



PARLIAMENT OF TASMANIA

PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Redevelopment of Dodges Ferry Primary School

Presented to the Clerk of the House of Assembly in accordance with House of Assembly Sessional Order 321.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

Legislative Council

Ms Rattray (Deputy Chair)
Mr Hiscutt

House of Assembly

Ms Butler (Chair)
Ms Burnet
Mr Shelton

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	3
2	BACKGROUND.....	3
3	PROJECT COSTS	5
4	EVIDENCE	6
5	DOCUMENTS TAKEN INTO EVIDENCE	24
6	CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION	25

1 INTRODUCTION

The Committee has the honour to report to the House of Assembly in accordance with the provisions of the *Public Works Committee Act 1914* and House of Assembly Sessional Order 321 on the -

Redevelopment of Dodges Ferry Primary School

2 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 This reference recommended the Committee approve redevelopment works at Dodges Ferry Primary School to deliver contemporary, flexible learning environments, safer amenities, address capacity constraints and remove all demountable buildings from the site.
- 2.2 Dodges Ferry Primary School was established in 1988 and is located on Old Forcett Road, Dodges Ferry, on a 4.71ha site partly surrounded bushland near the coast and adjacent a council owned sports oval. The built infrastructure includes 21 single-story buildings, including six demountable buildings.
- 2.3 Each year the Department of Education, Children and Young People assesses the infrastructure priorities across its schools. Dodges Ferry Primary School has been assessed as a Priority One school, with Priority One schools having the most urgent infrastructure upgrade needs.
- 2.4 Continuing enrolment growth at Dodges Ferry Primary School has led to capacity constraints, and demountable classrooms have been installed on site to cope with demand. A demountable amenities block has also been installed at the school, to provide sufficient facilities to meet the additional enrolment demand. The placement of these demountable buildings has reduced organisational coherence across the school, resulting in inefficient circulation patterns and diminished sightlines that adversely affect campus functionality and supervision.
- 2.5 Several buildings, including some demountable classrooms, are in poor condition and occupy land ideally suited to new general learning areas (GLAs) and a delivering a more cohesive campus layout. The school also has a lack of offices, breakout rooms and meeting spaces to provide support services to students. Outdoor areas are also increasingly constrained, with available open space insufficient to adequately meet the needs of the growing student population.
- 2.6 In response, DECYP and the school community have planned a redevelopment to address these issues with the following scope of work:
 - removal of all demountable buildings and some permanent structures that are at the end of lifespan;
 - replacement of toilet facilities and provision of additional safer student bathroom facilities;

- provision of 14 new contemporary GLAs with covered outdoor connections including a new kindergarten building and outdoor play area with connection to the prep building;
- extended and refurbished administration building including a welcoming entry foyer to school;
- new fencing where required;
- refurbishment of existing building nine into a food hub;
- significant improvement of line of site and improved connectivity to all external areas;
- reconfiguration of existing roadways, bus drop off, car drop off and visitor/staff carparking; and
- potable water and sewer service upgrades.

3 PROJECT COSTS

- 3.1 Pursuant to the Message from Her Excellency the Governor-in-Council, the estimated cost of the work is \$25 million.

The following table details the cost estimates for the project as at the time of DECYP making its submission:

Description	Cost Estimate (\$'000)
Construction Cost (inc. site infrastructure upgrades)	14,820
Market Conditions and Escalation Forecast	2,880
Construction Contingency	1,770
Consultant Services	1,553
Statutory Fees / Insurances	500
Furniture/Equipment/IT	500
Tasmanian Government Art Scheme	80
DECYP Project Management	750
School Administration Support	60
Design Contingency	750
General Project and Post Occupancy Contingency	1,337
Total	25,000

...

The total budget estimate is summarised above and demonstrates sufficient market and escalation allowances, as well as design and construction contingencies to manage unforeseen circumstances that may arise during the design and construction.

A staged construction program has been developed to minimise school operational impacts during construction and is anticipated to be undertaken over 18 months. Site infrastructure service upgrades are included in the construction cost, noting the bulk of the service upgrades will occur in stage one with the new buildings.

The project budget currently allows for a total project contingency of \$5.4 million made up of the following elements:

- Construction Contingency \$1.770 million
- Design Contingency \$750,000
- Market Conditions and Escalation Allowance \$2.880 million¹

¹ *Dodges Ferry Primary School – Major Redevelopment*, Submission to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, pp. 17-18

4 EVIDENCE

4.1 The Committee commenced its inquiry on Tuesday, 7 July 2026 with an inspection of the site of the proposed works. The Committee then returned to Committee Room 1, Parliament House, whereupon the following witnesses appeared, made the Statutory Declaration and were examined by the Committee in public:-

- Kane Salter, Deputy Secretary Business Operations and Support, Department for Education, Children and Young People;
- Todd Williams, Director Facility Services, Department for Education, Children and Young People;
- Ron Daly, Education Leader Learning Environments, Department for Education, Children and Young People; and
- Paul Cockburn, HBV Architects.

The following Committee Members were present:

- Ms Jen Butler MP (Chair);
- Hon Tania Rattray MLC (Deputy Chair);
- Hon Casey Hiscutt MP; and
- Mr Mark Shelton MP.

Need for the Redevelopment

4.2 The DECYP submission outlined the need for the works, noting Dodges Ferry Primary School had been identified as a high priority for redevelopment:

In 2023, DFPS was identified by DECYP as a Priority 1 site for capital redevelopment. DFPS was included in the DECYP submission to the Department of Treasury and Finance in 2023 and \$25 million was allocated in the 2024-25 State Budget.

DECYP considers DFPS a priority site for works to provide facilities that are healthy, safe and fit-for-purpose to deliver high quality teaching, learning and support services, with safe and welcoming spaces that contribute to improved education and lifelong learning outcomes for the school community.²

...

Continuing enrolment growth at the Dodges Ferry Primary School has required support from ongoing delivery of demountable buildings. There are currently six demountable buildings servicing the school at the start of 2026.

The incremental addition of demountable buildings has, over time, eroded the campus's organisational coherence, resulting in awkward circulation patterns and diminished sightlines. Outdoor areas are increasingly constrained, with shrinking open space unable to meet the needs of a growing learner population. Any additional demountable would need to be placed

² *Dodges Ferry Primary School – Major Redevelopment*, Submission to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, p. 8

on the last remaining level, grassed areas—reducing essential play space and creating remote, poorly connected learning locations positioned well away from core school amenities.

The school has inadequate offices, breakout rooms and meeting spaces to provide support services to learners.

