

Campbell Barracks Redevelopment Project, Swanbourne, Western Australia

- 2.1 The Department of Defence (Defence) seeks approval from the Committee to redevelop parts of Campbell Barracks located in Swanbourne, Western Australia.
- 2.2 The primary objective of the project is to provide Campbell Barracks with functional and flexible purpose-built facilities and upgrade ageing infrastructure.¹
- 2.3 Campbell Barracks is home to the Special Air Service Regiment (SASR). The SASR is a Special Forces unit of the Australian Army which provides unique capabilities to support sensitive strategic and recovery operations, as well as advisory and training assistance to other units.²
- 2.4 The estimated cost of the project is \$223.6 million, excluding GST.
- 2.5 The project was referred to the Committee on 22 June 2015.

Conduct of the inquiry

- 2.6 Following referral, the inquiry was publicised on the Committee's website and via media release.
- 2.7 The Committee received one submission and two supplementary submissions from Defence, and four submissions from the public. A list of submissions can be found at Appendix A.
- 2.8 The Committee received a briefing from Defence and conducted an inspection and public and in-camera hearings in Perth on 6 August 2015. A transcript of the public hearing and the public submissions to the

1 Defence, submission 1, p. 14.

2 Defence, Submission 1, p. 1.

inquiry are available on the Committee's website.³

Need for the works

- 2.9 Much of the infrastructure and engineering services within Campbell Barracks date back to the 1960s. Since then, the SASR's role has expanded and the unit has more than doubled in size from approximately 300 personnel to approximately 700 personnel.⁴
- 2.10 The increase in SASR's operations and associated specialist training requirements, manning levels and equipment holdings has rendered the existing Campbell Barracks facilities and infrastructure inadequate for SASR needs.⁵
- 2.11 The redevelopment project seeks to address problems associated with ageing and obsolete working accommodation, a dysfunctional layout, inadequate storage and poor infrastructure.⁶
- 2.12 At the public hearing, Defence told the Committee that, while there were no projections for future increases in SASR personnel numbers, the redevelopment design would be flexible enough to allow for future growth should this eventuate.⁷
- 2.13 During the inspection, the Committee saw for itself the state of ageing infrastructure and noted how the current lay-out makes the SASR's ability to achieve operational efficiency challenging.
- 2.14 The Committee is satisfied that the need for the work exists.

Options considered

- 2.15 Where possible, Defence plans to adaptively reuse existing facilities.⁸
- 2.16 However, a number of the facilities that were constructed in the 1960s are, functionally inefficient and do not comply with relevant codes.⁹
- 2.17 Therefore, adaptive reuse was not considered feasible for the Operations Precinct, Combined Mess facilities, the Entry Precinct and elements of the Operational Support Squadron for the following reasons:
- functional inefficiencies associated with the location of the associated existing facilities throughout Campbell Barracks;

3 <www.aph.gov.au/pwc>

4 Defence, submission 1, p. 2.

5 Defence, submission 1, p. 3.

6 Defence, submission 1, p. 2.

7 Brigadier Noel Beutel, Defence, transcript of evidence, 6 August 2015, p. 8.

8 Defence, submission 1, p. 11.

9 Defence, submission 1, p. 11.

- technical difficulties associated with the upgrade of the existing ageing and obsolete buildings to meet the current requirement;
 - existing building size and configuration does not correlate with modern requirements;
 - security implications associated with the locations of select buildings is incompatible; and
 - the extent of works required to meet statutory requirements does not represent a cost benefit.¹⁰
- 2.18 Where adaptive reuse is not possible, Defence has considered two procurement options; a public-private partnership or a traditional contracting methodology.¹¹
- 2.19 Defence's option analysis concluded that a traditional method of contracting would offer a better outcome.¹²
- 2.20 The Committee found that Defence has considered multiple options to deliver the project and has selected the most suitable option.

Scope of the works

- 2.21 Defence has separated the work into nine scope elements.

