

Appendix 6: Comments by Nick Harwood on The Property Group report

1. It seems incomplete not to have included the Main Rd site in the site comparison assessment to gauge how that site fares with the alternatives. It would come up very well on many things like acquisition cost, construction cost, geotech hazard.
2. I am uncomfortable with proposals to consider a new school site in a mapped tsunami hazard zone, especially when there is a clear option (Main Rd) that eliminates the hazard. My gut feel is that I'd be uncomfortable putting my kids in a school with a tsunami hazard. The report notes that evacuation plans can be put in place to mitigate life-risk issues. However, in terms of asset risk management it doesn't stack up to build a new multi-million dollar school in a tsunami hazard zone – again, especially when there is a local alternative (Main Rd) that does not have that risk. In my opinion, the preferred Redcliffs Pk Location B with its tsunami hazard is inferior to Main Rd for the simple reason of that hazard. By excluding Main Rd from the TPG assessment these comparisons are lost. There are also the perception management issues to consider with building in a tsunami hazard zone.

I have added pdf “sticky notes” through the main TPG report to page 46 and the T+T report (Appendix L). In the T+T report the main review comment relates to the design PGAs they have used in the liquefaction hazard assessment and this knocks on into their results.