Dodges Ferry is not serviced by TasWater for water supply or wastewater removal. School water use requires weekly water-tanker deliveries. Site wastewater infrastructure is problematic. The school is serviced by a settling pond which is legacy infrastructure not adopted by TasWater as not meeting standards.

Several buildings (including demountable buildings) are in poor condition and occupy the optimal location for new GLAs and a cohesive campus strategy.

Building 12 (Ferry Hall) was considered for relocation/repurposing but contains extensive asbestos and lead paint and the project budget contains no available funding for refurbishment or relocation of this facility.

The redevelopment of DFPS will address these site issues, while also delivering on the core objective of increasing the school's capacity and providing connected contemporary learning and support facilities.³

..

Learning spaces currently feature visible learning prompts and student work, but limitations such as inconsistent classroom sizes, temperature control issues, minimal breakout areas, and restricted visibility create barriers to fully realising contemporary learning opportunities.

The opportunity to integrate learning in both indoor and outdoor spaces is currently an opportunity not available consistently to all students across all year groups.

The future vision for pedagogy at DFPS builds on these strengths by leveraging design to amplify learning opportunities for all students:

- Flexible and connected General Learning Areas (GLAs) will support fluid grouping, team-teaching, and targeted instruction, with acoustically treated breakout rooms enabling small-group learning, assessment, and sensory regulation.
- Enhanced access to outdoor learning environments, including nature-based and covered spaces, will promote inquiry, creativity and wellbeing, aligning with the school's holistic teaching and learning philosophy.
- Purposeful circulation, improved visibility, flexible furniture, and elements such as natural light and calming colour palettes will further enhance learning conditions and student choice.
- Access to technology and improved connectivity all across the site will allow contemporary digital learning practices to thrive.
- A return to the notion of a 'village' school where the built environment radiates out from a central hub will encapsulate students in an environment of care, supported by high quality learning opportunities through sensitive pedagogical practices.⁴

School Capacity

4.3 The DECYP submission noted the current capacity of the school and the increased capacity made possible as a result of the redevelopment:

³ *Dodges Ferry Primary School – Major Redevelopment*, Submission to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, p. 9

⁴ *Dodges Ferry Primary School – Major Redevelopment*, Submission to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, p. 5

The current enrolment capacity is for 650 FTE, however this currently includes a number of temporary buildings. Based on student data the school is at approximately 78 per cent occupancy.

The proposed works will increase the school's capacity to 725 FTE which can be accommodated in permanent, contemporary facilities.

DECYP enrolment projections, as per the table below, note an anticipated decrease in enrolments, however housing developments near the school are noted, and it is unclear if a reduction in the student numbers will eventuate. The project provides future proofing by including additional GLAs to accommodate potential enrolment growth.

First Term Census Actual 2023-2026 and Projected 2027-2029

	*2023	*2024	**2025	**2026	**2027	**2028	**2029
Kindergarten (Head Count)	36.5	41	35.5	37	34	31	30.5
Preparatory	64.5	62.5	68	70.5	68.5	68.5	63
Year 1	79.5	66	81	66.5	71.5	69	69.5
Year 2	63	73.5	78	79.5	70	69.5	68
Year 2	72.5	63	71	76.5	73.5	68	66.5
Year 4	60.5	66.5	68	70	71	70.5	66
Year 5	60.5	58.5	67	65	60.5	62	61.5
Year 6	56	61	49	65.5	57	57	58
Total Persons	493	492	517.5	530.5	506	495.5	483

5

4.4 The Committee questioned the witnesses about the school capacity, including how it is calculated:

CHAIR - ... The school currently enrolls around 530 full-time students, we understand from our hearing today, but this proposed project is being expanded to a capacity of 725 students. How was the 725-student figure determined?

Mr DALY - My understanding is that it is based on spaces that can accommodate your general learning aspects. I guess when we talk about capacity, personally, I see two aspects to that. I see a capacity from that perspective, but an operational capacity, which I think is different, we talk about the general learning areas (GLAs) where the students will spend most of their time, but there also needs to be spaces that some of those specialist classes - such as your art and it could be science, or it might be music and so forth - can be conducted. When we talk capacity here, that's including those spaces. I think, hopefully, that explains how that works. So, capacity in terms of the way we look at it, doesn't necessarily work from a point of view for a school operation.

CHAIR - So, it's not a basis of modelling on projected housing growth in the area? Or is there any demographic consideration taken -

⁵ *Dodges Ferry Primary School – Major Redevelopment*, Submission to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, p. 6

Mr DALY - In terms of the projected numbers, there is a formula... but it does take into account some of those things that you've just mentioned.

Mr WILLIAMS - ... What Ron was saying around the operational needs of a school is real. We have a basic capacity calculation that applies a simple calculation for every available space that can be used as a general learning area by 25 students. Currently, the school capacity is calculated at 675 and we are looking to increase that.

Partly the feedback we received from community was around the growing needs of the school and, if we were investing funds, the feedback that came through was ensuring that we were positioning for the future. In our submission, we've included the department's internal projection figures, which are used for a variety of reasons. There's always a balance, so it is hard to get good, up-to-date demographic information and there are differing means. Government does have a source, and we're working to improve that source. We also have had a good collaboration with council, who also have a good source of information, including the land availability and the land rezoning. You put all of that together and we believe we've come up with the right figure to plan for the next 50 years, which is the investment that we're making - is a substantial investment to position the school for the future.

Mr HISCUTT - Can I tease that capacity question out a little bit? There's 25 GLAs, including the three kinder ones, as I read the plans, at 25 - and I note this is where I'm going with this discussion - that equals 700 at 25 per room and the capacity is 750, which, as you said, I understand to mean other specialist spaces. But at the start of the day, all children need to start in a homeroom; they're not going to start their day in music classroom or the science classroom. Why do we use that number as a capacity when it clearly is not right? It's not the capacity of the school.

Mr WILLIAMS - We use that should we need to be able to use the space and we needed to have a consistent methodology. We do have schools that are under pressure, and those schools that are under pressure we do look to use a music room or an art room for a general learning area. It's a consistent statewide application that we use as a mechanism that we can then go further and have the local discussions - that does involve our learning area to talk about how schools use the spaces, because each school does use their space differently. But it's a method - and we track the occupancy, the capacity fee actuals biannually when the census is done, and that's a mechanism for us to hone in on those schools that are under pressure. Then we work with them further to see how we can support them.

Mr HISCUTT - I just feel like that methodology sets schools up to fail because they will be in a position where... it won't be known until too late that they are above what the real capacity is. It's a real concern of mine, so that's why I'm going into it.

