



RSPCA \$40m feasibility test

Version 4.0

14 March 2024

Version control

Version	Date	Author	Sections edited	Comments
1.0	17.02.2025	Max Yarra	ALL	Document created
2.0	11.03.2025	Max Yarra	1.1, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3	Calculations updated based on new funding and additional information.
3.0	12.03.2025	Max Yarra	ALL	Updated for cab sub submission, full scope assessment added
4.0	14.03.2025	Max Yarra	3.2.3, 4.1	Cost estimates and risk updated

Contents

1.	Introduction.....	3
1.1.	Purpose of this report	3
1.2.	Facility scope.....	3
1.3.	Scope of works	4
2.	Background Information.....	4
2.1.	Design plans	4
2.2.	Cost Plan	4
3.	Feasibility assessment.....	5
3.1.	Information used.....	5
3.1.1.	Exclusions	7
3.1.2.	Additions	7
3.1.3.	Assumptions.....	7
3.2.	Method	9
3.2.1.	Calculations	9
3.2.2.	Scenario 2 Scope reduction	10
3.2.3.	Risks.....	11
4.	Outcomes	11
4.1.	Scenario 2 – reduced scope facility	11
4.2.	Scenario 3 – original full scope facility	14

1. Introduction

1.1. Purpose of this report

Purpose of this report is to investigate the feasibility of delivering a new RSPCA facility including all enabling works on the site proposed on Block 02 Section 14 Pialligo, within a \$40m budget envelope. The current design developed for a new facility meets the functional aspiration of the RSPCA however has been identified to be significantly outside the budget committed by the Territory despite value management and design rationalities being undertaken.

A high-level cost reduction exercise has been undertaken by TCCS Infrastructure Delivery to understand if delivering a functional facility is feasible within the \$40m budget envelope, and this report details the process undertaken and the findings.

1.2. Facility scope

The proposed site for the new RSPCA facility is located at the end of Addison Road, on block 02 section 14 Pialligo. A functional brief for the facility was developed in collaboration with RSPCA, which detailed minimum functional requirements like, floor areas, holding capacities and technical functions. The current design has been developed to meet the minimum requirements of this functional brief. Value management assessment has been undertaken to reduce the costs, and the opportunities identified through this assessment have been included in this feasibility test.



Figure 1: Original northern site concept design 19.08.2024

1.3. Scope of works

The works required to deliver the new RSPCA facility have been split into three categories, with several works packages within each category. This has been done to understand the cost to deliver each work scope, and to assist with understanding the cost implication when undertaking detailed reduction of scope.

The Enabling works packages are works required to upgrade public assets that are required to enable the development to start construction, but also provide wider community benefit and are not specifically related to the RSPCA facility. The Early Works are elements that are directly related to the facility.

Table 1 - scope of works breakdown

Package	Enabling Works	Description	Delivery
ENW1	Addison Road intersection	Signalisation and upgrade to the Addison Road intersection as per the Northrop PSP design	TCCS/RSPCA
ENW2	Addison Road upgrade	Upgrade of Addison Road from the new intersection to the new facility entry, as per the Northrop concept design	TCCS/RSPCA

Package	Early Works	Description	Delivery
EW1	Facility Site Servicing	Works to get service connections to the site (Elec, Comms, Water)	TCCS/RSPCA
EW2	Facility Site Civil works	Civil works internal to the site boundary (Clearing, Benching, overland stormwater channels)	TCCS/RSPCA

Package	Facility works	Description	Delivery
FW1	Main facility building	All works required for the facility build. (cat modules, dog modules, Vet clinic, admin, services, mechanical, external works, landscaping, inground stormwater, inground septic)	TCCS/RSPCA

2. Background Information

2.1. Design plans

In 2024 TCCS identified that the original southern site location was not viable due to ecological restrictions, and therefore decided to move the facility north to the second site location identified in the original 2022 site feasibility study. Concept design work for the new northern location was completed in late 2024, which confirmed the original design capacity and building floor plates from the southern site could be applied to the new site location through simple alignment adjustments, and minimal technical changes. The alignment/positioning of the buildings were adjusted to address the overland water flows which run through the centre of the site, concerns raised by the ACT Equestrian association, and restrictions presented by the Airport flight path. The main change from the original design was location of buildings and circulation through the spaces, however the functional requirements for the design remained unchanged from the original southern site design.