Scope element 1 - Operations Precinct

This is proposed to be a mixed-use facility that will provide purpose-designed working accommodation and consolidate the Regimental Headquarters and four Squadrons into one interconnected, secure complex. Each facility will provide for command, control and operational office areas, open office space, Sensitive Compartmentalised Information Facility areas, briefing and conference rooms, personal storage and amenities. Key aspects of the individual facilities include:

- **Regimental Headquarters.**
Working accommodation constructed over three levels that provides a shared theatre for 450 people, mission planning rooms and laundry.
- **Squadron Facilities.**
The facilities for the squadrons will be constructed over two levels that includes an armoury, Quartermaster Store, wash down area, weapons cleaning area, loading bay and training rooms. The facilities for one of the squadrons includes workshops and laboratories.¹³

10 Defence, submission 1, pp. 11-12.

11 Defence, submission 1, p. 11.

12 Defence, submission 1, p. 11.

13 Defence, submission 1, p. 15.

2.22 *Scope element 2 - Operational Support Squadron*

This facility will consolidate Operational Support Squadron Headquarters, Quartermaster Store (Q Store), Marine Support Centre, Battle Troop, Skills Troop and Force Projection Troop. Key aspects of the facilities include:

- Operational Support Squadron facilities spread over three buildings including the two existing buildings A1005 and A4065 and new construction for the Force Projection Support Centre.
- Adaptive reuse of Building A1005 to house the Operational Support Squadron Headquarters, Q Store, common facilities, Skills Troop, Battle Troop, Force Projection Troop and associated building services. This will include working accommodation, training and development room, planning areas, conference room for 30 personnel, Q Store, armoury, loading bay and workshops.
- Adaptive reuse of Building A4065 to house elements of the Skills Troop including the Reinforcement Cell and the Climbing and Survival Cell. The facility will include office accommodation, planning room, specialty store areas, equipment cleaning area and a loading dock.
- New Force Projection Support Centre. This facility provides operation storage for each of the three Sabre Squadrons and for the Operational Support Squadron. It includes zodiac and dive storage area, weapon cleaning areas, store areas, conference and training room, office space, Q Store, pump and tank filling rooms and workshop.¹⁴

2.23 *Scope element 3 - Main Quartermaster Store (Q Store)*

It is proposed that the Q Store be moved closer to the entry precinct in order to minimise the distance travelled by delivery trucks. Consequently, the Link Building will be extended and reused. Key aspects of the facilities include:

- New headquarters which will provide offices and common facilities for personnel and will include the reception area, briefing and conference room, reproduction area, archive room and storage.
- The main Q Store which consolidates freight receipt and dispatch and storage in one location and includes delivery area, chain wire mesh store areas, office spaces, communications room, armoury, pallet store, and 14 external access squadron store areas.
- A commodity store area with general storage area, office space, customer service area, fitting rooms and returns area.¹⁵

¹⁴ Defence, submission 1, pp. 15-16.

¹⁵ Defence, submission 1, p. 16.

2.24 *Scope element 4 - 152 Signals Squadron*

It is proposed to reuse Building A4002 which already has many of the fundamental requirements of the 152 Signals Squadron. With minor refurbishment, it can provide an almost fully functional outcome. The proposed refurbishment will provide:

- A ground level containing working accommodation, common facilities, armoury, vehicle workshop including radio frequency shielding room, Q Store, and vehicle bays.
- Level one with training, briefing and conference rooms, office accommodation, and common facilities.¹⁶

2.25 *Scope element 5 - Soldier Training and Recovery Centre*

It is proposed to refurbish the existing building including re-lining the swimming pool. Key aspects of the facilities include new flexible office space, rock climbing facilities, extended training areas, and new storage areas.¹⁷

2.26 *Scope element 6 - Combined Mess*

The proposed Combined Mess consolidates all mess facilities into one building that addresses the current operational inefficiencies. It will:

- cater for 430 diners across three dining zones;
- allow for the three zones to be opened into one continuous space catering for up to 620 diners;
- provide a social hub for recreation, support and transit; accommodation for the Officers and Senior Non-Commissioned Officer ranks; and
- cater for collocated bulk food storage (both dry and refrigerated), field catering equipment store, and field ration pack/stores within the centralised loading and delivery compound.