Mr SALTER - Perhaps just to add, we don't aim to get schools to 100 per cent capacity. So, when we're looking at it, 80 per cent is what we're looking for, and when schools get above that, we know they're starting to potentially creep into spaces that they're using for other purposes. So, yes, we're not aiming to get to 100 per cent capacity.

Mr HISCUTT - I would have thought it would be better to define that 80 per cent is 100 per cent and schools could bear the 105 or 110 per cent capacity, would be a more realistic way of looking at that instead of trying to keep it below...

Mr DALY - It does very much come down to, as Todd said, around how they structure their school, how they operate, class sizes, because it's based on 25. Ideally, a lot of schools will set up more in the low 20s. So, there's a whole lot of factors. I guess it's finding that - having that common measure that they can apply across the whole system.⁶

⁶ Transcript of Evidence, 7 July 2026, Department for Education, Children and Young People, p. 2-4

Consultation

4.5 The DECYP submission provided a summary of consultation undertaken for the project:

DECYP undertakes extensive community engagement for all major capital works projects and initiated community consultation in September 2024 for this project. The purpose of the consultation process was to generate awareness and seek feedback from the school and the community on the draft site master plan and to inform the development scope of works for the Government's \$25 million funding commitment. Consultation feedback was via an online form and workshops with students, staff members and the broader community. A Community Engagement Outcomes Report (Attachment 3) was prepared following this consultation process, which was made available via the consultation database, school channels and on DECYP's website in early 2025.

The PWG - comprised of representatives from the school, school association, facility services and the design consultant team - have met fortnightly to analyse, discuss and provide feedback on every element of the design and project as it evolved. Students and staff have been consulted during the design phase and feedback incorporated into the design choices.

The PWG reviewed the draft site master plan and developed a site master plan that incorporated key priorities identified through the consultation for improving teaching and learning.

The current concept plan (Attachment 1) scope of works supports the community voice and the schools teaching and learning framework by maintaining a central, prominent library as a key learning hub, providing more and larger classrooms to support enrolment growth, increasing storage and improved staff and student bathrooms, expanded spaces for student support and staff collaboration and prioritisation of redevelopment of early years learning spaces.

The current concept plan (Attachment 1) for the proposed works was endorsed by DECYP in December 2025.

Consultation with the students, staff and the broader community on the concept plan was undertaken from 17 February until 13 March 2025. The concept plan was shared with the broader school community and the consultation process was promoted via the school's communication channels, the DECYP website and social media channels. As part of the community consultation process, staff and parents/carers had the opportunity to provide any additional feedback on the concept plan.

Further consultation on the draft concept plan was undertaken in February – March 2026 with the school and broader community. A small number of enquiries were received seeking further information on elements contained in either the concept plan or the artist's impressions. No significant issues were raised.⁷

4.6 The Committee asked the witnesses to provide additional detail on the consultation process:

Mr SHELTON - ... can you just explain... the extent of the consultation that's happened and to hear everybody talking about it and understanding the fact that they've been under pressure for a long time. There's been a series of sort of minor upgrades, but it's got to that point where it needed to be done. So, community consultation is my request for you to just inform the committee.

...

⁷ *Dodges Ferry Primary School – Major Redevelopment*, Submission to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, p. 9-10

Mr COCKBURN - ... we've had project work groups for the last 12 months, which are fortnightly basis, and that has involved the school association - two members of the school association for that period...

...

Mr WILLIAMS - ... The 'get involved' campaign that we run for all our school redevelopments is an important connection with community and upfront before we start doing things, we go and talk to community about that and we did that. Through that process, we got some very strong views from community, which were welcomed. One of those was around their library and ensuring their library stayed central to the school. The other part was about futureproofing; making sure we built capacity into the future. That happens upfront before Ron and Paul were engaged, and then also part of that are staff forums and student forums. Unfortunately, Matt - as Matt Kenny is the principal - isn't here today, but Matt was central in those forums with the 'get involved' team and did have specific forums with staff and students to capture and listen. Then through the design process, when we have our concept plan to share, we've gone back out to community to share that with community. So, we're upfront, we're listening, designing and then re-engaging and the feedback has all been positive around the plans that we're presenting to you today for consideration.

Mr DALY - ... Through those fortnightly meetings - there's a representation, I guess, in those meetings. There's staff, there's school association, DECYP and architects, and then the workshops as well that have been conducted to gain further input from staff. Only recently there was another workshop with the kinder staff around the development of that space. So, it's been an ongoing process.

- 4.7 The committee sought further detail from the witnesses on two of the key issues raised during consultation; retention of the library and Out of School Hours Care (OSHC).
- 4.8 Regarding the library, it was noted that there was strong feedback about retaining the library in its current form as the heart of the school, with the witnesses noting retention was a key factor that influenced the redevelopment design:

CHAIR - ... The community engagement consultation report showed strong concern regarding the future of the library. We saw the library today. How did that feedback influence your final concept plan?

Mr COCKBURN - Very strongly. That was pretty much the first item that we had to address: the retention of that library as a no-go development zone.

CHAIR - Yes, and the core of the school, we gathered.

Mr COCKBURN - And the heart of the school.

Mr WILLIAMS - In the original - to start, to facilitate discussion with community, we did a high-level plan. That high-level plan talked about the food and the library coming together in the centre. The feedback from community was very strong, that they did not want the food with the library. We've then reconsidered the plan and realigned the food in an adjacent area that you saw today.⁸

- 4.9 The Committee recognised that access to OSHC was important for the school community and this was made clear in consultation responses. The Committee

⁸ Transcript of Evidence, 7 July 2026, Department for Education, Children and Young People, p. 4-5

sought to explore this matter further with the witnesses, including potential options for providing OSHC at the school:

CHAIR - Community consultation repeatedly also highlighted the need for a dedicated before- and after-school care facility, yet this submission is largely silent on that provision. Why has that need not been identified as a project priority and where will that demand be accommodated once the redevelopment is complete? It just seems to be a pretty prevalent theme through - and I've had a number of submissions or conversations with members of the community, as I'm sure Mr Shelton has as well around that aspect.

Mr WILLIAMS - Yes, certainly understand and value what outside-school-hour care brings to school communities. Absolutely.

CHAIR - And productivity for Tasmania so people can work.