2.2. Cost Plan

A Cost plan was developed by Turner and Townsend in 2023 and was based off the 90% PSP design developed for the southern site. In late 2024 the plan was updated to align with the new northern site concept and identified that the facility build cost was very similar to the southern site, however due to site being further north along Addison Road and topography constraints, the enabling work costs increased.

Capital Cost

RSPCA	Enabling Works Total Excluding GST (\$)	On Site Civil Works Total Excluding GST (\$)	Building Works Total Excluding GST (\$)	Project Total Excluding GST (\$)
TOTAL TRADE COST - EXCL. GST	\$3,571,199	\$3,768,742	\$33,484,014	\$37,055,213
Preliminaries & Builders Margin	\$892,800	\$942,185	\$7,031,643	\$8,866,628
TOTAL BUILDERS COST - EXCL. GST	\$4,463,999	\$4,710,927	\$40,515,657	\$44,979,656
Training Levy	\$8,928	\$9,422	\$81,031	\$99,381
Approval Fees	\$53,568	\$56,531	\$486,188	\$596,287
Building approvals	Excl	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$400,000
WHS Audit			\$20,000	\$20,000
Design & Professional Fees (Less PSP)	\$178,560	\$188,437	\$2,349,908	\$2,716,905
Escalation as per Project Development Program (4%pa)	\$224,305	\$236,713	\$4,173,919	\$4,634,937
SUBTOTAL - EXCL. GST	\$4,929,360	\$5,402,030	\$47,826,703	\$58,158,093
Sustainability Initiatives	\$98,587	\$108,041	\$430,440	\$637,068
PAP Fees	\$98,587	\$108,041	\$956,534	\$1,163,162
Insurances	\$39,435	\$43,216	\$382,614	\$465,265
Contingency	\$1,023,113	\$1,121,218	\$9,926,671	\$12,071,002
TCCS Fees	\$246,468	\$270,101	\$2,391,335	\$2,907,904
MPC Fees	\$257,422	\$282,106	\$2,476,572	\$3,016,100
TOTAL DEVELOPMENT COST - EXCL. GST	\$6,692,972	\$7,334,753	\$64,390,870	\$78,418,595

Figure 2 - current T&T cost plan breakdown 25 September 2024

The above costings are based on the concept design documents for the northern site and have assumed the same square meter building rates as the southern site. Since these estimates were developed the project team have been working on a value management assessment which will achieve some savings across the full scope of the project. These savings are yet to be quantified but have been taken into consideration in the infrastructure deliveries feasibility assessment.

3. Feasibility assessment

3.1. Information used

Since the 2024 T&T cost plan was completed, the consultant team have undertaken a value management assessment in coordination with the RSPCA and identified a number of costs saving design changes. These changes have been articulated in revised drawings provided by the consultant team but as they were implemented after the 2024 cost plan was completed, they have not been reflected in the T&T costings. The revised value management floor plans, along with the 2024 T&T cost plan formed the basis of the feasibility assessment.

