

Gallipoli Precinct Action Group

30/03/2020

The Public Works Committee,

The Gallipoli Precinct Action Group Committee on behalf of its members but in particular those residents living in close proximity to the Lloyd St entrance to Gallipoli Barracks, Enoggera, would like to make a submission to the Public Works Committee regarding the Land 121 Stage 5B Facilities Project Gallipoli Barracks, Brisbane.

The Gallipoli Precinct Action Group Committee (GPAG) has presented a number of submissions to the Public Works Committee relating to proposed projects at Gallipoli Barracks, Enoggera voicing concerns over a number of issues including but not limited to :-

Community Consultation/Information/Communication

Access/Egress/Parking Facilities - Traffic Management Plan/ Non - Compliance.

Concern - Community Consultation/Information/Communication

The Department of Defences' Submission to the Public Works Committee regarding the Land 121 Stage 5B Facilities Unit page 15 – states in part -

Consultation with Key Stakeholders

49. Defence has developed a community consultation and communications strategy that recognises the importance of providing local residents and other stakeholders an opportunity to provide input into, or raise concerns relating to, the Project.

50. Defence has engaged with a variety of stakeholders during project development to date, and further consultation will be conducted to support the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works' inquiry into the Project. These include:

e. Community Groups: (1) The Muwinina People (Hobart, Tasmania) (2) The Nyoongar People (Perth, Western Australia) (3) The Gurambilbarra Wulgurukaba People (Townsville, Queensland) (4) The Jagera People (Brisbane, Queensland) (5) The Taungurung People (Puckapunyal, Victoria)

Given that the GPAG is a known Community Group – (Gallipoli Barracks, Brisbane) and the PWC in the past has addressed this issue of proper Community Consultation with Defence :- see Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, Friday 27/11/2015 Transcript re Land 121 Unit Sustainment Facilities page 13 exert :-

“CHAIR: I am starting to show my political old age. Consultation is important. There is a very big difference between ticking the box on process and going through genuine consultation. A great way to demonstrate to this community that you understood the

importance of these local action groups was in your own submission when you were talking about the consultation with key stakeholders at Gallipoli Barracks. At item 27b(3), you mentioned council and community members. If you had taken the time to mention these action groups, that would have given us a little bit of comfort that you genuinely understand the importance of these issues.

And the Public Works Committee Recommendation – Final Report 1/2016 which states in part :-

***“2. LAND 121 – Unit Sustainment Facilities Project
Recommendation 1***

The Committee requires that the Department of Defence report back to the Committee after six months of tabling this report on the effectiveness of its consultation strategies with community groups around Gallipoli Barracks, including: ☐ the type of consultations undertaken ☐ lessons and improvements to engagement with community groups ☐ issues raised during consultation and Defence’s response ☐ the effectiveness of quarterly consultative meetings and the project team’s email-box”

It was therefore disappointing for Residents to have only 3days notice via letterbox drop of the scheduled “Community Consultation” regarding the Land 121 Stage 5B Facilities Project. It was also disappointing that this Community Consultation took place ***after*** submissions to the Public Works Committee had ***closed*** and the Community Liaison Officer appointed to assist and address issues local Residents have relating to Gallipoli Barracks was neither informed nor invited to this “Community Consultation”

As a means of addressing this, correspondence was sent to the provided email address Land121STAGE5B@jacobs.com on 17/03/2020 with the following questions and comments.

1. Why were Residents not given more advance notice of the scheduled meeting ?

Residents living in close proximity to the main Lloyd St Entrance to Gallipoli Barracks received information via letterbox drop 02/02/2020 regarding the Community Consultation scheduled to be held on 05/02/2020 at the Gaythorne Bowls Club concerning the Land 121 Stage B Project.

Defence have been advised in the past to liaise with known local groups or known individual Residents who have concerns regarding proposed Projects at Gallipoli Barracks.

2. Why was the Community Liaison Officer Mr. David McGuire neither informed nor invited to the Community Consultation?

As a direct result of Residents ongoing issues relating to projects at Gallipoli Barracks the Public works Committee recommended the appointment of a Community Liaison Officer to assist and address issues the nearby Local Communities may have regarding proposed Projects at Gallipoli Barracks. Mr. David McGuire was engaged in this role May 2016.