Mr WILLIAMS - Yes, absolutely. Much needed and fully supported. The challenge with the project that we've presented is the scale of removing the modular units that we have - the modular classrooms and the modular amenity facilities - and replacing new. The highest priority for the project was around contemporary learning areas and, indeed, the contemporary support spaces which the school really lacks at the moment - not enough meeting rooms to bring professional support staff easily. So, they were the highest priorities. We are still progressing outside-school-hour consideration.

There is a \$10 million government OSHC (outside school hours care) program and Dodges Ferry is being considered under that, and we're working that assessment through right now and hopefully that will be presented in the coming months. We certainly value OSHC, outside school hours care, and there is a fund that we're looking to support schools to expand OSHC.

CHAIR - Is there a risk that the redevelopment will be completed without sufficient dedicated OSHC space to meet that community need? Rather, they are really just two distinct things now, are they?

Mr SALTER - I think they're two distinct things. But as Todd's outlined, the assessment for the use of the \$10 million funds, the minister's made some initial announcements on three schools, so we're working through the next stage of considerations for the minister to make decisions on. It's part of current decision-making processes.

Mr WILLIAMS - And certainly not going to pre-empt the outcome of the process that's working through. What I would say, though, is the work that we're doing under this project increases capacity and provides space for the school to have flexibility with its use and OSHC is a consideration in that. Yes, there is a little conflict in terms of times, before- and after-school care, but there is also an opportunity that the school will have more space at their needs.

Ms RATTRAY - I always had an interest in demountables. You'd probably recognise that across the table. But given that there are six demountable buildings and some of them are leased - I don't believe all of them would be leased, I think we saw where ones up the back were initially there for a short term and ended up being a long term - is there any opportunity to reuse any of the demountables for some OSHC care? Is that something that could be facilitated?

Mr WILLIAMS - What I would say about the demountables is that they're not contemporary and we use them as our temporary structures whilst we're sourcing a permanent solution. We do currently have six modular units on site and two modular amenity blocks, so there's eight altogether and that doesn't include those classrooms up the top that I referred to as the modulars before the modulars that became permanent. So, if you included that, there's probably another half a dozen on top of that. In regards to the reuse of the four that we lease - and there's the two toilet blocks that we lease as well, there's two modular units - and the approach that we use in that is that that forms part of our construction contract and the contractor then takes responsibility for that building. As we talked about, then there's an opportunity for parties to connect with the construction company around future use of that facility.

Ms RATTRAY - So, I guess the answer's is no, pretty much?

Mr WILLIAMS - I still believe there's an opportunity.

Ms RATTRAY - But effectively, in the short term, no.

Mr DALY - I think some of the spaces, those additional spaces, that the school will have access to will probably accommodate OSHC better than one of the terrapins or demountables. I guess the food multi-purpose space that's going to be created will probably fit that need if it is needed and the OSHC funding doesn't progress.

Ms RATTRAY - Or if it's progressed.

Mr DALY - Yes.

Mr COCKBURN - It's probably fair to say that the demountables are inappropriate because they don't have facilities attached to them; they're just simply classroom spaces.

Mr WILLIAMS - Yes, and that's the other part, is then you've got your supervision of students who are leaving the modular unit to go to the toilets, and obviously, hopefully in a contemporary world, you position those things close together to maximise supervision and safeguarding.⁹

...

Ms RATTRAY - Just a question around the decommissioning of the current canteen space, which would have a kitchen facility of some sort - we didn't actually head into there. Is that going to be repurposed, that particular area?

...

Mr WILLIAMS - It's a small kitchen that's connected to the gymnasium - in close proximity to it.

...It'll remain as such. It is also the area that we're looking at to support OSHC, the outside school hours care, and a kitchen is important for that. There's an adjoining music area which we see, potentially, the music area, the kitchen and the gymnasium supporting OSHC as well. So, the small kitchen - canteen - we still see value in that as it currently stands because the gymnasium area is really the community connection area, which seems logical to keep that as part of it.

Ms RATTRAY - As part of it, even though - and forgive me if I'm misunderstood you - but you already indicated that the OSHC area would be well suited to the hub area as well. So, you're not going to have two lots of spaces, are you? Or potentially, yes?

Mr WILLIAMS - I think there's flexibility - is what we've talked about it.

Mr DALY - It could accommodate it.

Mr WILLIAMS - We're still working that OSHC program through. The connection to that community zone is what I was talking about with the canteen and keeping the canteen and potentially, in the future, having OSHC in that front community zone. But there is opportunity for the other spaces in the school, should they be needed.¹⁰

Central Food Hub

4.10 The Committee asked the witnesses to explain the reasoning behind prioritising a central food hub over some of the other options raised by the school community

⁹ Transcript of Evidence, 7 July 2026, Department for Education, Children and Young People, p. 5-7

¹⁰ Transcript of Evidence, 7 July 2026, Department for Education, Children and Young People, p. 11-12

during consultation. The witnesses noted that it could function as more than just a food hub and was multi-purpose in nature:

CHAIR - ... Why was a food hub considered a higher priority than some of the classrooms, say, or library and early year upgrades that were sought by the community? Could you explain for the record why that central food hub was prioritised?

Mr DALY - I mean, it's listed as a food hub but, for me, it's a multipurpose space. So, it may accommodate a class for a specialist, and that may be food and fibre down the track, because schools, the specialist offerings will often change depending on the skill set of the staff that they can attract to their school. It will be more than just a food dining space; it will be used as a classroom meeting - a larger meeting space as well.

Mr COCKBURN - A full staff meeting can occur in the food building, and it's probably the only place that's really appropriate to a full staff meeting, rather than a gymnasium, for example.

Mr DALY - And the location, adjacent to the gymnasium - the community spaces, I guess - the gymnasium, the library, it's creating a space for young people to connect.

CHAIR - One of the young men - actually, I think he was one of the school captains - we spoke to said there was going to be a full kitchen as part of that food hub. Can you give us some details around that?

Mr COCKBURN - There will be a full kitchen as part of that. It'll be a commercial kitchen. It'll be able to be simply separated from the other space to allow that flexibility that Ron was referring to. But we see it operating in a number of ways: one is separate to that space and the other one is for a full cafeteria experience within it. It sort of continues on in a link way between those two buildings that we've opened up, which is currently a narrow little passage through the building, and that becomes an outdoor space to the food hub as well - to the eating space.

...