Table 2 - 2025 Value Management changes

Item	Description
Landscaping	Reducing landscaping to minimum functional requirements
Parking	Reduce parking to minimal functional requirements
Dog and Cat offices	Adjust dog and cat modules to incorporate office and admin functions. Reducing modules by 1 Cat and 1 Dog
Stage delivery	Deliver the multi-use building as a future stage
Mech plant on ground	Position the mechanical services on the ground rather than in the roof cavity.
Adjust roof	Reduce complexity of the roof profile on dog modules
Admin roof	Reduce the angle of the admin/vet/services roof, reducing material and constructability costs
Reduction in corridors	The internal corridor for the services building is now an external space due to the deletion of the wall. It also reduces the internal area

CABINET

Adjust the layout of the dog modules	Introduction of a fan shape layout for dog modules, reducing bench platform extent.
--------------------------------------	---

Table 3 - background information used to inform the assessments

Document	Type	Description
T&T Concept cost plan report	Cost plan	Concept cost plan report developed by Turner and Townsend based on the northern site concept design. Published 25 September 2024
ASK124	Floor Plan	Floor plan of cattery area with overall area quantity and individual room area quantities. Layout based on the value managed layout
ASK125	Floor Plan	Floor plan of admin/vet area with overall area quantity and individual room area quantities. Layout based on the value managed layout
ASK126	Floor Plan	Floor plan of kennel area with overall area quantity and individual room area quantities. Layout based on the value managed layout

Table 4 - Information used to inform the 2024 T&T cost plan

DOCUMENTS	DATE RECEIVED
WT Peer Review: - RSPCA WT Peer Review (10).pdf	31/07/2024
Architectural Drawings, Report, and design brief: - ASK030-02-CONCEPT.pdf ASK100-01-SITE PLAN.pdf ASK101-01-ROOF PLAN.pdf ASK102-01-ADMIN & CATTERY.pdf ASK103-01-KENNELS.pdf ASK104-01-ROOF PLAN - ADMIN & CATTERY.pdf ASK105-01-ROOF PLAN - KENNELS.pdf - RSPCA Combined.pdf - RSPCA Facility North Site Draft Concept Report_Rev A_High Res.pdf - RSPCA Facility North Site Draft Concept Report_Rev A_Reduced Size.pdf	20/08/2024
Civil drawings: - 2024.08.16 - RSPCA Water Reduction Review (retention tank size).pdf - Civil works Combine.pdf - CR222041-01-C000 Cover Sheet - C000.pdf - CR222041-01-C010 GA - C060.pdf - CR222041-01-C020 Driveway - C020.pdf - CR222041-01-C040 Vehicle Turning Movements - C040.pdf - CR222041-01-C040 Vehicle Turning Movements - C041.pdf - CR222041-01-C100 Offsite Works Plan - C100.pdf - CR222041-01-C100 Offsite Works Plan - C101.pdf - CR222041-01-C110 Site Works & Pavement Plan - C110.pdf - CR222041-01-C110 Site Works & Pavement Plan - C111.pdf - CR222041-01-C110 Site Works & Pavement Plan - C112.pdf - CR222041-01-C110 Site Works & Pavement Plan - C113.pdf - CR222041-01-C160 Concept Stormwater Management Plan - C160.pdf - CR222041-01-C160 Concept Stormwater Management Plan - C161.pdf - CR222041-01-C160 Concept Stormwater Management Plan - C162.pdf - CR222041-01-C160 Concept Stormwater Management Plan - C163.pdf	20/08/2024

CABINET

The architectural drawings used to inform the 2024 T&T cost plan have been superseded by the 2025 value management sketch plans indicated in Table 3 - background information used to inform the assessments

3.1.1. Exclusions

The 2024 T&T cost estimate was used as the basis of the feasibility assessment and therefore all the exclusions from that cost plan have also been considered in this assessment. These are detail in table 2 below.

Table 5 - Exclusions from the assessment considerations (taken from the T&T cost plan)

The following items and allowances have been excluded from the T&T cost estimate.
Land acquisition costs.
GST has been excluded from all costs
Staging Costs
Out of hours work
Treatment of contaminated soil (If any)
Specialist equipment
Relocation of existing equipment
Temporary works – protection other than allowed for
Vet Clinic Fit out and Equipment, Base build only.
Medical gases
Automated windows
Rainwater reuse tank, although we have allowed for sustainability initiatives generally.
UXO scanning & removal.
Works not specifically mentioned in the cost plan.