Key aspects of the facility include:

- Three dining areas consisting of Other Ranks Mess to cater for 300 personnel, Senior Non-Commissioned Officers Mess to cater for 80 personnel, and an Officers Mess to cater for 50 Personnel;
- The Officers Mess and the Senior Non-Commissioned Officers Messes will have two levels and include transit areas, private dining areas, wet mess, ante rooms and ablutions;
- Catering Troop working accommodation including office space, training room with the capacity for 14 personnel and ablution and break out facilities.

¹⁶ Defence, submission 1, p. 17.

¹⁷ Defence, submission 1, p. 17.

- Kitchen facilities, preparation areas, store rooms, cold rooms and wash areas.¹⁸

2.27 *Scope element 7 - Entry Precinct*

The proposed new entry precinct will cater to a range of scalable security responses, including heightened levels of SAFE BASE alert, special events held at the Barracks and sufficient space for turning circles. Key aspects of the facility include:

- A new Visitor Reception Centre designed to withstand a potential blast event.
- Office space, guard room and sleeping quarters for one person, interview room, reception area, a separate Sentry House, locker room, amenities, communication rooms and secure storage areas.
- Supporting infrastructure consisting of expanded parking areas to cater for 120 vehicles including an allowance for a large truck turning circle, heavy vehicle stop and search area, realigned smart fence and crash rated sliding gate and blast walls.¹⁹

2.28 *Scope element 8 - Fibre Transmission Facility*

The proposed facility will be an extension and refurbishment of the existing Fibre Transmission Facility that will incorporate a network monitoring room.²⁰

2.29 *Scope element 9 - Infrastructure*

It is proposed to refurbish and extend the following:

- electrical network;
- information communication technology infrastructure;
- civil roads and pavements;
- civil stormwater;
- fire services;
- potable water supply;
- sewer system;
- irrigation network; and
- gas²¹

2.30 In addition, plans to both construct and refurbish existing workshop and transport yard facilities have also been approved, pending available funds.²²

18 Defence, submission 1, pp. 17-18.

19 Defence, submission 1, p. 18.

20 Defence, submission 1, p. 18.

21 Defence, submission 1, pp. 18-20.

2.31 At the public hearing, Defence told the Committee that it plans to stage these works over a three-year construction period.²³ Defence outlined a basic construction schedule:

The general idea is to build the new stuff and then go back through and do the refurbishment and adaptive reuse of the existing facilities. Basically, we will finish the gym, the mess and the operations precinct and, when the operational precinct is operational, we will go back and start retrofitting those other buildings.²⁴

2.32 Given the length and scope of the project, the Committee queried risks regarding the timeframe. Defence responded:

One of the highest risks that we have identified there is that aspect about the interface between the existing infrastructure and new infrastructure. That risk comes from a gap in information on some of the in-ground infrastructure. In the 1960s, recordkeeping on this and the ability to digitally record where certain infrastructure was in the ground was not that great, so that adds to this risk. For anything, particularly in-ground infrastructure like power, water, sewerage: if we find something that we were not aware of, it has the potential to take us either longer to repair or replace, or it could have an impact on us such that we may have to rethink the proposed solution, because what we were expecting to find may not be suitable. So there is a risk there on the time factor as well.²⁵

Hazardous materials

2.33 At the public hearing, Defence confirmed that, while asbestos had been found on the Barracks, appropriate measures are in place to manage any risk of contamination to soil and groundwater.²⁶

2.34 Given the ageing infrastructure, the Committee queried the presence of asbestos in buildings that are marked for demolition. Defence responded:

There will certainly be some. There is an asbestos register that is being maintained and updated by Defence, and we were obviously given copies of that. We then did the necessary investigations. Some of the buildings certainly will contain some elements of asbestos. It is identified in our draft environmental

