

The Proposed Works

Purpose

2.1 The AIPM has operated from the current site since 1960.¹ The AFP submitted that the aim of the redevelopment is to

...substantially improve the operational efficiency and long term sustainability of the AIPM, to expand the functional capacity, to modernise security and to the extent possible, to achieve compliance with the relevant codes and standards.²

Need

2.2 The AFP submitted that the need for the redevelopment is as follows:

- existing teaching, recreation, dining and administrative spaces are inadequate to satisfy increasing demand for AIPM programs;
- residential accommodation is substandard;

1 Appendix C, Submission No 1, paragraph 2

2 *ibid*, paragraph 3

- operational inefficiencies in the layout and functionality of the existing facilities;
- many of the facilities are in poor and deteriorating condition, and do not meet relevant current codes and standards;
- operating and maintenance costs are increasing as the facilities age; and
- the identified built heritage elements of the site need to be preserved and protected.³

Scope

2.3 The redevelopment will consist of:

- replacement of residential accommodation blocks, administrative and academic office accommodation and senior common room facilities;
- refurbishment of existing library, teaching, dining areas and specific heritage buildings;
- construction of soft and hard landscaping to various areas of the site including consolidation of car parking;
- removal of existing barrack style accommodation buildings and miscellaneous stores buildings; and
- landscaping works to improve the environment for both humans and native fauna occupants of the site.⁴

Options Considered

Do Nothing

2.4 The AFP submitted that this option was not considered viable as:

- the current site is considered inadequate to satisfy the needs of the AIPM; and
 - the continued use of the site will result in further deterioration, continued operational inefficiencies, ongoing high maintenance and
-

3 Appendix C, Submission No 1, paragraphs 11 - 15

4 *ibid*, paragraph 16

recurrent costs, and the need to address otherwise avoidable OH&S issues.⁵

Relocate

- 2.5 This option was not considered viable, by the AFP, as:
- it failed to take account of the strong police connection to the current site which has existed since 1960; and
 - it was the most costly and therefore least desirable option.⁶

Redevelop

- 2.6 The AFP considered this to be the most cost effective option, and following an infrastructure audit of the site, a Master Plan was developed which included three possible layouts for the site.⁷

Project Delivery

- 2.7 Subject to parliamentary approval, construction is planned to commence in late 2006 and will take approximately 26 months to complete.⁸

Cost

- 2.8 The AFP submitted that the redevelopment will cost \$16.224 million including:
- planning and approval costs and fees;
 - project management and superintendence fees;
 - all construction costs;
 - furniture;
 - fittings;
 - equipment;

5 Appendix C, Submission No. 1, paragraph 18

6 *ibid*, paragraph 19

7 *ibid*, paragraph 20

8 *ibid*, paragraph 80

- contingencies; and
- escalation.⁹

9 Appendix C, Submission No. 1, paragraph 78