In addition to the standard exclusions from the T&T cost plan, the following additional exclusions have been included

Table 6 - Additional exclusions from the assessment considerations

The following items and allowances have been excluded from the ID Feasibility assessment.
Sewer connection and pump station – septic system has been allowed for
1.2% DA fee calculations have not been included – Due to the DA being submitted by TCCS.

3.1.2. Additions

Due to the progression of the project since the 2024 cost plan some additional design and cost items have been added to the cost assessment.

Table 7 - Additional allowances

The following items and allowances are in addition to the item and allowances included in the T&T cost plan
Allowance for a septic system to treat wastewater – costings have been informed by the south Australian RSPCA

3.1.3. Assumptions

Due to the high-level nature of the T&T cost plan, and that it was based on costings originally prepared for the southern site, and then modified to suit the changes proposed for the northern site, the data needed to be adjusted to facilitate the assessment. This required us to make the following assumptions.

Table 8 - Assumptions made during assessment

Document	Element	Description
Cost plan	Square meter rates	The square meter rates used in the assessment calculations has been utilised from the 2024 T&T cost plan. This rate has not been updated to account for the value management changes made in early 2025 and makes a general assumption about combined costs of the building elements (walls, floor, ceiling, roof etc) to inform the rate.
Cost Plan	Square meter rate	The square meter rate provided in the T&T plans, assumes the same rate is applied for every square meter, however an area in the middle of a room is made up different materials and quantities compared to a square meter that includes a wall or door, therefore the rate is a general cost indicator.
Cost Plan	Lump sum rates	The 2025 T&T cost plan did not include detail about the specific items the lumps sums covered, therefore some lump sums could not be specifically reduced to align with other scope reductions and were reduced by a percentage factor instead.
Architectural plans	Floor plate area	The cost reduction to buildings was based of reducing floor area. This was done by removing rooms or reducing room sizing. The quantity of area removed was based off the floor area plans provided by GMB, however the areas indicated in these plans only account for internal room area and not the area taken up by doors, walls, windows etc. These area reductions also assume the same reduction in vertical area, which includes ceiling, roof cavity and roof structure.
Architectural plans	Floor plate area	The square meter rate cost has been applied to the proposed reductions in area, to achieve a proposed cost reduction. As most of the floor area reductions are internal, the actual reduction in cost may not account for adjustments required in external walls, cladding etc
Architectural plans	Floor plate area	Reduction in floor area has not taken into consideration the impact on room layout and circulation space. The total reduction proposed may not be achievable when the spaces are re-arranged, as circulation space to maintain appropriate access will need to be considered
Mechanical	Lump sum rate	The mechanical rates for the dog and cat modules are a lump sum in the T&T cost plan. This rate was simply divided by the number of modules to give a module rate, and then reduced according to the reduction in modules. This has assumed the system cost reduces when the area to be serviced reduces.
Mechanical	Lump sum rate	The mechanical rates for the vet/admin/services buildings are a lump sum in the T&T cost plan. This rate has been divided by the square meter area of the 2024 design to ascertain a rough square meter rate for each building space. This does not consider the complexity of the mechanical design, and simply reduces the mechanical requirement based on the square meter reduction. This may not represent the accurate change in mechanical cost.
Cost Plan	All rates	TCCS has assumed that all the rates and percentage allowances in the cost plan are an accurate representation of the market at this point in time.

3.2. Method

Several cost reduction scenarios were considered for assessment, and were interrogated to determine which scenario was best to be assessed. Scenario 2 was chosen as the most feasible option to progress, and scenario 3 “BASELINE” was included to provide a baseline to compare with. 2 other scenarios were interrogated however were considered as unsuitable as they did not deliver a reasonable outcome.

