



COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA

# Official Committee Hansard

PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC  
WORKS

**Reference: Enoggera redevelopment stage 1, Gallipoli Barracks,  
Brisbane, Queensland**

TUESDAY, 6 MAY 2008

MITCHELTON

BY AUTHORITY OF THE PARLIAMENT



## **INTERNET**

Hansard transcripts of public hearings are made available on the internet when authorised by the committee.

The internet address is:

**<http://www.aph.gov.au/hansard>**

To search the parliamentary database, go to:

**<http://parlinfoweb.aph.gov.au>**

**PARLIAMENTARY STANDING**  
**COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS**

**Tuesday, 6 May 2008**

**Members:** Mr Butler (*Chair*), Senator Troeth (*Deputy Chair*), Senators Mark Bishop and Forshaw and Mr Champion, Mr Forrest, Mr Hale, Mr Lindsay and Mr Slipper

**Members in attendance:** Senators Forshaw and Troeth and Mr Butler, Mr Champion, Mr Lindsay and Mr Slipper

**Terms of reference for the inquiry:**

To inquire into and report on:

Enoggera redevelopment stage 1, Gallipoli Barracks, Brisbane, Queensland

**WITNESSES**

**ADAMS, Mr Alan Luke, Project Director, South Queensland, Infrastructure Asset Development, Department of Defence ..... 1**

**DAY, Brigadier Stephen Julian, Commander, 7th Brigade, Department of Defence..... 1**

**GRICE, Brigadier William, Director General, Infrastructure Asset Development, Department of Defence ..... 1**

**HURCUM, Mr Gregory Paul, Manager, Base Services, Brisbane, Department of Defence..... 1**

**SIMPSON, Mr Craig, Project Manager, John Holland Group ..... 1**

**ZENTELIS, Mr Rick, Director, Heritage and Biodiversity Conservation, Estate Policy and Environment, Department of Defence..... 1**



---

**Committee met at 3.37 pm**

**ADAMS, Mr Alan Luke, Project Director, South Queensland, Infrastructure Asset Development, Department of Defence**

**DAY, Brigadier Stephen Julian, Commander, 7th Brigade, Department of Defence**

**GRICE, Brigadier William, Director General, Infrastructure Asset Development, Department of Defence**

**HURCUM, Mr Gregory Paul, Manager, Base Services, Brisbane, Department of Defence**

**ZENTELIS, Mr Rick, Director, Heritage and Biodiversity Conservation, Estate Policy and Environment, Department of Defence**

**SIMPSON, Mr Craig, Project Manager, John Holland Group**

**CHAIR (Mr Butler)**—I declare open this public hearing of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works. The committee is inquiring into the proposed redevelopment of Gallipoli Barracks at Enoggera, here in Brisbane. I welcome representatives of the Department of Defence. Although the committee does not require you to give evidence under oath, I should advise you that these hearings are formal proceedings of the parliament and consequently warrant the same respect as proceedings of the House itself. I remind witnesses that giving false or misleading evidence is a serious matter and may be regarded as a contempt of parliament. Brigadier Grice, do you have any opening remarks?

**Brig. Grice**—Thank you, Mr Chairman. This proposal seeks approval for the Enoggera redevelopment stage 1 project for the Department of Defence. The majority of the messes on the base were constructed in the 1960s and they have reached the end of their economic and functional life. In addition, the accommodation of the 7th Brigade and associated units located adjacent to 7 Brigade are in a similar condition.

The key aim of the Enoggera redevelopment stage 1 is to rationalise the messing arrangements in line with moves to increase overall defence efficiencies and reduce resources allocated to support function. The scope of works for this project includes the rationalisation of messing, the construction of a single combined mess, construction of new working accommodation for the headquarters of the 7th Brigade and other minor units, upgrades to some engineering services to support the work, and the demolition of redundant facilities, including the demolition of five existing messes.

The total outturn cost for this project is \$80.2 million, and this includes professional design and management fees and charges, construction, furniture, fittings and equipment, together with appropriate allowances for contingency and escalation. Subject to parliamentary clearance, it is intended to commence construction works in mid to late 2008, with the works being complete by 2011.

The Defence witnesses are ready to answer any questions the committee may have on the project.