Mr WILLIAMS - I did mention this morning at the meeting, when I talked and explained to the committee about contemporary schools and contemporary learning, it's about the learning spaces and the flexibility and the indoor and outdoor, and it's absolutely about the support spaces where professionals can come in. Even more so today it's about food and about bringing young people together to learn about food, but to eat together as part of that as well. In the contemporary developments we're doing, food is a central part of that and many schools - and I can't remember how many times they had breakfast club and hot meals - but you heard the young people talk about that today and the benefit that that brings.¹¹

Water and Sewerage Works

- 4.11 The DECYP submission outlined the current issues with the school's water and sewerage services and the benefits of the proposed service infrastructure upgrades:

Dodges Ferry is not serviced by TasWater for water supply or wastewater removal. School water use requires weekly water-tanker deliveries. Site wastewater infrastructure is problematic. The school is serviced by a settling pond which is legacy infrastructure not adopted by TasWater as not meeting standards.¹²

¹¹ Transcript of Evidence, 7 July 2026, Department for Education, Children and Young People, p. 10-11

¹² *Dodges Ferry Primary School – Major Redevelopment*, Submission to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, p. 9

Infrastructure upgrades (water and wastewater) reduce environmental and health risk and reliance on tanker deliveries.¹³

4.12 The Committee asked the witnesses to provide further detail on the proposed water and sewerage infrastructure works:

Ms RATTRAY - I was interested to read that Dodges Ferry is not serviced by TasWater for water supply and wastewater removal, so there's obviously some significant works that have to be undertaken to facilitate what infrastructure is needed for the school. I think it would be really useful to have what infrastructure is required and what consultation and communication has been undertaken and the solutions that have been arrived at with TasWater around that really important infrastructure.

Mr COCKBURN - I could probably talk about the need to upgrade some of the infrastructure in terms of water storage for various things, particularly firefighting. The firefighting capacity at present is significantly low. That's a big cost to do that - to replace all of that. You'll notice, after walking around today, the location for a number of water tanks for drinking water. Currently, the school gets water trucked in and we're hoping to alleviate that problem with the water storage that is rainwater, essentially. The wastewater treatment plant, which, to be honest, I've had little to do with because it doesn't form part of this project; it's a separate project with TasWater...

Mr WILLIAMS - ...As part of our infrastructure assessment upfront, we understood the challenges of old infrastructure. When the current sewerage system was installed, the school certainly wasn't the size that it is today. To position for the future, we know that we need an improved sewerage system and, for some time now, we've been working with Sorell Council and TasWater on what the solution is. Through that discussion there's been an agreement reached for TasWater to fund a new sewerage system that will not only support the school, it will also support the local football club and the community centre. As we're going to be undertaking the major works, we've agreed that we would deliver those works as part of our project that's covered under the funding agreement with TasWater.

Ms RATTRAY - Have you identified what the cost from the department is going to be? We heard this morning that TasWater's contribution is in the order of \$600,000.

...

Mr WILLIAMS - ... There is not a cost to the department for that; TasWater have agreed to fund the installation. We are project managing that component and TasWater have agreed to pay for that project management component as well. Yes, the current cost estimate that we've based the funding agreement on at this point is approximately \$600,000.

Ms RATTRAY - Right. And the department has that in writing?

Mr WILLIAMS - We have that in a signed agreement, correct. Yes.

CHAIR - Can you also explain to us, or maybe Paul, if you could explain to us, how this new water and sewerage system will benefit and protect the school from bushfires?

Mr COCKBURN - The school, as mentioned earlier, is in a bushfire zone. It's considered - it has a BAL (Bushfire Attack Level) ranking of 19, and 29 for a small portion, so therefore it's subject to ember attack from a bushfire. The current capacity, I believe, is 90,000 litres, that will be increased to 288,000 litres of water storage for firefighting. The existing infrastructure on the site has a fire ring main with a number of fire hydrants attached to that. Those tanks will serve that and the capacity should be enough to fight bushfire attack on that school.¹⁴

¹³ *Dodges Ferry Primary School – Major Redevelopment*, Submission to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, p. 12

¹⁴ Transcript of Evidence, 7 July 2026, Department for Education, Children and Young People, p. 7-8

Removal of Ferry Hall

- 4.13 The Committee acknowledged community attachment to Ferry Hall, and questioned the reasoning behind its proposed removal:

Mr HISCUTT - Talking about Ferry Hall, and the statement... says:

Building 12 (Ferry Hall) was considered for relocation/repurposing but contains extensive asbestos and lead paint ...

Happy with that statement and where it's going, but it follows with:

... the project budget contains no available funding for refurbishment or relocation...

However, the project funding has about, in total, \$6.7 million in contingencies and escalations. Is that a correct statement to say that that's the reason why this wasn't done, or because it would take away from other things that could be done with that funding?

Mr SALTER - I'm happy to go first. I mean, I think in the first instance, the hall isn't fit for purpose, and contemporary needs going into the future in respect of contingencies, perhaps as we've outlined in other projects, we think those contingencies are appropriate for this stage of the project. I wouldn't say that there's a correlation at all between those contingencies and the intended use of the hall.

Mr WILLIAMS - I'll add a little bit of context to it as well. Certainly, as you've seen today in the site visit, there are a number of other areas of the school that we aren't going to touch or refurbish. There are certainly higher needs for the school and the cost to remove and relocate and reinstall a facility is expensive. We have been engaged with council on the matter and, as we've discussed, for us, it's surplus to educational needs and will be marked as such in our construction contract. That was the discussion around should community or council wish to connect with us or the contractor, we could certainly make that building available. What we're saying is there are higher needs for the expenditure than paying for it to be reinstalled elsewhere.

Mr HISCUTT - I think I could accept that if the statement here was not a priority within the school's needs and infrastructure. But I just find it hard to accept it being the project budget being the constraint considering those contingencies that are there. But I'll leave that as a statement.

CHAIR - Just subsequent to Mr Hiscutt's question: is Ferry Hall - does it have any heritage values at all?

Mr COCKBURN - No, it doesn't.

CHAIR - I couldn't remember if it did.

Mr COCKBURN - Only from a community point of view. It's not on the register.

CHAIR - It's not listed at all on the register and there's no heritage values?

Mr WILLIAMS - It's not listed, no. Obviously a strong community connection because they understand that the community arranged quite some time ago for it to be located to the school. So, a strong connection, but no formal heritage values or recognition.¹⁵

Traffic Management and Parking Changes

- 4.14 The Committee asked the witnesses to outline the proposed parking and traffic management measures that would be implemented:

CHAIR - ... reconfiguration of existing roadways, bus drop-off, car drop-off and visitor/staff car parking. Could you for the record talk us through the traffic management changes or proposed traffic management changes. I believe that there's a new space which should be exclusive to buses, drop-offs and pickups and also an extension of the car park.