Table 9 - Scenarios assessed

Scenario	Description	Outcome
N/A	Maintain the existing scope of the project and assess what can be delivered for \$40m	High level assessment indicated all of the enabling works could be achieved, and delivery of the vet/admin/services building was achievable for circa \$42m. However, this was deemed an unsuitable outcome as the facility would not be fit for purpose
N/A	Assess the cost of delivering the same quantum of infrastructure currently located at Weston, but on the new site.	Due to the Weston site being randomly distributed, utilising shipping containers and temporary structures, and lack of information, ID questioned the accuracy of the outcome.
2	Work through each building floor plate and reduce individual room areas, and remove double up of asset	This option indicated that all function types could be retained in the facility, but space allowance rationalised to achieve a cost saving. This is the option that was progressed.
3 “BASELINE”	Deliver the project as per the original scope	The test parameters used for the other scenarios were applied to the existing scope of works, so as to present a baseline for comparison purposes.

After interrogating the above, Scenario 2 was chosen as the most feasible option to progress, and scenario 3 “BASELINE” was included to provide a baseline to compare with. Two other scenarios were interrogated however were considered as unsuitable as they did not deliver a reasonable outcome. A breakdown of the findings for each scenario is provided in section 4.

3.2.1. Calculations

The T&T cost plan utilised square meter rate calculation for the building costs, and lump sum calculations for most of the enabling works and servicing/mechanical works. Where possible lump sum items have been converted into square meter rates to enable a more accurate scope reduction. Some assumptions were made to facilitate this conversion, refer to the assumptions section.

Overheads, capital overheads and contract overhead costs were calculated on a percentage basis as per the T&T cost plan and were applied to each individual works package to see the total delivery cost of each package in isolation. Additionally, a total cost for each overhead cost was tabulated to indicate the cost of each item for the whole project.

Table 10 - Overhead cost calculations used in assessments

Overhead	Percentage calculated	Cost calculated on
Prelim and builders’ margin	25% for Enabling works, 21% on Facility works	Trade cost
Training Levy	0.2%	Builders cost

CABINET

Building Approvals	\$200k on Facility works	Lump sum
WHS Audit	\$20K on Facility works	Lump sum
Design and professional fees	4.0% for Enabling works, 5.8% for Facility works	Builders cost
Escalation	4% per annum for 1.25 years for Enabling Works and 2.5 years for Facility Works	Builders cost

The following capital overheads were calculated on the builder's cost + overheads and included

Table 11 - Capital overhead cost calculations

Capital Overhead	Percentage calculated	Cost calculated on
Sustainability initiatives	2.0% for enabling works, 0.9% for Facility works	Building cost + overheads
PAP Fees	2.0%	Building cost + overheads
Insurances	0.8%	Building cost + overheads
Contingency	20%	Building cost + overheads
TCCS Fees	5.0%	Building cost + overheads

The following contract overheads were calculated on the builder's cost + overheads + capital overheads

Table 12 - Contract Overheads

Contract Overhead	Percentage calculated	Cost calculated on
ICBR fees	4.0%	Building cost + overheads + Capital overheads

3.2.2. Scenario 2 Scope reduction

TCCS started by interrogating the 2024 T&T cost plan, breaking down the works into individual packages, which better align with the likely delivery strategy for the works. These packages are detailed in Table 1 section 1.3 of this report. Each work package was then systematically interrogated, reducing the scope of the works if possible, or removing a work item if it was not critical to deliver the project.

Table 13 - Scenario 3 Enabling Works scope reduction

Works package	Works item	Scope reduction
ENW1	Allowance for sewer connection/pump station – allowance for septic system is included in facility costs	NO REDUCTION
ENW2	Additional ground water engineering	NO REDUCTION

Table 14 - Scenario 2 early works scope reduction

Works package	Works item	Scope reduction
EW1	Allowance for sewer connection/pump station – allowance for septic system is included in facility costs	REMOVED
EW2	Additional ground water engineering	REMOVED
	Contamination soil removal	REMOVED
	Relocation of existing site services/structures	REMOVED