**CHAIR**—Thank you.

**Mr LINDSAY**—Brigadier, the opening part of your justification says that you present a proposal for the redevelopment of Gallipoli Barracks stage 1, Enoggera. Have there been previous redevelopment projects at Enoggera?

**Brig. Grice**—There has not been a redevelopment project in the last 20 years. The last redevelopment was in the early eighties. Since then there have been a number of smaller, medium works projects and in 2006 there was a project to construct approximately \$17 million worth of new facilities for the tactical unmanned aerial vehicle project.

This project is the first in what we hope will be a series of redevelopments to improve the overall level of facilities on the base. There are currently two other similar sized redevelopment projects that are sitting in the unapproved MCF program in the 2013 and 2016 time frame. Subject to funding and to an estate-wide assessment of priorities, and subject to Army's priorities for these funds, there may be future redevelopments to upgrade the working accommodation of existing major units on the base.

**Mr LINDSAY**—When the brigade headquarters are relocated, 139 Signals Squadron will be located away from the brigade headquarters. Is that normal? Shouldn't the Signals Squadron be located with the brigade headquarters?

**Brig. Day**—Yes, the Signals Squadron should be located as close as possible to brigade headquarters as a matter of practice. I am happy to say in this case that is what is going to happen. They will be right next door. In fact, they will be closer under this redevelopment than they currently are.

**Mr LINDSAY**—I must have misunderstood that. I thought they were over the road.

**Brig. Grice**—You will recall the new site for Headquarters, 7 Brigade?

**Mr LINDSAY**—Yes.

**Brig. Grice**—There were two facilities that were going to be demolished. Immediately adjacent to that is the commencement of 139 Signals Squadron unit lines.

**Mr LINDSAY**—Okay; that is fine. In some messes, there is a commercial centre attached to the mess where you get Frontline and Defcredit and whatever. Have you considered doing that with this mess? Your proposal doesn't include that. Can you explain why?

**Brig. Grice**—Future stages of the redevelopment may include the relocation of those facilities. During our tour you saw the Dalziel club and the area adjacent to the theatre where the commercial precinct currently sits, and at the moment Army has not specified a requirement to relocate those; there is still some residual life in those. But it is a scope element which is up for consideration in future phases. This project, with the funds available for us, was to rectify the most pressing issue on the base, which is the rationalisation of messing and the provision of quality food and recreational services to the soldiers on the base.

**Mr LINDSAY**—Is it your view that central messes work best with the commercial centre attached to the mess?

**Brig. Grice**—Brigadier Day may have some thoughts on that. Through accidents of developmental history there are both forms on bases across the estate, and both work. I think what we have is an evolutionary thing here. As we go forward, as we did with Hardened and Networked Army, we have the opportunity to shape an entire precinct. So we shaped it for the future. Here, where we still have residual life in buildings, that opportunity has not presented itself yet but will present itself in the fullness of time.

**Mr LINDSAY**—And it will be possible, if a relocation is deemed necessary, that a precinct space is available?

**Brig. Grice**—We believe there is space that could accommodate that, in particular the Long Tan Mess, and other areas around there are possibilities to do just that.

**Mr LINDSAY**—In relation to the combined mess facility, you have said that a single structure will reduce operating costs. Have you got any idea of the quantum of that reduction in operating costs?

**Brig. Grice**—The annual facilities related operating costs, in the reduction of five messes to one, is of the order of nearly \$300,000 a year. In addition, we expect that there will be a sizeable reduction in personnel services through efficiencies gained from rationalising and having all of the mess staffs at one location. It is very difficult for us to put a figure on that, but it could be of the order of \$500,000 to \$1.25 million per year in additional savings. It will not be until Army and DSG have resolved and planned the detailed operation of the mess, which is something that has just commenced—so it will be some time before we are able to quantify exactly how much those savings will be. But there is the scope for substantial additional savings.

**Mr LINDSAY**—You raised the issue of the enhancement of the watercourse that runs past the mess. We talked about some of the living inhabitants in that watercourse. Part of that watercourse will go underground under the car park. Where it leaves the frontage of the mess it goes underground under the oval—is that right?

**Brig. Grice**—Yes.

**Mr LINDSAY**—So is the wildlife in that area of any significance, knowing that a lot of that watercourse is underground?

