

Woodlands
660 Hoskinstown Rd.
Bungendore NSW 2621
26 May 2004

Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works
Parliament House
Canberra 2600

Dear Committee,

**Re: Our submission regarding your inquiry
into HQJOC Bungendore NSW**

1. OUR INTEREST IN THE PROPOSAL.

We make this submission to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works as owners, and business partners of Woodlands Bungendore NSW (the HQJOC site).

2. Since the announcement of the proposed building of HQJOC on the 03 October 2001, we believe we have co-operated with Defence and their contractors by supplying information, allowing access, keeping out of the media and away from politicians. However, during the early stages we were not kept informed and relied on media and rumour for information, which in most cases was false. Farm plans were held up, workdays were lost, and three generations of "Woodlands" Hyles were under stress.

3. We have been patient with defence. We do not wish to delay the project, or jeopardize our relationship with defence through this period of compulsory acquisition.

4. Overall, we are happy with the development. However, the over-riding factors are the expectation of fair and reasonable compensation and acquisition proceeds.

CONCERNS

5. FINANCIAL COSTS.

We are concerned that we are liable for our costs and losses associated with the Defence acquisition until acquisition takes place. This is because you, the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works are yet to report, and the House of Representatives pass an “expediency motion” (therefore we have not received a letter of acquisition yet.) and acquisition is not guaranteed until the letter is received. This is our major concern.

6. We point out that Defence advised us to seek legal help, gave us the tip on how to select law firms, interview them and engage them as our legal representatives. Defence told us that it is one of our entitlements under the Land Acquisition Act, but neglected to tell us reimbursement would occur when and only if acquisition takes place.

7. We have granted access, assisted with valuable information, been on hand to assist and created a calm environment with no protest or hostilities with the understanding of compensation will be recoverable. We are patiently waiting. If payment is forthcoming, there is still a chance of a photo opportunity with the Minister for Defence shaking our hands on the handing over of the site, or the commencement of building.

8. ENTRY ONTO WOODLANDS.

There has been a period recently, where we were finding out about Defence plans to enter without us being consulted. For example- the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works site inspection planed for Friday 18 June 2004.

As we still own the land we feel we have a right to be informed and consulted. I am pleased to report that Defence have now authorised a further nine personnel to enter under section 7 of the LAA, and employed a consultant to co-ordinate entry.

9. Some entry has not been where we expected. During the Environmental Impact Study on site 5 (HQJOC), an Aboriginal Heritage study was carried out extending five kilometers to our eastern boundary. This will remain our land after HQJOC and we are left to deal with the aboriginal artifacts sites found

10. We note that Defence has chosen to use Secondary access option one – along the railway to Burbong. This is not working out as easily as Defence thought. The existing track can't be used and land needs to be acquired from various owners.

11. We again offer option three (Figure 5.2 EIS Vol. 1) through Woodlands to the Hoskinstown Road. This has access advantages for farm forestry, wind farming potential (I am looking into this and Defence could be involved) and Hyles access. It also fits the original concept of dealing with one landowner. This is on the proviso of our use for legal access.

12. DELAYS FOR ANSWERS TO OUR QUESTIONS ASKED.

After making the effort to read both volumes of the Draft EIS and making a submission and adding corrections (minor and major) in November 2003, we are still waiting for answers to some of our basic questions about

- Boundaries. (Defences Statement of Evidence – annexure 1, 2 & 3. to the PWC show the eastern boundary. This could be changing.)
- Fences.
- Legal access to the rest of Woodlands using the Commonwealth road.
- Ownership and maintenance of fences.
- Stock crossings at the Kings Highway and the primary access road.
- Farm management plans and Aboriginal Heritage conflicts.
- Water issues and possible use of sewage waste as farm fertilizer.
- Fire management and Woodlands farm forestry areas.

We have been told that Mr. Paul Gallagher (recently engaged consultant with APP) will be answering our EIS submission.

13. CONCLUSION.

The present management team headed by Air Commodore B. E. Plenty (Jack) seems to be sympathetic to our complaints with changes being made to accommodate our entitlements, and answers are slowly filtering through.

14. We hope management heads don't change as they have in the past, so we can have continuity and understanding until acquisition.

15. I close quoting the draft EIS at 19.5 "It is important that HQAST is seen as a good neighbour...etc.". As neighbours, I hope that they act as a good neighbour to the local community and us.

Yours faithfully,

Robert Hyles For Woodlands Pty Ltd. And W.R. Hyles & Co.
Phone 02 62382230 Mobile 0412 388200
Email sarobhyles@hotmail.com