For all building areas the scope was reduced by simply removed floor area, resulting in a smaller total floor plate area and therefore reduced cost. A summary of the total reductions is provided below, detailed summary of the reduction is included in the budget test excel

Table 15 - Scenario 2 facility works scope reduction

Works package	Works item	Scope reduction
---------------	------------	-----------------

CABINET

FW1	Vet Clinic	REDUCED by 216m2
	Facilities support + volunteer briefing	REDUCED by 228.5m2
	Adoption	REDUCED by 179m2
	Admin	REDUCED by 141m2
	Kennel area	REDUCED by 1354m2
	Cattery area	REDUCED by 473m2

To gain additional savings across the projects reduction to overheads were considered. Most overheads percentages are set in stone, and reductions to these costs were considered a high risk resulting in an artificially reduced cost, therefore only 1 reduction was made for scenario 2-3.

Table 16 - Additional calculation reductions

Works package	Works item	Scope reduction
ALL	Contingency	REDUCED to 20%

3.2.3. Risks

Due to the preliminary nature of the information provided in both the cost plan and the revised architectural concept drawings, assumptions have been made to inform an interpretation of the data to undertake this assessment. This inherently increases the risk of inaccuracy in the findings presented. Some of the key risks are identified below

- This assessment has been undertaken as test scenario only and has not been professionally informed by qualified consultants. The assessment is based on data provided for the full scope of works and as interpreted by Infrastructure Delivery to the best of our abilities. Therefore, the proposed cost reduction may not be fully realised
- The reduced scope outcome fundamentally changes the design layout of the facility and will require most of the facility to be fully re-designed. Redesign costs have been estimated and factored into the assessment
- Reduction and removal of floor area from the floor plates will have a functional impact to these buildings, and therefore the reduced scope design does not meet the function brief original prepared for the facility.
- Allowances included in the original cost plan to reduce construction risk, have been removed to help reduce the total cost closer to the \$40m budget envelope. For example, allowance for additional site engineering and disposal of contaminated soils. This presents a possible financial risk should these elements be needed during construction
- Reduction of contingency increases financial risk to the project, should unforeseen issues arise through construction.
- Some lump sum items did not have enough detail about what they were applied to, therefore they were reduced by an assumed percentage amount. This does not consider the complexity of each item and may represent an inaccurate indication of cost

4. Outcomes

4.1. Scenario 2 – reduced scope facility

This scenario was deemed the most logical and feasible to deliver an outcome that may meet the minimum requirements of the RSPCA. As per the method in section 3.2 each building was systematically interrogated and reduced in size by removing individual rooms or reducing areas of rooms to achieve a rationalised floor plate. Full details of the exact removals and reductions can be provided by TCCS at request.

CABINET

Limitations: None of the proposed adjustments that have informed this assessment have been discussed with RSPCA or with the project team. The outcome while it may come closer to the \$40m budget envelope, may not meet the functional requirements of the RSPCA today or into the future.

Table 17 - scope reduction totals

Building	Description	% reduction from original scope
Vet Clinic	Removal of 216 m2 of floor area	27% reduction GFA
Admin	Removal of 141 m2 of floor area	31% reduction in GFA
Adoption	Removal of 179 m2 of floor area	46% reduction in GFA
Services	Removal of 228.5 m2 of floor area	43% reduction in GFA
Sally port	REMOVED	100% reduction in GFA
Education	REMOVED	100% reduction in GFA
Cattery	Removal of 473 m2 of floor area	37% reduction in GFA
Kennels	Removal of 1354 m2 of floor area	59% reduction in GFA
TOTAL	Total reduction of floor area	46.5% Reduction in total GFA from original design

Table 18 - Scenario 2 financial calculations

ENW1 – Enabling Works – Intersection upgrade	
WORKS	TOTAL COST
Trade costs - intersection	1,498,625.00
Trade costs - bus stop	\$274,815.00
Prelims and margins	\$443,360.00
Overheads	\$230,547.20
Capital overheads	\$729,309.47
Contract Overheads	\$127,066.27
Sub-total	\$3,303,722.94

