

Gallipoli Precinct Action Group

Land 17 Phase 1/B, 1C Project Gallipoli Barracks.

Chair and Committee Members of the Public Works Committee- 45th Parliament.

The Gallipoli Precinct Action Group Committee on behalf of its members particularly those living in close proximity to the Lloyd St Entrance of Gallipoli Barracks, Enoggera, Brisbane recently provided feedback as part of the PWC process involving the - Land 121 Unit Sustainment Facilities Project and in light of recommendations made by the PWC. (Correspondence dated 09/11/2016)

While the GPAG Committee has applauded the appointment of a Community Liaison Officer albeit part time this has not resulted in a resolution of residents' concerns.

It is therefore necessary for the GPAG Committee to submit a written objection to the PWC regarding the Land 17 1B/1C Defence Project for the following reasons:-

Community Consultation.

The Gallipoli Precinct Action Group Committee appreciates the difficulty confronting Defence when endeavouring to consult with multiple stakeholders. Members of the community were given the opportunity to raise their concerns at a Community consultation held 09/11/2016 at the Gaythorne Bowls Club. Disappointingly, the GPAG Committee President was only informed of this scheduled "consultation" 24 hours earlier by chance from a phone call from the Gallipoli Barracks Base Support Manager, Mr Heath Rosen in relation to another matter. This, despite an earlier phone call from a gentleman from Defence Infrastructure @ 2 weeks earlier requesting contact details of the Gallipoli Precinct Action Group. Disappointingly no correspondence was received prior to the scheduled consultation and unlike other Defence projects no newsletter drops informing the local community of the scheduled consultation was arranged. An advertisement was placed in the local newspaper which historically has not proved to be the most effective way of communication given the unreliability of newspaper delivery persons. Correspondence was received a day after the scheduled meeting advising that an error had been made causing the email not to be sent. It is unclear why the information was not provided as part of the initial phone conversation. The same evening at the same venue a Community Consultation re the Land 121 Unit Sustainment Facilities Project was held.

Noise/pollution.

As a means of demonstrating reasonableness the GPAG Committee and local residents have to date avoided voicing concerns about the level of noise associated with activity on base. The relocation of a significant number of Military vehicles of one model or another from Sugar Mill Rd to the "inner city Army Base" has meant an increase in the level of noise in the surrounding area.

Many of these vehicles are not suited for road travel or are oversize and transported into the Base via the shared Council road. The GPAG Committee would question whether a Road Traffic Noise Assessment was conducted at any stage of the redevelopment of Gallipoli Barracks and/or with subsequent projects.

It's worth noting too that nowhere in Defences submission to the PWC have Defence considered the impact that noise dust and fumes associated with construction activity will have on the surrounding area.

Noise is particularly problematic when heavy vehicles wait on the residential street or in the entry lane's to the base close to residential housing leaving their engines running as passes are secured and directions received. It's worth mentioning that projects run concurrently on base with many projects not requiring PWC approval but requiring the use of heavy vehicles. The use of Compression brakes also impact the local neighbourhood. As was reasoned by Ms Claydon (PWC – Land 121 Unit Sustainment Facilities Project page 11) it is the “accumulative effects” of these issues that lead to greater frustration.

Contact- Project Team

It has recently been brought to the attention of the GPAG Committee that no “site manager” related to the current Land 121 Unit Sustainment Facilities Project is available to be contacted should an issue arise and the contact procedure is via email. It makes one question how “issues” can be addressed “immediately” by the Project team. The GPAG Committee believe that this same process will be followed with the Land 17 Phase 1B/1C Project.

Traffic Concerns – Impact on Local Community – Security.

Page 19 of Defences Submission

Public Transport, Local Road and Traffic Concerns

43. There is no increase to base populations as a result of this project. However, during construction there will be an increase to the number of large vehicles that enter the bases to deliver materials to site for construction. Contractual arrangements within each construction contract will mitigate the effects of this on the local road network through the development of Traffic Management Plans (if applicable) within each Site Management Plan.

Impact on Local Community

47. The additional construction vehicles required to enter each site will be managed closely to ensure that impact on any local community will be minimised. Prior to construction commencing, Defence will hold community consultation sessions as required to articulate the proposed site and traffic management procedures. This will allow the community to provide feedback on any issues regarding perceived impact by the construction.

