

Submission to the Public Works Committee re the Land 121 Stage 2-Unit Sustainment Facilities Project.

Dear Sir/ Madam

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 PWC objecting to the Land 121 Stage 2-Unit Sustainment Facilities Project- Gallipoli Barracks Enoggera.

It is disappointing that the local community again finds themselves voicing concerns to a proposed project to be undertaken at Gallipoli Barracks Enoggera. It is also disappointing to learn that there will be no onsite viewing at Gallipoli Barracks nor will the PWC Hearing be conducted in Brisbane as members of the GPAG Committee would like to be in attendance.

Past projects such as the ELF2b Project and the Land 17 Phase 1a Infrastructure Project have drawn criticism from the local community primarily due to related traffic issues whether it be as a result of an increase in the volume of vehicles generated by the considerable expansion to Gallipoli Barracks (permanent or temporary) or non-compliance to traffic regulations by Gallipoli Barracks personnel (ADF and civilian) which remain unresolved and problematic to the local community residing in close proximity to Gallipoli Barracks.

Residents' have endeavoured to voice and highlight these concerns by commenting at a number of PWC Hearings.

References:-

PWC Hearing re ELF2B held at Gaythorne RSL Wednesday 4th November 2009.

- Submission No 5 ELF2b- 29th October 2009 - Mr Ian Ferrier
- Comments by Private Citizens as recorded in the Official Committee Hansard 4th November 2009.
- Mr Neville Dance private citizens p14
- Mr Ian Ferrier private citizens p14
- Mr Howard Gibson private citizen p14
- Mr Chris Harbeck private citizen p14
- Submission N0 2 Land 17 Phase 1a Infrastructure Project 1st December 2011 - Mrs Mary Harbeck.
- Comments by private citizen Mary Harbeck as recorded in the Official Committee Hansard Wednesday 7th December 2011 p11-13

While traffic congestion and noncompliance to traffic directives by Gallipoli Barracks personnel continue to be problematic and will be exacerbated by further projects at Gallipoli Barracks what adds to these concerns is the inadequate detail outlined regarding proposed projects to enable the public to make an informed decision regarding impacts upon the local community.

The GPAG Committee will address a number of our concerns directly related to Defences' submission to the

The GPAG Committee will provide examples of our concerns referencing prior projects/incidents.

Note:- References have been stated but attachments kept to a minimum

Clarity of Information and Consultation Process.

Consultation with Key Stakeholders.

Page 10 of Defences Submission advises of consultation within Defence.

Page 11 of Defences Submission refers to Community consultations and states:-

“25. Defence has developed a community consultation and communications strategy that recognises the importance of providing local residents, statutory authorities and other interested stakeholders an opportunity to provide input into, or raise concerns relating to the project.”

Disappointingly the Department of Defence uses the terminology “Consultation”, “Notification” and “Information” interchangeably and the publics’ expectation of a community consultation does not align itself with an informal drop in session as outlined on the website and Notice of Public Information Session letterboxed to *“some”* residents.

It’s worth pointing out that despite a purported 25,000 leaflet drop, residents most affected by Gallipoli Barracks activity and living closest to the Main Lloyd Street entrance to Gallipoli Barracks Enoggera did not receive the leaflet advertising the public information session and received notification from someone in a neighbouring suburb.

While this may be seen as an oversight it’s not the first time residents living closest to the main Lloyd Street entrance of the Army Base have been overlooked regarding *“Community consultation, Feedback or Information relating in some way to Defence and Gallipoli Barracks redevelopment.(Gallipoli Barracks Traffic Study 2013: Defence Housing , Community Notifications ELF2b project.)”*

Questions regarding the consultation process were emailed to LAND121@jacobs.com the contact email address on 30th October 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.

“26. Defence has also conducted consultation with State Government Authorities to align heavy vehicle mass compliance requirements.”

Hopefully Defence will heed the advice given by the State Government Authorities.

27. Community consultations will occur as follows for the areas where works are proposed:

b. Gallipoli Barracks, QLD

(1) Ms Jane Prentice MP, Federal Member for Ryan;

(2) Ms Kate Jones, State Member for Ashgrove;

(3) Council and community members; and

(4) QLD utilities providers.

The GPAG Committee emailed the above mentioned stakeholders on the 6th October 2015 requesting information regarding the consultative process pertaining to the Land 121 Stage 2 Unit Sustainment Facilities to date the GPAG Committee have verbal confirmation from the office of the State member for

Ashgrove Kate Jones of receipt of the letter advising of the community consultation” to be held at Ashgrove Golf Club on Wednesday 7th October 2015.

