

Other issues

Community consultation process

- 4.1 In its submission to the Committee, DHA advised that formal public notification of the proposed works had been undertaken and that a meeting was held with members of the public on 12 July 2001 at the Graythorne RSL.¹ DHA also advised that at the public meeting general issues regarding vegetation, traffic and open space had been raised and are being addressed, and that further public meetings are scheduled to ensure that the community is kept fully informed.²
- 4.2 In addition to consulting the public, DHA advised that the following organisations and authorities were consulted:
- Councillor Anne Bennison of Brisbane City Council, Enoggera;
 - Mr Geoff Wilson (Local State Member for Mitchelton) and Mr Jim Fouras (Local Member for Ashgrove and Enoggera);
 - Brisbane City Council;
 - the Commander of the 1st Division, Major General Jim Molan;
 - the Commander of the 7th Brigade, Brigadier P.F. McIntosh; and
 - the local representative of the National Consultative Group of Service Families.³

1 Submissions, p. 9.

2 Submissions, p. 9.

3 Submissions, p. 9.

Adequacy of consultation process

- 4.3 At the public hearing the Committee questioned DHA regarding the level of efforts undertaken to involve the community.⁴ DHA advised:

We held a publicly advertised meeting, which was attended by 30-odd people, and they raised various concerns which we were able to address, thus the reason for some amendments to our process. ... prior to this hearing, [DHA] letter boxed every house in the area – 200 houses in the area – and we opened our office, just across the road, which is adjoining the subdivision, and invited people in to view what we were doing, to talk about what we were doing and to hear their concerns. The concerns that people had were generally about the tree that was in their backyard or what we were doing about traffic or what we were doing about the size of the park. We were able to talk them through what we were doing, and they expressed satisfaction.⁵

- 4.4 At the public hearing the Committee questioned representatives from the Department of Defence whether they had been consulted about the proposed works.⁶ The Committee was advised that while representations had occurred about the location of the site, consultations had not occurred about the standards of residence that is proposed.⁷ However, this criticism of DHA was qualified by the Department of Defence Representative who stated:

The reason for that [not being consulted about the standard of housing] is that I have not really inquired, because generally we are very happy with the standard of DHA housing and I do not have any concerns from any of my people about the standard of the housing. The only concerns that are expressed to me is about the location of the housing. This development is really going a long way to help alleviate that kind of concern.⁸

Conclusions

- 4.5 The Committee is strongly of the view that it is an essential element of DHA's role in public works such as that proposed to involve and include in the process to the greatest extent possible its immediate clients.

4 Evidence, p. 3.

5 Evidence, p. 4.

6 Evidence, p. 12.

7 Evidence, p. 12.

8 Evidence, pp. 12-13.

- 4.6 The Committee is of the opinion that with respect to future projects its clients should be consulted to the fullest extent possible about all aspects of the relevant project, particularly in regard to housing, about the location and standard of that housing.

Cost

- 4.7 The cost of the project was initially set at \$16.0 million.⁹ This includes construction costs, civil works, headworks charges, contingency and professional fees.¹⁰ This estimate is based on the construction of 69 detached houses.
- 4.8 DHA, in supplementary evidence, advised that the number of houses constructed would be reduced to 66. This reduction is based on discussions with the Brisbane City Council relating to the increase in size of the community park from 1095m² to 2000m². The estimated cost of the project has consequently been reduced to \$15.3 million.¹¹
- 4.9 DHA reported that J.M. Still and Associates, Quantity Surveyors, has prepared construction estimates based on a preliminary architectural concept.¹² DHA commented that project estimates 'are based on delivery via competitive lump sum tender by suitably experienced and structured developers from the domestic sector of the local construction industry'.¹³
- 4.10 Subject to Parliamentary approval, the proposed works will commence in April 2002, with the objective of having the residences ready for occupation by December 2002.¹⁴ The works will be implemented as a managing contractor contract.

Conclusions

- 4.11 DHA confirmed in evidence that the estimated cost of building 66 detached houses at Enoggera would be \$15.3 million. DHA commissioned J.M. Still Quantity Surveyors to prepare preliminary estimates. DHA advised during a briefing to the Committee that this estimate includes a

9 Submissions, p. 9.

10 Submissions, p. 2.

11 Evidence, p. 2.

12 Submissions, p. 10.

13 Submissions, p. 10.

14 Submissions, p. 9.

sufficient contingency amount. Based on the evidence provided, the Committee accepts the project estimates.