**Brig. Grice**—I might pass to Mr Rick Zentelis to answer that question.

**Mr LINDSAY**—Or is it really just ambience you are trying to create in front of the mess?

**Mr Zentelis**—The habitat that is being created with the ripple strips and the engineered works will maintain a population of the tusk frog species. It also will maintain the water quality, so that when it leaves the site it will not impact adversely upon further frog habitat downstream. So it is a viable site in itself but it also provides various other things, such as aesthetics and ambience.

**Senator FORSHAW**—Is there any asbestos in any of the buildings that are due to be removed and, if so, can you assure the committee that all the relevant codes et cetera will be followed?

**Brig. Grice**—There is asbestos in all of the buildings to be demolished. This is an ongoing issue across the estate. Defence is well-versed in the removal of asbestos and I assure the committee that the Queensland legislation regarding the removal of asbestos will be followed. Mr Simpson, maybe you might like to add something.

**Mr Simpson**—During the planning phase on the 7 Brigade headquarters site and the ADFIS sites we undertook significant asbestos testing in both the buildings and on the ground surrounding the buildings. A number of sites were located that contained asbestos. We have incorporated a remediation plan, a removal plan within the specifications that we have delivered as a part of the 90 per cent detailed design report.

**Senator FORSHAW**—I assumed there would be, and I am sure you would know this has been an issue that has been raised at other sites—the Randwick Barracks was one. It is a matter the committee is always rather concerned about—ensuring that it is done properly.

**Brig. Grice**—You did notice as we were completing our tour this morning and going past the Long Tan sergeants mess that on the right hand side we identified some existing facilities which will remain in operation. There were some works being undertaken there as part of the Defence Support Group's ongoing asbestos remediation program, which is a yearly program. Greg, you might want to give us some information about the asbestos remediation program on Enoggera barracks.

**Mr Hurcum**—There is a rolling program for asbestos remediation which occurs across the Defence Support Group South Queensland—which also includes Gallipoli Barracks. As Brigadier Grice mentioned, the program you saw as you drove through the 6th Battalion area is a remediation process in progress as we speak. It commenced in December last year and will finish some time in the next few months. It is a rolling program—we take asbestos removal very seriously and seek a nil asbestos detected outcome in all the buildings, where possible. There is also a register of all asbestos in all our buildings: we know exactly where the asbestos is, and the register is updated, I believe, on an annual basis.

**Mr SLIPPER**—The asbestos would largely be in the form of what we used to call fibro or fibrolite cladding?

**Mr Hurcum**—In cladding, floor tiles and a variety of areas. I cannot actually speak specifically about where it is, but all the buildings are inspected by experts who make determination for its removal in a safe manner.

**Brig. Grice**—I might ask Mr Simpson to give some additional detail on that.

**Mr Simpson**—We detected significant amounts of asbestos sheeting as well as asbestos contained within the vinyl flooring. In addition to that, we established, externally to the buildings, some older-style conduits that were actually constructed out of asbestos.

**Mr SLIPPER**—I think your asbestos removal program is commendable. If you go to Sri Lanka today, you will see huge signs that have ‘Asbestos Industries Ltd—building a better Sri Lanka’. They are still putting it in. It is actually a significant cost to Australia’s aid program because we have as part of our requirements specifications that we will not allow or use asbestos, even if it is being used in the country where we are giving the aid. That has meant that our projects are often more expensive than others because everyone else uses asbestos still.

**Senator FORSHAW**—I note that you have indicated specific performance targets, including energy saving, water reduction, and waste reduction. Is there any opportunity for using, say, solar power or solar heating—if you need any heating up here? I’m from Sydney!

**Brig. Grice**—Yes, there is. Craig, you might go through some of those measures.

**Mr Simpson**—The headquarters building has a solar hot-water system with an electric backup. Unfortunately, gas supply location to that building meant that from a whole-of-life point of view, it was not economical to provide a gas backup to the solar hot-water systems on the headquarters building. For the mess building we did investigate, from a whole-of-life perspective, the use of solar hot water. But due to the high heat requirements for water in a commercial kitchen such as the mess building, the energy used to boost the temperature of that water meant that solar hot water just was not a viable option. In the instance of the mess building, we have a gas-fired hot-water system with the water pre-heated by redundant heat from the mechanical services system.

**Brig. Grice**—You may want to go through some of our water efficiency measures on the mess and the headquarters as well.