The GPAG Committee query this process, as in the Department of Defence’s earlier ELF2b Project the 2009 Statement of Evidence to the Parliamentary Standing Committee page 8 advises of stakeholder consultation inclusive of local state and federal representatives yet when addressing the impact that the Lloyd Street Upgrade (main entrance) would have on local residents the Local Councillor informed the GPAG Committee that he was unaware of this design in spite of written correspondence to local residents in 2013 stating *“I have had numerous and regular meetings with the individuals responsible for the barracks redevelopment and I advocate your concerns on every occasion.”* What constitutes “consultation”? To highlight the issue residents have regarding clarity of information and consultation consider the following:-

The Lloyd St Entrance upgrade to Gallipoli Barracks.

The GPAG Committee are aware that the Lloyd Street Entrance Upgrade to Gallipoli Barracks was part of the ELF2b Project. Noteworthy, the only reference to this upgrade in Defences submission to the PWC, November 2009 is detailed on page 20 (refer 55 (h)) of the ELF2b PWC Submission which reads in its entirety:-

“Road Network. New roads will be required to be constructed to service the proposed 2nd Combat Engineer Regiment precinct. The main access to the Barracks will continue to be through Lloyd Street with secondary access points at Wanimo Street and Fraser Road. A number of internal intersections will be upgraded along with security upgrades to the Lloyd Street and Frasers Road entrances and;”

This upgrade which only merited an incomplete sentence and was “fast tracked” consisted of :

Reconfiguring the current entrance to provide a vehicle turn around facility before the security check-point.

- The provision of additional car parks, kerbing and footpath on the southern side of Lloyd Street between the Barracks entrance and Ardentallen Road.
- Relocating the existing recruiting office.
- Constructing a new Defence Pass Office.
- Demolishing the existing Guard Post.
- Construction of two new guard posts.
- Significant street lighting.

The configuration also allows for direct access into the two new entry lanes into Gallipoli Barracks from Ardentallen Road, a nearby residential street (signed local traffic only) and as a result converts the formerly Ardentallen Road and Lloyd Street ‘T’ intersection into a major intersection which includes the re-entry point for rejected vehicles. This in effect makes Ardentallen Road a **THROUGH ROAD** for any vehicle wishing to access the Gallipoli Barracks and a complex intersection.

How was this part of the project given permission and viewed by the PWC when no details were given? Similarly, how was the community, particularly those living in close proximity to the Barracks entrance able to provide feedback before this was implemented particularly since this upgrade has negatively impacted on the local community?

Since Frasers Road is also mentioned in the same incomplete sentence as security upgrades to Lloyd Street should the public have concluded that the new design to upgrade this exit would be comparable in design and cost to the Lloyd Street Entrance Upgrade ?

To date the Frasers Road (Ashgrove) Entrance to Gallipoli Barracks remains unchanged.

Note the purported **detailed design** (Fig 1) of the Lloyd Street Entrance to Gallipoli Barracks letter boxed to residents just prior to the upgrade. Fig 2 shows the completed works.



Fig 1.




Fig 2.

Was this a convenient oversight or an attempt by Defence to mislead?

It begs the question what design details have been omitted in Defences submission to the PWC regarding the Land 121 Stage 2 Unit Sustainment Facilities and what will be the real impact on residents living in close proximity to Gallipoli Barracks?

The GPAG Committee have not gone into details in informing of steps taken to obtain information regarding this part of the ELF2b project as it would prove too lengthy and not necessarily relevant at this time but it is our intention to expand on this issue in written communication to Senator Dean Smith along with other concerns voiced by residents living adjacent to a section of the perimeter of Gallipoli Barracks in Norman Terrace. Residents contend that the facilities built are not being used as intended and raise concerns regarding hours of operation ,noise and exhaust pollution .

Traffic Concerns

Page 18 of defence's submission addresses Public Transport, Local Road and Traffic Concerns

“Public Transport, Local Road and Traffic Concerns

55. There is no increase to base populations as a result of this project. However, during construction there will be an inevitable increase to the number of large vehicles that enter the bases to deliver materials to site. Contractual arrangements within each construction contract will mitigate the effects of this on the local road network through the development of traffic plans within each Site Management Plan.”

Historically traffic plans related to large projects at Gallipoli Barracks have proved to be abysmal failures with large heavy rigid vehicles routinely accessing the Base via residential areas signed Local Traffic Only. Damage to parked cars and local trees, contractors and large vehicles parking across driveways increase in dust and fumes and in some instances abuse from drivers have ensued.

