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## PRESENT:

The Right Honourable, the LORD MAYOR (Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER) – LNP

The Chair of Council, Councillor David McLACHLAN (Hamilton) – LNP

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **LNP Councillors (and Wards)**  | **ALP Councillors (and Wards)** |
| Krista ADAMS (Holland Park) (Deputy Mayor)Greg ADERMANN (Pullenvale)Adam ALLAN (Northgate)Lisa ATWOOD (Doboy)Fiona CUNNINGHAM (Coorparoo)Tracy DAVIS (McDowall)Fiona HAMMOND (Marchant) Vicki HOWARD (Central) Steven HUANG (MacGregor)Sarah HUTTON (Jamboree)Sandy LANDERS (Bracken Ridge)James MACKAY (Walter Taylor) Kim MARX (Runcorn)Peter MATIC (Paddington)Ryan MURPHY (Chandler)Angela OWEN (Calamvale)Steven TOOMEY (The Gap) (Deputy Chair of Council)Andrew WINES (Enoggera) | Jared CASSIDY (Deagon) (The Leader of the Opposition)Kara COOK (Morningside) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition)Peter CUMMING (Wynnum Manly)Steve GRIFFITHS (Moorooka)Charles STRUNK (Forest Lake) |
| **Queensland Greens Councillor (and Ward)**Jonathan SRI (The Gabba) |
| **Independent Councillor (and Ward)**Nicole JOHNSTON (Tennyson) |

## OPENING OF MEETING:

The Chair, Councillor David McLACHLAN, opened the meeting with prayer and acknowledged the traditional custodians, and then proceeded with the business set out in the Agenda.

Chair: Please be seated.

 I declare the meeting open.

 Are there any apologies? No apologies?

 Confirmation of minutes, please.

## MINUTES:

**542/2021-22**

The Minutes of the 4675 meeting of Council held on 15 March 2022, copies of which had been forwarded to each Councillor, were presented, taken as read and confirmed on the motion of Councillor Sandy LANDERS, seconded by Councillor Sarah HUTTON.

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

Chair: Councillors, I’d like to call on Mr Richard Ward, who will address the Chamber on road safety concerns at Bennetts Road, Norman Park. Billy is showing Mr Ward to the microphone now. Good afternoon, Mr Ward. You can stand or sit. You have five minutes once you commence speaking. Thanks very much. Billy will turn your mic on.

**Mr Richard Ward – Road safety concerns at Bennetts Road, Norman Park**

Mr Richard Ward: Thank you. Mr Chair, LORD MAYOR, and Councillors, good afternoon and thank you very much for the opportunity to address Council today. There are two serious road issues that I’d like to highlight and bring to your attention this afternoon in Norman Park. These issues are so significant that my neighbours and I believe it’s only a question of when and not if a fatality will occur. We also consider that this risk can be substantially reduced if Council were to implement some very minimal and low-cost measures.

The first issue concerns the Bennetts Road roundabout that intersects Waminda and Agnew Streets. With increasing traffic, particularly during peak hour, this roundabout is particularly dangerous and almost impossible to cross safely as a pedestrian as cars speed through the roundabout. Children are therefore unable to walk or ride to Norman Park State School (NPSS) by themselves or with their friends, unless they’re accompanied by an adult.

Consequently, the Council’s Active School Travel program at NPSS isn’t that effective, because parents and caregivers are required to drive to school to ensure the children arrive safely. The effect of this is that more traffic is then pushed along narrow suburban streets that aren’t designed to cope with the demands of school drop-offs and pick-ups. Issues like this then impact on the Council’s objectives of being an effective, healthy city—an active, healthy city and accessible, connected city, and doesn’t promote or encourage children to be more active and independent.

Simple measures such as reducing the speed limit a suitable distance from the roundabout to 40 kilometres per hour, pedestrian crossing signage, road markings such as zebra crossings are feasible, and traffic calming devices such as speed humps would go a long way to make it safer to cross the roundabout. Ideally, permanent solutions would be implemented such as installing of a pedestrian traffic island further down Bennetts Road, a pedestrian overpass or traffic lights.

The second issue concerns Bennetts Road itself, between the roundabout and Pattison Avenue. This particular stretch of suburban road is considered by residents to be a high accident zone. Since 1 January this year, there have been around 11 accidents, single car accidents, and they often involve a car spinning out of control to the other side of the road and hitting parked cars. It’s inconceivable to me that, despite the accident rate going up every year and repeated complaints to Council, neither Council nor the Department of Transport and Main Roads have taken any action to address this.

Local residents are sick and tired of being the first responders at the scene of an accident. As I said before, it’ll only be a matter of time before a driver or another motorist, innocent pedestrian or cyclist, is seriously injured or killed. Drivers travelling in either direction of Bennetts Road seem to be confused by the alignment of the road as it sweeps and weaves—the road camber is in parts opposite the direction of travel. On the relatively straight section between 254 and 285 Bennetts Road, cars are spinning out of control.