3. Why was the Community Consultation held after submissions to the Public Works Committee had closed?

Residents living in close proximity to the main Lloyd St Entrance to Gallipoli Barracks have made submissions to the Public Works Committee a number of times to advise of local concerns regarding a proposed Project at Gallipoli Barracks- a well-documented history of Residents' concerns exists. It is disquieting that this "Community Consultation" was scheduled after submissions to the PWC had closed.

Due to a lack of response from Jacobs - a second email was sent 24/03/2020 – to date no response has been provided. The PWC was cc'd into correspondence sent to the provided address for this Project. This is not dissimilar to our experience with 'Jacobs' regarding the earlier Land 121 Unit Sustainment Facilities Project and highlighted in the GPAG's Submission to the PWC - 22/10/2015

'Questions regarding the consultation process were emailed to LAND121@jacobs.com the contact email address on 30th August 2015 with the email undelivered. This was queried at the community consultation held at Ashgrove Golf Club on Wednesday 7th October 2015 and it was acknowledged that there was a problem but was resolved. Further correspondence was sent 15th October 2015 with questions from the initial correspondence included and a request for additional information regarding traffic management plans-to date no response has been received. No other contact details have been provided.'

Clearly communication between stakeholders continues to be a problem.

Concern Access/Egress/Parking Facilities - Traffic Management Plan/ Non - Compliance.

The Department of Defences' Submission to the Public Works Committee regarding the Land 121 Stage 5B Facilities Unit page 14,states in part :-

'g. There will be an increase in contractor personnel accessing and working at each site during the construction activities. The mandated development of Traffic Management Plans by the Contractor, together with ongoing and regular coordination of all construction activities with local Defence authorities at each establishment, will mitigate the effects on the internal and external road networks.'

Management of traffic entering and exiting Gallipoli Barracks is problematic – non compliance to traffic directives by Base personnel (ADF and Civilian) continues to impact the safety and amenity of Residents living in close proximity to the main Lloyd St Entrance.

This issue is exacerbated when Projects are undertaken at Gallipoli Barracks.

It has been our experience that Traffic Management Plans relate to routes ***on Base only*** and not initial access to the Base via the public road network. Residents are only affected when the public road network is used inappropriately.

However, Defence is well aware of these concerns - any increase of traffic on the local Council Road that accesses Gallipoli Barracks makes for congestion, an increase in noise and fumes and an upsurge in vehicular non-compliance to traffic directives.

Contractors are required to undergo induction prior to accessing the Base.
This process takes about 20 minutes and contractors are required to park off Base.

Parking spaces are limited to 24 (car size) with a 10 minute restriction, while larger vehicles park in one of the two entry lanes to Gallipoli Barracks impeding access by other vehicles – often leaving their engine running thus increasing noise and fumes. On Street parking on Lloyd St is limited and larger vehicles cannot conduct a required U turn safely and as a result often rat run through the local area often damaging existing trees and compromising the safety of Residents.

Ardentallen Rd or one of the other local streets become the unofficial car park for Gallipoli Barracks –

See attached pictures entitled – Parking and unsafe exit – This was taken only a few months ago 13/12/2019 – the Heavy vehicle and its trailer parked against the traffic flow, the trailer was unhooked and the vehicle continued into Gallipoli Barracks exiting Ardentallen Rd against the left turn only directive and in an incorrect unsafe manner.

See attached pictures entitled – Contractors unloading and Unloading Gallipoli Barracks taken 03/12/2020 :-

These pictures show a heavy vehicle parked in Ardentallen Rd across 2 driveways delivering Grass to Gallipoli Barracks – the forklift was used to unload the grass into the smaller truck (Contractors -Spotless who are engaged by Defence) on the opposite side of the street then the truck proceeded to enter the Base.

Clearly access, egress and parking are issues that should have been fully addressed as Gallipoli Barracks expanded and should not be the problem of Residents.

It would be appreciated if Defence or Jacobs would clarify what practical measures will be in place to ensure that the local residential streets at the Lloyd St Entrance to Gallipoli Barracks and in particular Ardentallen Road are not used as a thoroughfare or carpark for the duration of this project.

It is disappointing that the concerns raised continue unresolved. It is not unreasonable for Residents to continue to highlight these issues until a solution is attained.

On a positive note, The GPAG would like to acknowledge the assistance of the current Base Manager and the Community Liaison Officer. Both have been helpful and pro-active in addressing other issues affecting Residents' safety and amenity and it is acknowledged that this is not the forum to review these misgivings.

Thank you for taking the time to read this correspondence.

GPAG Committee