¹⁵ Transcript of Evidence, 7 July 2026, Department for Education, Children and Young People, p. 8-9

Mr COCKBURN - ... It was quite early in the design process that we came to the realisation that we didn't want to spend a lot of this funding on civil infrastructure - that being car parks and roads. Yet, there was a need to solve a problem: a conflict between buses and cars, primarily, in that main car park. The solution we arrived at was using the top road, the one that passes the football club for bus drop-off, and retaining the existing car park in its current form in the front of admin for drop-off and staff car parking. There is a need to extend that slightly. Under the planning scheme we're required to provide one car space per full-time employee, which is 55. We were 16 short of that in its current form, so we have had to extend the car park on the side heading towards the football oval by 16. That's aligned in a manner that if it develops further, can connect up with the football club parking around the oval and also make that connection through to allow on game day cars to exit through the school, so they get two exit rows back onto Old Forcett Road. We had a traffic engineer look at this in detail and provide two reports for the purposes of the development application.¹⁶

Connection of Classrooms to Outdoor Learning Areas

4.15 The Committee asked the witnesses to provide additional details on the proposed design to enhance connection between classrooms and landscaped external areas:

CHAIR - Can you just run us through, in very general detail, a little bit about the landscaping of the proposed project, knowing that it's a really beautiful bush environment on the waterfront at Dodges Ferry. Could you give us some information about what you plan to do with the landscaping of the site?

Mr COCKBURN - The landscape architects we've engaged have worked very closely with us over the last 12 months to develop a concept. That concept is largely about ensuring that each general learning area has a direct connection to a quality external space - that external space is age-appropriate. For example, the kindergarten is - and this often chews up a large part of the landscape budget, kindergarten works are usually a bit heavier - specifically to that kindergarten building. Whilst it's good to have flexibility within certain general learning areas, kindergartens aren't like that, so we've got to set up that appropriately. That occurs next to the existing nature play area so it's an appropriate sort of connection to that for the littlies because I understand that the littlies, being the kinders and the preps, they're the ones that use that nature play area more so. The older kids use the oval - that sort of thing. That's why it's set up like that. The landscape spaces are directly connected to classroom spaces that are age-appropriate.¹⁷

Construction Timeline and Staging of Works

4.16 The Committee asked the witnesses about the feasibility of the project timeline:

CHAIR - ...

how confident are you or is the department that construction can commence in January 2027 and finish by July 2028, given the current market conditions? How confident are you?

Mr WILLIAMS - We're confident at this stage.

Mr COCKBURN - Yes, we're confident.

Mr WILLIAMS - We've got an aggressive program, and we've got our development application in with council and we're working that through.

Mr COCKBURN - I think we're pretty confident with the start date. It gives us a fair bit of time from when the tenders come in to awarding the contract and doing, if any, value-management

¹⁶ Transcript of Evidence, 7 July 2026, Department for Education, Children and Young People, p. 12-13

¹⁷ Transcript of Evidence, 7 July 2026, Department for Education, Children and Young People, p. 15-16

that's necessary. The 12-month period is essentially for new build and the last six is for renovations.¹⁸

4.17 The Committee asked the witnesses to explain how works would be staged to minimise disruption to the school's operation and students:

CHAIR - I've got one more question on page 11. Construction is scheduled to occur while the school remains operational. What arrangements are planned to minimise disruption to student learning? Because I think that's going to be a really difficult process to manage, I imagine.

Mr WILLIAMS - Yes, certainly front and centre in all our redevelopments and in all the work that we do with schools, the focus is obviously about maintaining safe school operations. I know that Paul and the team have been working closely to look at a stage process that allows that to happen. Perhaps Paul could -

Mr COCKBURN - Yes. Look, this is something that we worked through during the project working group meetings. The staging outcome, if you like, that we arrived at was one whereby the kindergarten forms stage 1. That's a pretty simple stage because that affects nobody. So, we're happy with that one.

Stage 2 is fairly intense. That's the most challenging, and we've talked this through with the school and how they might manage it. So, there's still a bit of work to do in that particular area, I think to refine that and no doubt, though, we'll work through that as well with the contractor when that stage 2 happens.

Stage 3 is largely refurbishment and small construction area of admin. That becomes simply a matter of rehousing admin during that stage.

Mr SHELTON - With stage 2, I mean that's the noisy one - the demolition of the building and whatever goes along with that. Is the start of stage 2 - are you looking at a holiday period for that to happen?

Mr COCKBURN - We would definitely look at a holiday period for the demolition. You're right, it's noisy. There's, in some cases, asbestos removal, that sort of thing. So, we'd ask the contractor to schedule that in that manner.¹⁹

Project Costs

4.18 The Committee considered the project budget in detail, including a thorough examination of the project contingencies and allowances:

Mr HISCUTT - ... At the start of the brief, you said we're comfortable with where the pricing is at. I mean, the pricing for the building is apparently \$14 million, and obviously the consultants and some of those other things, but the rest of it is contingency. If we're comfortable with the building being at that price, at this point in time, why are we building a 26 per cent contingency? We're expecting it to go more than a quarter above what we're currently comfortable with it being.

Mr SALTER - I'd clarify my comment to say that based on the QS (quantity surveyor) advice, we're comfortable with what's currently shown as direct construction, as well as the contingencies combined together. This is normal project management to have appropriate contingencies: design contingency before you get to 100 per cent detailed design, then the market escalation for going to tender and then during construction, having a construction contingency. So, when I'm saying I'm comfortable with the combined program budget estimates that are supported by the QS and the architects.

Mr HISCUTT - I guess what I'm struggling very much is with the word 'contingency' being used in this aspect, because it sounds as though you're saying that you're comfortable that the

¹⁸ Transcript of Evidence, 7 July 2026, Department for Education, Children and Young People, pp. 24-25

¹⁹ Transcript of Evidence, 7 July 2026, Department for Education, Children and Young People, p. 13

building is going to cost \$20 million, because that's \$14 million plus the contingencies and that's where we're currently comfortable that the construction of the building is going to cost \$20 million and not \$14 million. But this line item has the construction cost at \$15 million, and I'm struggling to see how that's a contingency and not a -

Ms RATTRAY - A natural construction cost.

Mr HISCUTT - Yes.

Mr SALTER - I'll go to Todd in a second, but we're being transparent in the different elements that make up the estimated construction cost. It'd be easy for us just to wrap them up together, but in terms of, again, an industry norm in terms of how we're presenting this information.