22 Defence, submission 1, p. 10.

23 Brigadier Noel Beutel, Defence, transcript of evidence, 6 August 2015, p. 9.

24 Mr Cameron Owen, GHD, transcript of evidence, 6 August 2015, p. 10.

25 Brigadier Noel Beutel, Defence, transcript of evidence, 6 August 2015, p. 10.

26 Mr Jason Miezio, AECOM, transcript of evidence, 6 August 2015, pp. 10-11.

management plan, which will be given to the contractor and to the staff who will work there so that they can make sure they do the necessary investigations to identify whether it is asbestos and, if it is, have the necessary subcontractors deal with it. But the point is that a large part of the asbestos has already been removed, so we are only talking about small pockets of it in the adaptive re-use buildings.²⁷

- 2.35 The Committee was subsequently satisfied that Defence is prepared for managing hazardous materials safely and effectively.
- 2.36 Subject to Parliamentary approval of the project, work is expected to commence in early 2016 and be completed by late 2018.²⁸
- 2.37 The Committee finds that the proposed scope of works is suitable for the works to meet its purpose.

Community concerns and consultation

- 2.38 In accordance with its community consultation and communications strategy, Defence undertook the following consultative activities:
- detailed email correspondence with local groups and State and Federal members, with individual briefings conducted where requested;
 - notices in the local newspapers providing information on opportunities for the public to comment on issues relating to the project; and
 - a public consultation session held on 7 July 2015.²⁹
- 2.39 Defence responded to a number of issues raised at the public consultation session relating to the Campbell Barracks project, including questions about a possible increase in noise levels as a result of the redevelopment. Defence advised community participants that no increase in noise is expected.³⁰
- 2.40 With regard to traffic management concerns, Defence told the Committee that construction traffic would not use Campbell Barracks' main entrance, thus reducing traffic congestion around this intersection. Additionally, Defence advised that the construction contractor will be required to work with Main Roads Western Australia to ensure all construction traffic is managed appropriately.³¹

27 Mr Jason Miezio, AECOM, transcript of evidence, 6 August 2015, p. 11.

28 Defence, submission 1, p. 36.

29 Defence, submission 1.2, pp. 1-6.

30 Defence, submission 1.2, pp. 7-10.

31 Defence, submission 1.2, p. 9.

- 2.41 At the public consultation session a number of queries and concerns relating to the nearby Seaward Village redevelopment project, a Defence Housing Australia (DHA) project, were raised. Defence referred these matters for response to a DHA representative who was in attendance at the public consultation session.³²
- 2.42 The Committee also received a number of submissions from members of the public outlining concerns relating to the DHA proposal to redevelop and sell sections of the Seaward Village. Matters raised in submissions include:
- detrimental impact on local traffic;³³
 - environmental impacts including destruction of local bushland;³⁴
 - potential increased risks to the safety and security of Campbell Barracks, as well as to military personnel and families living in Seaward Village;³⁵
 - risk of disrupting training activities on Campbell Barracks;³⁶
 - a lack of collaboration between Defence and DHA regarding the Seaward Village and Campbell Barracks redevelopment projects.³⁷
- 2.43 At the Committee's public hearing, local residents Mr Andrew Leahy, vice-chairman of the Australian Special Air Service Regiment Association and Mr Vandongen, reiterated community concerns regarding the proposed DHA development at Seaward Village.³⁸
- 2.44 In response to a Committee question, Brigadier Beutel advised that although Defence were aware of community concerns relating to the Seaward Village, the DHA proposal was not seen by Defence to have an impact on the Campbell Barracks project.³⁹
- 2.45 At the in-camera hearing, representatives of Defence also reassured the Committee that they had no concerns about the proposal for more civilians to be living among enlisted residents of Seaward Village.

32 Defence, submission 1.2, p. 7.

33 Denise and Malcolm Murray, submission 4, p. 2; Merrilee Garnett and Sam Vandongen, submission 3, p. 1.

34 Denise and Malcolm Murray, submission 4, p. 2.

35 Brig (Ret) T Nolan and Maj (Ret) A Leahy, submission 2, pp. 1-3.

36 Brig (Ret) T Nolan and Maj (Ret) A Leahy, submission 2, pp. 1-3.

37 Merrilee Garnett and Sam Vandongen, submission 3, p. 4; Denise and Malcolm Murray, submission 4, p. 1; Lesley Shaw and Friends of the Allen Park Bushland Group, submission 4, p. 1.