ENW2 – Enabling Works – Addison road upgrade	
WORKS	TOTAL COST
Trade cost - road upgrade	\$293,340.00
Trade cost - street lighting	\$51,500.00
Trade cost - sw	\$150,880.00
Prelims and margins	\$123,930.00
Overheads	\$64,443.60
Capital overheads	\$203,859.89
Contract Overheads	\$35,518.14
Sub-total	\$923,471.63

EW1 - Early works - Site servicing	
WORKS	TOTAL COST
Elect connection	\$41,500.00
minisub	\$465,500.00
Comms connection	\$25,000.00
Water connection	\$28,000.00
Prelims and margins	\$140,000.00
Overheads	\$72,800.00

CABINET

Capital overheads	\$230,294.40
Contract Overheads	\$40,123.78
Sub-total	\$1,043,218.18

EW2 - Early works - site civil works	
WORKS	TOTAL COST
Bulk removal + benching	\$3,487,172.00
SW - re-routing overland flow	\$106,500.00
Site clearing	\$180,204.00
Prelims and margins	\$943,469.00
Overheads	\$690,603.88
Capital overheads	\$1,611,568.77
Contract Overheads	\$280,780.71
Sub-total	\$7,300,298.36

FW1 - Building works - Facility	
WORKS	TOTAL COST
Cat area + Mech	\$ 3,135,317.54
Vet and Admin area + mech	\$ 6,211,649.43
Dog area + mech	\$ 3,698,130.63
External works (paving and walls)	\$ 2,714,579.94
Landscaping	\$ 756,433.12
Services (Negative Mech)	\$ 3,278,871.40
inground SW tanks and equipment	\$ 45,000.00
Septic System	\$ 800,000.00
Prelims and margins	\$ 4,334,396.23
Overheads	\$ 4,515,593.07
Capital overheads	\$ 8,788,011.46
Contract Overheads	\$2,531,119.31
Sub-total	\$40,809,102.13
TOTAL	\$53,379,813.22

Reduced scope VS existing site comparison: Based on high level data interpolated from aerial imagery and the previous COX masterplan for the Weston RSPCA site, TCCS compared the reduce floor plate areas of scenario 3 with the existing floor plate areas of the Weston site to understand the difference in area capacity. This calculation ONLY compares floor plate area and does not consider the capacity to area ratio (C:A/R) of the current facility or the minimum animal welfare C:A/R required for the new facility.

Table 19 - Facility size compared to Weston facility

Use Type	Weston area	New Reduced scope area	% difference
Adoption + retail	315.00	209.00	-33.65%
Vet clinic	290.00	571.00	96.90%
Administration	110.00	305.00	177.27%
Services + Laundry	250.00	300.00	20.00%
Laundry			
Volunteer briefing			
Kennels	800.00	903.00	12.88%
Cattery	320.00	400.00	25.00%

CABINET

CABINET

Small animals	30.00	200.00	566.67%
Farm animals	33.00	200.00	506.06%
TOTALS	2148.00	3082.00	43.76%

Conclusion: The existing design priced at circa \$78m meets the functional requirements outlined by the RSPCA at the start of the project. This assessment has simply reduced scope by removing area, therefore it has inherently reduced the functional use/capacity of the facility. How this reduction compares to the minimum requirements of the RSPCA now and into the future has not been interrogated and will need to be discussed with RSPCA. The outcome of the financial calculations indicates that even with drastic reductions in the scope of the facility, delivery could not be achieved within the \$40m budget envelope.

The reduced scope facility presented in scenario 2 is 43.76% larger than the Weston facility, however it is well known that the Weston facility is operating above capacity and is currently not fit for purpose. Additionally a simple comparison of size does not take into consideration the functional requirements of the facility or the C:A/R of the current facility compared to the reduced scope option.

