special non-democratic measures to avoid following due process. The opposition to the project expressed by the general public and the museum and arts community is unprecedented. However, their reasoned, evidence-based, criticisms and the comprehensive Legislative Council Inquiry report have been treated with contempt. The financial aspects of the project have been very badly managed, and the waste of taxpayers' money is enormous. The heritage aspects of the whole move are also relevant here. Though the initial plans have been modified and the situation has slightly improved, the autocratic decision-making process persists, with consequent ongoing problems.

This is expanded on the following pages, (the current version of our fact sheet), and full references are available on <https://powerhousemuseumalliance.com/what-the-experts-say/the-powerhouse-move-idea-facts-june-2019-tom-lockley/> . This, and several preceding versions of the fact sheet have all been submitted to MAAS museum, NSW and its agencies, and to the Premier and to the minister for the arts, and none of these assertions have been challenged by any agency or relevant official. If you

The evidence is clear that the planning of this entire project is undemocratic, destructive of heritage and financially wasteful. If DPIE accepts this state of affairs, it is complicit in these deficiencies.

Thank you for any consideration you give to this matter.

Tom Lockley,
concerned citizen of New South Wales.

FACT SHEET: The Powerhouse Museum 'move', issue 5, 13 March 2022

This document summarises evidence that the NSW Government's plans for museum organisational changes in Paramatta and Ultimo are flawed to such an extent that democratic norms are being constantly circumvented and a successful outcome for massive expenditure is very unlikely. As always, since these fact sheets were first developed and circulated in 2017, any Government responses will be publicised, and if necessary, corrections of fact will be immediately issued. So far, no evidence of errors has been found in previous fact sheet versions.

Summary of points raised: Alternatives were never properly investigated. No significant expert input was involved. There was no consultation on basic issues with any significant stakeholders. These deficiencies have persisted over the 7+ years since the basic announcement. The Government has imposed excessive secrecy and taken special nondemocratic measures to avoid following due process. The opposition to the project expressed by the general public and the museum and arts community is unprecedented. However, their reasoned, evidence-based criticisms and the comprehensive Legislative Council Inquiry report have been treated with contempt. The financial aspects of the project have been very badly managed, and the waste of taxpayers' money is enormous. The heritage aspects of the whole move are relevant here. Though the initial plans have been modified and the situation has improved, the autocratic decision-making process persists, with consequent serious ongoing problems.

Full references supporting this statement are available. [Email tomlockley@gmail.com](mailto:tomlockley@gmail.com) or see, for example <https://powerhousemuseumalliance.com/what-the-experts-say/the-facts-about-the-powerhouse-museum-move> [tom-lockley/](#) Here is a brief summary of the deficiencies of the Government's administration of this process:

1. **Expert assistance was not involved in the fundamental decision.** Advice given by Ms Macgregor in 2014 is secret, and its validity is therefore unknown, but she has said that the main group with whom she spoke was the *Western Sydney Arts and Cultural Lobby* who gave only limited support and seem to be no longer functioning. There is no evidence of input from any relevant expert, any museum / arts peak body, any of the local government authorities of the area, or any other cultural group. 37 major cultural institutions of the area were not consulted in any way. Mr Borger, of the then Western Sydney branch of the Sydney Business Chamber seems to have had significant input but the initial financing plans for the 'move' were gravely flawed, with long-lasting consequences: see paragraph 9.
2. **No consultation with stakeholders occurred before the announcement,** as is exemplified by the fact that the Museum trustees and the Parramatta City Council were not even informed of the decision before it was announced.
3. **These deficiencies have persisted over the 7+ years since the basic announcement.** See paragraph 4 for comments on consultation. At no time has a Government-sponsored group containing people with relevant expertise examined alternatives. If there had been appropriate examination of alternatives, this project would never have been considered, eg for reasons mentioned in paragraph 8. Involvement of museum people at all significant levels has-been negligible: the demolition (March 2021) of the massive display structures on level 1 at Ultimo was certainly not done to recognised museum standards. The Trustees' only known requirements (1/9/2016) were for the Parramatta museum to use the whole site, with no commercial encumbrances, and be of at least the scale and scope of Ultimo with sufficient funding for the 'move' and running of the museum. The evidence is that these requirements have not been met.
4. Treasury document tpp08-5 (2008) sets out **the need for all major projects to evaluate the base case** (the situation before the project began) and then to evaluate the alternatives for achieving the stated aim, which in this case should simply be to improve the cultural facilities of the Parramatta area. These requirements were strengthened in TPP18-06 of 2017, particularly when considered in conjunction with TPP18-05, Government Commissioning and Contestability Policy (2016) **The Government has completely sidestepped these requirements by declaring the base case to be the Government's decision to move the**

museum. This special measure avoids following due process: all consultation has been only on what the public wants at the Parramatta facility and at any retained cultural facility at Ultimo. This has resulted in the farcical situation where, for example, the NSW National Trust has constantly and repeatedly expressed reasoned opposition to the entire project, but this has been entirely ignored in reporting their reaction to the 'move'. Also, the elected Parramatta Council had consistently supported the retention of this site area as open space, but Council was controlled by a Government-appointed administrator due to forced council amalgamations (12/5/2016- 23/10/2019). Just 68 days before the end of the tenure of the caretaker administrator the land deal was completed 'as a matter of urgency'. The Government's statements that the elected council supported the 'move' are manifestly wrong, but this fact has not been acknowledged by the Government, despite clear evidence brought to their attention. The deal has been ratified by the re-elected council, but by a narrow margin, reportedly from fear of offending the Government. Yet another ramification is seen in the recent Land and Environment Court judgement on the future of Willow Grove: the judgement specifically ignored discussion of the merit of the Government's plans for the site vacated by this heritage building.