With regard to the traffic management on the ELF2b Project addressing residents' concerns included - ignoring residents' complaints but in many cases the following rationale was applied when vehicles were reported to the designated person.

- Day 1 - The Driver of the vehicle received a warning.
- Day 2 - The Driver of the vehicle received a 2nd warning.
- Day 3 - The Driver of the vehicle was to be been re-inducted
- Day 4 - The Driver of the vehicle was removed from the site
- Day 5 - Same large vehicle different driver...not yet inducted.

Only later was it revealed that the traffic management plan although not exclusively related to “on base” traffic management focussed little on off base impacts to the local community.

What assurance does the local community have that a traffic management plan will be implemented so as to minimise the impact on the local residents? As previously stated request for information was sent to the contact email with no response.

The PWC – ELF2b Project 2009 made the following recommendation re traffic concerns.

Recommendation 7 stated:-

Land 121 - Unit Sustainment Facilities Project
Submission 2

"The Committee recommends that the Department of Defence consult with state and local governments in order to finalise plans for an entrance off Samford Road, Enoggera with Defence funding a fair and reasonable portion of the cost of the road works, in order to ease traffic congestion in the vicinity of Gallipoli Barracks."

While the local community and this committee acknowledges that a new entrance to Gallipoli Barracks was opened June 2015 (6 years after recommendation 7 was handed down by the PWC and Defence informed that the expenditure of some \$800 million on the Gallipoli Barracks upgrade was conditional on it overcoming the local traffic issues of which it was responsible) after Samford Road was upgraded it seems that the operating hours are 6-8AM and 3-5PM weekdays only.

With an expenditure of over \$70M of public funds (\$5.4M Federal & \$65M State) to ensure that Defence delivered on the promised new major entrance to Gallipoli Barracks, capable of addressing the local traffic problems it would seem that given the stated operational hours of only 4 hours/day and the expectation of at best 200 vehicles per day this costly exercise will not be a factor in reducing local traffic issues and consequently fails to deliver on commitments made to the local communities by Defence to address traffic issues related to Gallipoli Barracks.

As of October 2015 the Samford Road gate remains **unfunded** to act in a '**tidal flow**' mode and as previously stated is open only for 2 hours in the AM and PM - despite being the only access gate on a Sub-Arterial road servicing Gallipoli Barracks. It is questionable whether heavy vehicles can use this entrance.

Further Traffic Concerns

Ongoing concerns regarding non-compliance to traffic directives by traffic exiting Gallipoli Barracks the main offenders being Defence Personnel include but are not limited to:- speeding ,executing illegal turns to rat run local streets and other forms of dangerous driving.

No doubt the DoD will be quick to point out that these issues are a matter for QPS as they have in the past Reference Official Committee Hansard- Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works Land 17 Phase 1a Infrastructure project Wednesday 7 December 2011 p8 Comments from Brigadier excerpts only:-
"We in the barracks have issued directives to our people to ensure that when they leave the base they do not do what is called the rat run through Ardentallen Street, Norman Terrace and another street whose name I have forgotten."

"We cannot police that, because it is outside the barracks. It is not on Defence land."

"Yes, we do monitor it. There are two elements that are affecting this: the base population and the construction workforce for the large amount of construction that is going on at the barracks right now. In terms of the base population, the brigade commander and the base support manager at Enoggera have issued a directive to staff that they are not to turn left through those streets in exit from the barracks."

Unfortunately, we do not have a lot of control over what people do once they leave the barracks. I do not want to sound like I am duck shoving responsibility here, but that is a matter for the Queensland police, it is not something we can police. We can monitor, but we cannot take any punitive action against people. All we can do is issue a direction that that is what they have to do."

It's worth pointing out that this is such a significant ongoing issue that the State Member for Ashgrove has requested QPS to undertake monitoring of the area closest to the Lloyd St entrance to Gallipoli Barracks and in particular the Lloyd Street Ardentallen Road intersection.

What should concern the Department of Defence and the PWC is that this not only provides a poor example for others working on base but encourages inappropriate and unsafe behaviour. Since ADF personnel not

only disobey governmental traffic directives but also standing Base directives this demonstrates a complete disregard for rules and regulations and an obvious indifference to the safety of others. It would be reasonable to conclude that this attitude would permeate into their work ethic - a definite cause for concern.