38 Mr Andrew Leahy, private capacity, transcript of evidence, 6 August 2015, p. 1; Mr Samuel Vandongen, private capacity, transcript of evidence, 6 August 2015, p. 2.

39 Brigadier Noel Beutel, Defence, transcript of evidence, 6 August 2015, p. 7.

- 2.46 The Committee was subsequently satisfied that all matters raised by the community in relation to the Campbell Barracks redevelopment have been appropriately responded to by Defence.

Cost of the works

- 2.47 The estimated cost of the project is \$223.6 million, excluding GST.
- 2.48 At the public hearing, Defence told the Committee that completing the work in stages is an important factor in keeping within the project's delivery time frame and, consequently, budget:
- There is also the aspect that the operations do not impact on the construction aspect, noting that this particular form of contracting that we are approaching on this is a head contract. So it is fixed price and fixed schedule, and any delay that Defence causes the contractor is a cost to Defence, as opposed to the contractor. So it is extremely important that we undertake this through a phased approach...⁴⁰
- 2.49 With respect to the potential for finding hazardous materials during demolition works, Defence assured the Committee that it had contingency funding in place if this proved to be an additional cost.⁴¹
- 2.50 Defence provided further detail on the project costs in the confidential submission and during the in-camera hearing.
- 2.51 The Committee considers that the cost estimates for the project have been adequately assessed by Defence and the Committee is satisfied that the proposed expenditure is cost effective. As the project will not be revenue generating the Committee makes no comment in relation to this matter.

Committee comments

- 2.52 Having seen the ageing infrastructure and sub-optimal layout, the Committee is convinced that Campbell Barracks requires significant redevelopment in order for the SASR to continue operating effectively.
- 2.53 The Committee notes the concerns raised by local residents regarding the DHA proposed Seaward Village redevelopment. Notwithstanding these concerns, the Committee notes that local residents were very supportive of the Campbell Barracks redevelopment itself.
- 2.54 Defence is aware of the suggested increased risk to security on Campbell Barracks and to Defence personnel as a result of the Seaward Village redevelopment. The Committee understands that a security review of

40 Brigadier Noel Beutel, Defence, transcript of evidence, 6 August 2015, p. 9.

41 Brigadier Noel Beutel, Defence, transcript of evidence, 6 August 2015, p. 11

Campbell Barracks is currently being conducted⁴², and trusts that informed by the outcomes of the review Defence will manage security issues appropriately.

- 2.55 The Committee views other matters relating to Seaward Village as being not only beyond the scope of the inquiry but also outside of the Committee's authority.⁴³ Nevertheless, the Committee has undertaken to forward the transcript of public hearing proceedings to DHA for response to issues raised in relation to the proposed Seaward Village redevelopment.
- 2.56 The Committee did not identify any issues of concern with Defence's proposal to redevelop Campbell Barracks and is satisfied that the project has merit in terms of need, scope and cost.
- 2.57 Proponent agencies must notify the Committee of any changes to the project scope, time, cost, function or design. The Committee also requires that a post-implementation report be provided within three months of completion of the project. A report template can be found on the Committee's website.
- 2.58 Having regard to its role and responsibilities contained in the *Public Works Committee Act 1969*, the Committee is of the view that this project signifies value for money for the Commonwealth and constitutes a project which is fit for purpose, having regard to the established need.

Recommendation 1

- 2.59 **The Committee recommends that the House of Representatives resolve, pursuant to Section 18(7) of the *Public Works Committee Act 1969*, that it is expedient to carry out the following proposed work: the Campbell Barracks Redevelopment Project, Swanbourne, Western Australia.**

Recommendation 2

- 2.60 **The Committee requests a private briefing from the Department of Defence on the outcome of the security review of Campbell Barracks, once it has been made available to government.**

42 Defence, submission 1.2, p. 10.

43 In accordance with Section 6 A (3) of the *Public Works Committee Act 1969 (Cwth)* (Regulation 12, Schedule 3), DHA has been identified as an Authority of the Commonwealth to which the [Public Works Committee] Act does not apply.