**Mr Simpson**—The mess building has a water-harvesting facility of 400,000 litres. We re-use that water throughout all of the toilets throughout that building. In addition to that, the fittings and fixtures will all be WELS rated. The headquarters building has a rainwater-harvesting facility of 80,000 litres, and again we re-use that water back through the toilet facilities throughout the building. And all fittings and fixtures come with a WELS water efficiency rating.

**Senator TROETH**—You did have an industry briefing for this project, which you gave details of in paragraph 27. How much interest did the project attract at that briefing?

**Mr Adams**—We had an industry briefing for all people in the community that had responded to ads in the papers and on the AusTender. We had 10 companies represented at that industry briefing. All 10 expressed interest in this expression of interest.

**Senator TROETH**—Do you anticipate any impact of this development on the surrounding development and the traffic, given that the entrance—and the exit, obviously—to Enoggera is in the middle of a suburban area?

**Brig Grice**—The first point to make is that this is not a significant new development. What we are doing here is rationalising existing messes that have passed their useful life and replacing them with a single combined mess. This project will not result in additional personnel coming onto the base or leaving the base. Except during the construction phase, when there will be some additional construction traffic that can be handled through one of the many entrances on the

base, there will be no net increase in traffic in the surrounding areas as a result of this project. I might pass to Mr Greg Hurcum to give an indication of other traffic issues around the base.

**Mr Hurcum**—The traffic flow issues for Gallipoli Barracks will not be impacted upon by these projects, as Brigadier Grice said. However, being located seven kilometres from the city centre and adjacent to two major lateral feeders into the city draws a lot of traffic. A lot of that traffic is drawn from the greater Brisbane region and the growth corridors from Brisbane to the north and to the Samford Valley area, which brings the traffic in there. The traffic flow into the garrison occurs predominantly outside of those periods of peak time—that is, our peak period is at 7 am, just before the congested period into the city. Also, departure time is predominantly in the period around 4 pm, which is prior to the peak traffic period. However, we do work with local councillors and discuss traffic congestion flows with them. We also conduct traffic reviews. Most recently, between Wednesday, 5 March, and Tuesday, 11 March, we conducted a traffic flow measurement into the garrison. As an example of the traffic over that period of time through the Lloyd Street entrance, which is the main entrance—and there are three within the garrison—we had an average flow of 2,510 vehicles on entry through that gate over a five-day period, Monday to Friday. So we take seriously the traffic flow problems. We have a large facility located there and we work with the local council and other traffic organisations, such as Brisbane City Council transport department et cetera, and we try to maintain good relationships and measure our traffic flow.

**CHAIR**—Can I follow that up and perhaps be a bit more specific, because we have a written submission from the lord mayor where he has suggested that our committee should somehow cause studies to be ‘undertaken to assess the effects on the capacity of existing physical infrastructure external to the site’. By that I think he means external to the barracks. He then asks:

... what upgrades are intended as a consequence of the Barracks’ new development?

I guess I have taken that to be directed at traffic and the presence of bus stops or whatever else Mr Newman had in mind. Should I infer from your evidence that our committee should take the view that no further studies are required as a result of these developments, which are about rearranging the deckchairs, if you will, rather than something that will lead to an appreciable increase in traffic around the area?

**Brig Grice**—That is correct. Where we are conducting a project that, say, might induct a new unit of several thousand people into a base, at that stage it would be a matter of course that we would do an assessment of the effect that that development would have on the surrounding traffic infrastructure. In this case, that does not exist. There will be no changes as a result of this redevelopment and there will be no net increase. There will be no effect on the surrounding area as a result of this project.

**Senator FORSHAW**—I was going to make a comment about the lord mayor’s letter, but I won’t!

**CHAIR**—As there are no further questions, thank you for your evidence today. I also thank members of the public and other interested parties for attending today’s hearing. You will note that there are some pamphlets on the table near the entrance to this room. Those pamphlets

include some details about the committee website. On that website you will be able to find copies of all the written submissions made and in a couple of weeks time you will also be able to find copies of the transcript of the proceedings today. In the event that any member of the public has taken the view that because of the hearing today they wish to make a written submission to our committee before we make a decision about this inquiry, you should do so in the way that is indicated on that pamphlet and make sure you do so in the next fortnight.

Resolved (on motion by **Mr Slipper**):

That this committee authorises publication of the transcript of the evidence given before it at public hearing this day.

**Committee adjourned at 4.00 pm**