This assessment has been undertaken as test scenario only and has not been professionally informed by qualified consultants. The complexities of reducing floor plate area and still maintaining a functional and practical building have not been taken into consideration. The assessment is based on data provided for the full scope of works and as interpreted by Infrastructure Delivery to the best of our abilities. Therefore, the proposed cost reduction may not be fully realised

Without fully understanding the functional impact of these proposed scope reductions or having surety over the cost reductions that could be achieved, TCCS do not believe this is a suitable outcome for the RSPCA project. It should be noted that the overhead costs equate to 37% of the total costs and should a more efficient delivery model with less overhead costs be implemented, significantly more infrastructure could be delivered within the \$40m envelope.

4.2. Scenario 3 – original full scope facility

This scenario is based on the delivery of the full scope of facility works and the 2024 T&T cost plan, but has been assessed based on the scope of works identified in section 1.3 and has included design changes made in early 2025 as noted in section 3.1 and additional costs identified in section 3.1.2

Limitations: None of the proposed adjustments that have informed this assessment have been discussed with RSPCA or with the project team. The outcome while it may come closer to the \$40m budget envelope, may not meet the functional requirements of the RSPCA today or into the future.

Table 20 - Scenario 3 financial calculations

ENW1 – Enabling Works – Intersection upgrade	
WORKS	TOTAL COST
Trade costs - intersection	1,498,625.00
Trade costs - bus stop	\$274,815.00
Prelims and margins	\$443,360.00
Overheads	\$230,547.20
Capital overheads	\$729,309.47
Contract Overheads	\$127,066.27
Sub-total	\$3,303,722.94

ENW2 – Enabling Works – Addison road upgrade	
WORKS	TOTAL COST
Trade cost - road upgrade	\$293,340.00

CABINET

CABINET

Trade cost - street lighting	\$51,500.00
Trade cost - sw	\$150,880.00
Prelims and margins	\$123,930.00
Overheads	\$64,443.60
Capital overheads	\$203,859.89
Contract Overheads	\$35,518.14
Sub-total	\$923,471.63

EW1 - Early works - Site servicing	
WORKS	TOTAL COST
Elect connection	\$41,500.00
minisub	\$465,500.00
Comms connection	\$25,000.00
Water connection	\$28,000.00
Prelims and margins	\$140,000.00
Overheads	\$72,800.00
Capital overheads	\$230,294.40
Contract Overheads	\$40,123.78
Sub-total	\$1,043,218.18

EW2 - Early works - site civil works	
WORKS	TOTAL COST
Bulk removal + benching	\$3,487,172.00
SW - re-routing overland flow	\$106,500.00
EO for additional ground water engineering	\$20,000.00
EO for contaminated soil disposal	\$145,070.00
EO for relocation of existing onsite services/structures	\$10,000.00
Site clearing	\$180,204.00
Prelims and margins	\$987,236.50
Overheads	\$ 713,362.98
Capital overheads	\$1,683,564.55
Contract Overheads	\$293,324.40
Sub-total	\$7,626,434.43

FW1 - Building works - Facility	
WORKS	TOTAL COST
Cat area + Mech	\$4,936,278.40
Vet and Admin area + mech	\$10,034,166.22
Dog area + mech	\$ 9,196,269.97
External works (paving and walls)	\$3,164,753.64
Landscaping	\$2,035,236.24
Services (Negative Mech)	\$ 4,684,102.00
inground SW tanks and equipment	\$ 98,745.00
Septic System	\$800,000.00
Prelims and margins	\$7,339,405.81
Overheads	\$ 7,493,700.65

CABINET

CABINET

Capital overheads	\$14,835,232.06
Contract Overheads	\$2,584,715.60
Sub-total	\$67,202,605.59
TOTAL	\$80,099,452.77

Conclusion: This assessment was included to provide a baseline of the current design which meets the functional requirements of the RSPCA currently and into the future. It should be noted that the overhead costs equate to 37% of the total costs