Mr HISCUTT - But is it a contingency if you're expecting to use it? Isn't that contingency if we don't achieve things or if there's surprises; that's what we expect to use a contingency for? Whereas this sounds as though they're already budgeted in for.

Mr WILLIAMS - If I may, I think it is a language thing. Is it a budget? Yes, it is a budget to reflect the stage and point that we're at. Point taken, yes - and I think we spoke about this the other day about Devonport - we've tried a number of different ways to present the information over the last probably three years, and I can see that it's still causing some drama.

If we were at the end of the project, we could wrap up and go this all was contingency. But at this point, based on the advice that we're getting, these are the allowances that we're being told to make. Yes, they will shift over the next few months before we get ready to tender because we've got more detail. Then they will shift post-tender because we will have checked with market and market will have told us what the market escalation is. Then again it will shift over the two years while we draw down on our construction contingency budget item. I think the most important thing that, if I can just explain that, the allocation to Dodges Ferry Primary School to support the future of the school is \$25 million, and that's the investment that we'll make in Dodges Ferry Primary School.

Mr HISCUTT - I guess, as a committee trying to achieve value for money, it shouldn't just be, 'this is the amount of money we've got to spend, let's spend it', it should be 'what is the value of that money?' That's a statement, not a question.

I guess to ask the question in another way: the tender closes in October 2026, which is three to four months away, if things are running on track, do you expect at that stage that the construction tender, whoever that may be, will say it'll cost \$14 million or do you expect them to say it'll cost \$20 million when the final line item on that document comes through?

Mr COCKBURN - We'd expect them to be closer to \$20 million.

Mr HISCUTT - Yes, so it's not a - language. Language, I guess, is the question.

Mr WILLIAMS - We're talking the same but different, aren't we?

Mr HISCUTT - Yes, that's what I would look at it.

Mr WILLIAMS - This is that presentation, because, yes, you could add together the construction cost, the market conditions and the contingency and say, well, that's construction. In the past we've been asked to break that figure down more.

Mr HISCUTT - I guess it's a - thank you for the answer. I still think there's some challenges for me there - is probably the issue.

Mr WILLIAMS - Absolutely. And welcome the questioning because we're still trying to land on how best to present that breakdown, noting that it's reflective of the time and the advice that we're getting.

Mr HISCUTT - I guess at this point, in October, we're going to get a tender for \$20 million and then over the course of the construction there will be a surprise - a pipe is not where it is - a variation will cost - so the actual cost is then going above the \$25 million because of those variations that are above.

Ms RATTRAY - But it can't. It can't go above because there's no more money.

Mr COCKBURN - You'll notice market conditions and escalation forecast are \$22.88 million now.

Mr HISCUTT - An escalation I can understand.

Mr COCKBURN - There's a big number in that for the simple reason that we don't really know what the tender market's going to do. We could have favourable conditions, as Mark alluded to earlier, but you can have unfavourable ones, too. So, if that eventuates what is your, dare I say, contingency?

Mr WILLIAMS - I'm hopeful that it's closer to \$15 million and I don't want to pre-empt the outcome of the market. I wouldn't want to go there.

CHAIR - That was my next question: how was that \$2.88 million, or around there, for the market escalation allowance calculated and what construction inflation assumptions were used? Do you have that information? I know it's part of your quantitative survey.

Mr COCKBURN - Yes, it's our QS's experience of recent times, and it'll be a percentage applied to the overall construction budget cost estimate. What we're seeing from quantity surveyors at the moment is a higher number, based on a whole range of things to do with what the building industry is currently operating at. When things are busy, things get more expensive, that sort of thing. And things beyond your control, like wars in the Middle East.

Ms RATTRAY - It's interesting because that's not what we heard last week in the north-west, around the quantity surveyor and their predictions.

Mr WILLIAMS - Yes, I said last week I won't get Kane started on quantity surveyor estimates. But what we are seeing at the moment is the tender results that we're getting for the jobs we have on the go and they aren't of the size of Dodges Ferry, as an example, but nonetheless, the market is coming under what the quantity surveyor estimates are and that's current - that's what we're seeing up until now. There is a regional basis to that, and the north closer, whereas the south and the north-west are coming in under. That's just a general statement about what we're seeing from the market.

Mr COCKBURN - It's also a case of prequalification of contractors. Now, there's not a huge gene pool there when it comes to this sort of number.

...This particular job is not highly complicated construction. It just happens to have a reasonably large number attached to it. It's no more than residential construction, so that's the -

Mr HISCUTT - The actual format of how to put it together - could be built by -

Mr COCKBURN - Maybe that's attractive to some. We just simply don't know until we actually go to market.

CHAIR - It does make it hard for us, as a committee, to be able to assess value for money when there's \$10 million out of this project that we're really not sure whether or not that's value for money. I suppose that's why it makes it difficult.

Mr SALTER - Perhaps to assist the committee, I'm sure we can provide the detailed QS advice as follow-up information. In terms of value for money, then we're taking the expert advice, looking at that holistically in terms of what we can deliver. So certainly, we obviously feel that there is absolute value for money in terms of the extent of works that are being undertaken with the best advice that we've got at the moment.

Mr WILLIAMS - We did talk last week about the language again: net construction versus gross project construction or gross project funding because you cannot deliver a project without consultants involved. We have to pay all the planning experts to give all - these are requirements to deliver it.

...

... We need him to do that to make sure we're compliant in the facility that we're building. When we had that conversation about net construction versus gross project and the gross project - and this is just coming back to your comment, Chair, about the funding that you're concerned about the value - we can't do or deliver the construction without that expenditure. And yes, there are matters in there - furniture, equipment and IT - that provides absolute benefit to the school in if we have a contemporary learning area we do at the same time want to take the opportunity to provide contemporary IT, contemporary furniture. It is that opportunity for the next 20 to 30 years to bring the school up to a contemporary standard, and all of those pieces are really vital to that end product. That's all the gross funding discussion.

...

Mr WILLIAMS - The other part that I would add to that is that yes, the design that you're presented hasn't changed significantly, but there has been considerable work done to get to that point. This is about the timing it takes to get you the information. There's a couple of months of lead time for us to prepare the report and get a report and then get it so that it's available for public viewing. What we have is the concept hasn't changed significantly from that point, so I'm having that rider on it because the design is still evolving and the detail is still coming through.²⁰

Value Management and Tender Outcome

4.19 The Committee asked the witnesses if any value management had been undertaken to prioritise the planned scope of works within the allocated budget, and the possible outcome if a favourable tender result was achieved:

CHAIR - ...has any value engineering been undertaken to reduce costs? And if so, what elements were removed from the original master plan? Was there something original that's already been cut?