Page 22 of Defences Submission

Security

57. Advice from Defence Security and Vetting Service 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.

Gallipoli Barracks has approximately 7,000 Personnel with Base accommodation for around 2000. Access and Egress to Gallipoli Barracks is problematic for both Local Communities living in close proximity to Gallipoli Barracks and ADF Personnel with traffic congestion both on and off the Base. The Lloyd Street Entrance is the only gate operating with unrestricted hours. Lloyd Street is a shared public road.

Gallipoli Barracks Traffic Management Plans - Access via Lloyd Street (Main Gate)

Traffic Management Plans are not exclusive to “Projects” but apply to ALL vehicles requiring access to this large facility via the main Lloyd Street Gate - ADF Personnel, Civilians, Contractors, Deliveries Ancillary Services etc. . . .

Base Standing Orders, Traffic Management Plans – Project specific/regular deliveries affirm that vehicles are required to access Lloyd St via Wardell Street not rat run the side streets to access Lloyd Street and subsequently the Main Gate.

This is supported by long standing Brisbane City Council traffic directives, Local Traffic Only Signs – No left turn into the residential side streets from Lloyd Street. Residents have issue with the position of the U turn facility (Entrance Upgrade ELF2B Project) which allows direct access into Gallipoli Barracks entry lanes via Ardentallen Road. (This issue has been raised multiple times with a number of “stakeholders” and is contrary to advice given at so called community consultations and Defences stated objectives to the local community to “minimise rat running through the local residential area”.)

As stated in the Gallipoli Precinct Action Groups’ “feedback” dated 09/11/2016- “Millions of dollars of public funds have been spent to upgrade Samford Rd/ Wardell St intersection to facilitate the new entry on Samford Rd with the problematic Lloyd St/Wardell St intersection upgraded to **specifically** address safety and improve traffic flow into Gallipoli Barracks via Lloyd St. A section of Lloyd St has also been upgraded by Brisbane City Council increasing the lanes from 2 lanes to 4 lanes to assist traffic movement in and out of Gallipoli Barracks.”

Excerpt from Minutes of Proceedings the 4428 Meeting of the Brisbane City Council, held at City Hall Brisbane on Tuesday 25th February 2014 at 2pm.

Councillor Andrew Wines (Enoggera Ward) -: “\$65 million Samford Road State project, the \$30 million Lloyd and Wardell State project, the \$5.4million committed by Ms Gambaro, Federal MP for Brisbane and the Abbott Government, and our contributions will total more than \$100 million public funds....

The issues for residents is Non Compliance of Gallipoli Barracks Traffic to Base Standing Orders, Brisbane City Council Directives and Traffic Management Plans affecting the safety and amenity of the local community.

Disappointingly the main perpetrators are ADF Personnel. This belligerent attitude is also reflected in other inappropriate behaviour witnessed by the local community- Aggressive driving; speeding, verbal abuse, drunken and lewd behaviour and the continued attempts to smuggle persons into Gallipoli Barracks via the boots or cargo areas of private vehicles.

Regarding ADF conduct -The GPAG Committee note with interest a statement in the PWC Report re the Enhanced Land Force Stage 2 Facilities Project -2009 page 31.

“5.25 Another concern that has been brought to the attention of the Committee, in the current and previous inquiries, is the impact of anti-social and dangerous behaviour by Defence personnel on the local communities in which Defence bases are located. Similar concerns have been raised in Chapter 3. The Committee remains concerned that the behaviour of some Defence force personnel impacts negatively on local residents. Defence has a responsibility, as an employer and member of the community, to ensure that its personnel act in a responsible manner both on and off-base.”

The GPAG Committee and the broader community would concur with the quoted statement- Defence has a responsibility, as an employer and member of the community, to **ensure** that its personnel act in a responsible manner both **on and off-base** rather than the “boys will be boys’ line that has generally been used.

While it is evident that effort has been made by Defence to address a number of issues since the appointment of the Community Liaison Officer there has been no real resolution. It is the GPAG Committees concern that once the PWC avert their eyes from Gallipoli Barracks the old familiar habits of unresponsiveness to voiced concerns will return.

While the GPAG Committee consider it prudent to withhold approval to this and future projects until residents long standing concerns are resolved the GPAG Committee are also mindful of the limitations of the PWC. Nonetheless the GPAG Committee note with interest one of the objectives of the Public Works Committee “Examination of the entire project, irrespective of stages/phases; “and would appreciate this objective considered as part of the Public Works Committees deliberation.

GPAG Committee

Mary Harbeck President