5. Secrecy has been a major feature of the Government's actions. The lay understanding of 'cabinet in confidence' secrecy is that decisions taken by Cabinet are taken in secret, then supported by the whole group. The Government has used this mantra repeatedly, avoiding releasing basic information, eg regarding the business case, the data used to form the business case and even the terms of reference for people providing data to the people designing the business case. Even the details of the fire regulations which allegedly underpinned the need for removal of the massive structures from level 1 in March 2021 have not been released, despite requests.

6. Opposition to the 'move' has been enormous. *Inter alia* full-page protest advertisements (17 February 2016) were sponsored by the *Powerhouse Museum Alliance* which has maintained a website recording all news and proceedings. A large grass-roots movement was backed by *Save the Powerhouse Facebook* site. This culminated in the massive first Inquiry into museums and galleries (23/6/2017 to 17 July 2019). Support for the 'move' was scant: In the first Inquiry, the only non-Government submission favourable to the move came from *Tourism and Transport forum*, a lobby group linked with the *Western Sydney Leadership Dialogue* and the only witness favourable to the move was Mr Borger, director, Western Sydney, Sydney Business Council.. The consequent final report made a fully documented Finding that due process had not been followed, and several consequent recommendations. Numerous surveys have resulted in overwhelming support for retaining the Ultimo museum.

7. The Government rejected the first Inquiry finding in a brief statement (17/7/2019) that proper governance had been assured by a peer review group and six independent review panels. This statement was recycled from the *Business Case Summary* of April 2017. The Peer Review process has been comprehensively shown to be non-existent, and all the Government will tell us about the review panels is the month in which they were held. In view of the serious criticisms levelled against this project. This response is clearly **another denial of due process**.

8. Plans for financing the 'move' have been irresponsible. The original proposal was that the Ultimo site would be sold for urban development which would fund the new museum in Parramatta, with any surplus used for arts purposes within the Parramatta area. This was supported by studies by professional consultancy groups, eg the Deloitte document *Building Western Sydney's Cultural Arts Economy* (2015) sponsored by Sydney Business Chamber (Western Sydney) and still being quoted in 2021. This was ridiculous: the cost of removing and storing Ultimo exhibits and demolishing the museum would absorb any proceeds of land sale (\$250 million maximum). The latest 'official' cost for the project is \$849 million but museum experts put the cost at around \$1.5 billion. Costs of setting up a fully resourced museum at Parramatta have been consistently underestimated: the emphasis appears to be rather on non-museum activities such as e-gaming, micro brewery, demonstration kitchen for 200, kitchen garden, grocery store, bakery, performance spaces, accommodation, restaurants and cafes. Another example of financial irresponsibility is the decision to demolish and rebuild the Willow Grove building at Parramatta: there are

fears that this is another hurried Governmental decision not backed by any proper costing process and the informed opinion is that proper reconstruction will be prohibitively expensive. Finances are also relevant to the next section.

9. Heritage aspects of the 'move' have been downgraded. The repurposing of the powerhouse buildings was a highlight of the bicentennial celebrations of 1988, and achieved world-wide recognition. The attachment of the community for both the Ultimo building and the heritage buildings at Parramatta is clear, and well-founded: these are marvellous historic buildings. Even if this does not weigh with the decision-makers, **there is a clear and considerable monetary value engendered by heritage factors**; which has been completely overlooked. The 2020 recommendation of heritage assessment of the Pyrmont buildings was restricted to the basic structure of the original Powerhouse, thereby precluding discussion of the overall museum as a heritage item and leading to the ridiculous assertion that the site had no *persons or group of persons with which the building is associated... and is important for its associations with an identifiable group ... at a local level only*.

Recent developments:

On July 4 2020, after only a few hours consideration at a political level only, it was announced that the museum at Ultimo would be retained, and promises were made to keep three iconic exhibits on this site. However, degradation of the museum continued, for example with the demolition of the transport hall display cabinets and the Ecologic exhibition in March 2021.

The future remains very unclear. On 19 June 2021 it was announced that about \$480 million would be devoted to refreshing the museum, including a reorientation of the main entrance. There are no guarantees that traditional parts of the museum will not be further degraded, with the museum scheduled to close for 'rejuvenation' at the end of 2023.

The latest development is another round of 'consultations' ostensibly to develop a Conservation Management Plan, 'according to the Burra Charter'. This is not so: the first two stages of the Burra Charter process are 'Understand the Place' and 'Assess Cultural Significance' and no apparent efforts have been made to do this. Further, the latest reasonable time to begin this process was July 4 2020, halting the destructive actions until the CMP was completed. The consultation process, as usual, seeks only a token input from participants, based on acceptance of the autocratic decisions already made.

T Lockley, PO Box 301, Pyrmont 2009 tomlockley@gmail.com