Mr WILLIAMS - We talked at the site today about school priorities and where additional school priorities lie. As we talked about, there are a number of learning areas that we're not redeveloping at this stage. Hopefully we get a favourable tender response and we'll reinvest that money. It is normal process for the project team to explore opportunities, value management, as we work through the project, and this project is no different to those. I'm sure Paul can share with you some of those discussions.

Mr COCKBURN - If you think back to - there was a previous master plan, not done by me but another architect, and that didn't have an early learning centre. You had a two-storey building on the site up past the library, the library was attached to a food hub, that sort of thing, but it didn't include an early learning centre. One of the things we sort of did sort of with the school was to work through the process to get us to the point where we thought an early learning centre was actually really important; now, that wasn't considered previously. So, things evolve and hopefully the best outcome is what prevails.

...

Mr HISCUTT - Yes, it was just about that value management and I guess the statement ... was made it's \$25 million - basically, we'll spend \$25 million but if what we can produce here comes in as what we're expecting it to do, perhaps that \$2 or \$3 million that is less than was sufficient to get this school to the standard because that's what's been put here, that's identified needs... just because there's \$3 million more extra left in this budget, we'll spend it to increase some new things that aren't here. I guess how do I judge the value for money, which is part of my role in this committee - that's a rhetorical question - when that might not be the best use

²⁰ Transcript of Evidence, 7 July 2026, Department for Education, Children and Young People, pp. 18-22

of that money for Tasmania just because the budget says that it's this that we just have to spend to that?

Mr SALTER - I mean, I wouldn't describe it as we just have to spend that. It is a significant amount of money for this project. I suppose during the consultation stage and prioritisation there's things where the school in conjunction with the architects has all these - we don't think we can initially meet. They might still be high priorities. Equally, if we got an unfavourable result, then we've got to go through that value management exercise to prioritise even further. So, as much as possible, we want to complete works at the site so that we're not going back there for another 20 or 30 years. So, comfortable that a favourable result still means that there's high-value things that can be done in the school that will benefit for a long period.

Mr COCKBURN - Just going back on that, the very first estimate we looked at for this project was over by I think it was one and a half million dollars. So therefore we had to sort of value-manage that out of the job and what got value-managed out were those classrooms that you saw today - prep, I think they are. If you get a favourable result, presumably that would go back in.

... As a project working group, we're very conscious of those being left as the poor cousin off all these new buildings. Therefore, we sort of scheduled them up in terms of renovation and that put us over budget, effectively, so we've dropped that off. A favourable tender result, presumably that'd go back in.²¹

...

Mr SALTER - ...I'll add the contingencies, again, that we think they're appropriate for this stage of the projects. I'm not looking to draw down on contingencies right now. If we get good tender outcomes, then there'll be a range of priorities considered ...

...

Mr WILLIAMS - ... we're very hopeful that we get a positive tender result. Then any of the win out of that tender, should it should it fall that way, is absolutely going to be reinvested in the Dodges Ferry Primary School, and that will be a conversation with the school around the priorities at that time.²²

Does the Project Meet the Requirements of the Public Works Committee Act?

4.20 In assessing any proposed public work, the Committee seeks an assurance that each project meets the criteria detailed in Clause 15(2) of the Public Works Committee Act 1914. Broadly, and in simple terms, these relate to the purpose of the works, the need for and advisability of undertaking the works, and whether the works are a good use of public funds and provide value for money to the community. The Department's submission addressed these matters:

Do the proposed works meet an identified need/needs, or solve a recognised problem?

Yes, the design addresses the issues raised in consultation with the school and community including maintaining a central, prominent library as a key learning hub, Providing more and larger classrooms to support enrolment growth, Increasing storage and improved staff and

²¹ Transcript of Evidence, 7 July 2026, Department for Education, Children and Young People, pp. 22-24

²² Transcript of Evidence, 7 July 2026, Department for Education, Children and Young People, p. 14

student bathrooms, expanded spaces for student support and staff collaboration, prioritisation of redevelopment of early years learning spaces and addressing ongoing building and service infrastructure issues.

Are the proposed works the best solution to meet identified needs, or solve a recognised problem within the allocated budget?

Yes, a whole of site master plan was developed with the school and community priorities at the front and centre of the design. A cost estimate was developed for the whole site master plan and reductions to scope were carried out in a cost management exercise. The PWG considered priorities, staging and buildability of the works and agreed the proposed design and staging effectively addresses the highest priority needs to create a contemporary learning environment within the budget. The design identified the most workable solution to meet the school's education requirements, while giving future flexibility. The process includes reports from the project Quantity Surveyor to ensure the cost plan meets the budget and the project is deliverable.

Are the proposed works fit for purpose?

Yes, the proposed works respond to the briefing requirements expressed through the Education Brief. The design solution has the support of educational experts, school leaders, staff, the School Association and the community.

Do the proposed works provide value for money?

Yes, the proposed works address priority areas identified through the community consultation process and the most significant deficits of DFPS. Costs are minimised by retaining buildings and the use of modest, suitable new materials. Testing of options settled on the design which meets priority needs while remaining within the allocated budget.

Are the proposed works a good use of public funds?

Yes, the proposed works offer a cost-effective solution to meet the highest priority needs to assist DFPS to deliver quality contemporary educational experiences and to support the learning journey of the students and improve education outcomes. DECYP considers this to be a good use of public funds.

5 DOCUMENTS TAKEN INTO EVIDENCE

5.1 The following documents were taken into evidence and considered by the Committee:

- *Dodges Ferry Primary School – Major Redevelopment*, Submission to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works;
- DECYP response to questions on notice-Redevelopment of Dodges Ferry Primary School.

6 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

- 6.1 The Committee is satisfied that the need for the proposed works has been established. Once completed, by addressing the existing site challenges and prioritised needs of the school, the redevelopment will increase capacity and create a cohesive campus with contemporary learning and support facilities.
- 6.2 The proposed works will result in construction of 14 new contemporary GLAs, the removal of all demountable buildings, an upgraded administration building linked to a new entry foyer, and upgraded staff facilities, meeting rooms, and student support spaces. The redevelopment will also be designed in way that facilitates efficient circulation, improved sightlines and supervision.
- 6.3 Accordingly, the Committee recommends the Redevelopment of Dodges Ferry Primary School, at an estimated cost of \$25 million, in accordance with the documentation submitted.



**Parliament House
Hobart
15 September 2026**

**Jen Butler MP
Chair**