Impact on Local Community

Page 18 of defence's submission also addresses Impact on Local Community

“Impact on Local Community

58. The proposal will generate short-term employment opportunities, predominantly in the building, construction and labour markets in the Townsville, Brisbane, Sydney, Puckapunyal, Adelaide, Perth and Darwin areas.

59. The following are approximate estimates of required subcontractors for each of the sites:

b. Gallipoli Barracks - 90 personnel;”

Given Defences gross underestimate of contractors required as part of the ELF2b Project one has to question the accuracy of the estimate for this project.

Statement by Mr Peter Harry Pullman, Contract Administrator on behalf of Defence, Aurecon Australia Pty Ltd, page 9 the Official Committee Hansard 4th November 2009 ELF2b project.

We are anticipating that on average there will be about 350 tradespeople working throughout that period, peaking at around 500 at certain points during the construction.

Defence newsletter re ELF2b Community Update issue 4th December 2011 p2 under key project facts dot point 2 states *Workforce now comprises more than 900 people.*

Again issues with the accuracy of information.

Security

Page 21 of Defence's submission addresses security

“Security

70. Advice from Defence security authorities has been incorporated in the design solutions for the proposed facilities where appropriate. Security Risk Assessments have also informed the proposed designs. As such, the facilities meet appropriate security classifications as stipulated by Defence requirements.”

While this submission deems that the facilities meet appropriate security classifications residents living in close proximity to the main Lloyd Street entrance to Gallipoli Barracks continue to be dismayed at the continual breaches of security witnessed regularly as routinely men and women are smuggled into Gallipoli Barracks in the boots or cargo areas of vehicles.

A recognised heightened sense of alert regarding security exists and residents have been advised of additional security however, this has not deterred ADF Personnel from breaching security by the unsafe practice of transporting persons into Gallipoli Barracks in the boots or cargo areas of private vehicles. It appears that an increase of security measures consists of *“contractors”* positioned on the local council road of Lloyd Street stopping vehicles at random and at their discretion. It's worth noting that since Lloyd Street is the neighbourhood access road for the local residents a considerable percentage of vehicles being pulled over are civilians trying to access their homes. Correspondence from an Ardentallen Road resident to the Base Manager Glenda Hall regarding vehicle inspections conducted on Lloyd Street provided the following information 11th May 2015

“With regards to the vehicle inspections, unfortunately there is no other suitable place to conduct the inspections that offers safety and protection from the weather to the security guards. We have considered other options, however none are viable and the health and safety of the guards must take priority. If residents are pulled over for inspection, they just need to advise the guards that they are not accessing Gallipoli Barracks.”

Land 121 - Unit Sustainment Facilities Project
Submission 2

\$800 million + project at one of Australia's largest military bases and security measures consist of "contractors" stopping vehicles on a public street without any jurisdiction.

See attachment Lloyd St Security – Contractors in Hi Vis vests mid right in photo.

The Lloyd Street entrance upgrade allows for vehicles to by-pass this inspection point by accessing the entry lanes via Ardentallen Road.

Clearly little consideration has been given to security and it is resident's concerns that such a relaxed attitude and poorly thought out strategy will prove detrimental to the safety and wellbeing of those associated with Gallipoli Barracks.

While the GPAG Committee appreciate that the PWC has limitations in its role and primarily concerned with scope, need and costs of the works we believe that the aforementioned issues in this submission should not be discounted or undervalued and we refer to comments made by Mr Forrest - Reference Official Committee Hansard- Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works Land 17 Phase 1a Infrastructure project Wednesday 7 December 2011 p 6 and CHAIR p14.

"One of the responsibilities of our committee is to make sure the public are not unhappy with the large expenditure of Commonwealth funding, and we have some unhappy neighbours out here at Enoggera." (Mr Forrest).

The Public Works Committee has a particular role to play and, as the issues arise with people in the community who are concerned about something, we will endeavour to listen to those concerns, hear what you say and assist where we can. There is only so much that we can do in our role, but we are interested. That is why we are here. (CHAIR)

It has not been our intention to be vexatious but rather to highlight our valid concerns related to statements made by the Department of Defence in their submission to the PWC re the Land 121 Stage 2 - Unit Sustainment Facilities Project.

While purported details may look good on paper the reality of the impact that these projects have on the local community during construction and after completion of the project is not witnessed by any Public Works Committee. Since our concerns raise questions regarding the accuracy and reliability of information given to both the public and the PWC, transparency and the consultation process, local road and traffic concerns, the impact on the local community and security concerns, the GPAG Committee would request further scrutiny of this project before any approval is given.

GPAG Committee

Mary Harbeck President