Although more accidents seem to occur during the wet, it’s perplexing that accidents are also occurring in dry conditions. Even last week, when it was dry, a vehicle managed to hit the median steel barrier and then damaged that, along with the actual arrow sign. At the end of November last year, I was actually the first responder of an accident at 6.30am one morning, which happened within metres of where I was actually standing at the time.

A car spun out of control, crossed the median strip, and then hit a car travelling in the other direction before then hitting a parked car in front of me. It’s extremely fortunate no one was seriously injured or killed in that particular accident, and my neighbour, whose parked car was hit, then had the short-term replacement hire car vehicle damaged in exactly the same circumstances only a few weeks later. On a more personal level, my own car was actually written off in June last year when it was parked safe and legally on Bennetts Road, before it was rear-ended by a car mid-morning.

The cost of accident repairs and indirect cost of motorists being inconvenienced by not having their vehicle while it’s being repaired, aside from the impact on people being injured, is far more significant compared to Council implementing some simple and very low-cost measures, such as reducing the traffic speed to 40 kilometres per hour, installing some slippery road signs, and having an increased police presence to discourage speeding.

Now, it’s been previously argued that Bennetts Road is classified a suburban road, and therefore the designated road speed limit is 60 kilometres per hour. As I’m sure you’re aware, there are plenty of examples in Brisbane where arterial roads—the next level of road in the hierarchy—such as Ipswich Road and Old Cleveland Road, have 40 kilometre per hour stretches.

In conclusion, I invite you to inspect Bennetts Road, including the roundabout, observe for yourselves the traffic movements and safety issues I have highlighted. I kindly request you allocate funding to implement some immediate low-cost measures, such as reducing the speed limit and installing new road signage and traffic calming devices where appropriate. I welcome the opportunity to speak further on this issue with any Councillor or their representatives. Thank you again for allowing me to attend the Council meeting today and speak to you directly.

Chair: Thanks, Mr Ward.

 Councillor WINES, are you responding?

**Response by Councillor Andrew WINES, Civic Cabinet Chair of the Infrastructure Committee**

Councillor WINES: Thank you, Mr Chair, and thank you, Mr Ward, for taking the time to come in. I don’t need to explain to you that Bennetts Road is a very important inner-east road that operates a lot of key traffic through that corridor. That particular roundabout you mentioned near the train bridge is a focus of a lot of traffic. I recall the old Seven Hills TAFE before it was closed, and Mater Community Centre also was a significant driver of traffic through that particular community.

Bennetts Road is an important road for the local network, but I’d like to sincerely acknowledge the concerns that you’ve raised today about safety. I have some notes here about Bennetts Road, but I think what’s important is the things that you’ve asked for are relatively straightforward, a handful of them. Some of them will be harder to seek than others. I’ll be able to provide you some information about how speed limits are reduced on roads, and it’s actually quite a lengthy process, but I’ll provide you that information. Also, the matters around pedestrian safety, particularly your concerns around access to Norman Park State School, it’s a very important point and one of concern.

So, the pedestrian can—I make this undertaking to you, that I will pursue the offerings that you’ve made and I will speak to the senior managers of the traffic branches to see what can be done in the near term, both in—whether it be signs and lines, whether it be hard infrastructure about protected pedestrian movements, or whether it be other matters that would address that. So there’s a number of options in our, I suppose for want of a better word, our toolbox to address your concerns. So we will investigate Bennetts Road properly.

On the topic of car accidents through the corridor of Bennetts Road, the—I’ll just read it for a moment—due to community feedback received about car crashes on Bennetts Road, in 2021, Council conducted skid resistance testing between 259 to 301 Bennetts Road. The results of the testing showed that the road surface was generally in good condition, with some sections smoother than others due to high vehicle use, thereby reducing friction.

The opinion of Council engineers from that investigation was that this type of wear and tear is common for roads with high traffic volumes, such as Bennetts Road, and is considered to be an acceptable level of wear. That being said, I will happily investigate other alternatives. So, we have a number of road services that—so, a number of, sort of, bitumen services have better and more grip, and that’s something that we’ve been able to do, as well. So if it is a lack of grip issue through Bennetts Road, then we’re happy to consider the road surface through there, as well. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor WINES.

 Thank you, Mr Ward.

Mr Richard Ward: Thank you.

## QUESTION TIME:

Chair: Councillors, I draw your attention to Question Time. Are there any questions of the LORD MAYOR or a Civic Cabinet Chair of any of the Standing Committees?

 Councillor ATWOOD.

**Question 1**

Councillor ATWOOD: Thank you, Chair. My question is to the LORD MAYOR.

 LORD MAYOR, yesterday was a significant moment for the future of our city, with the signing of the City Deal officially complete. Can you please update the Chamber on what this means for Brisbane, including the City Shaping projects which are being funded through this historic agreement?

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you—through you, Mr Chair—Councillor ATWOOD for the question. Look, it was an important day yesterday because we saw something that was quite rare happening, and that is three levels of government plus a whole range of different councils from across the South East Queensland region standing together, united in support of something new and something important for our region, and that is the South East Queensland City Deal. It is a 20-year deal with a five-year initial period, and a five-year initial period of $1.8 billion worth of investment, and there’s much more investment to come, obviously, over those 20 years, but this is significant for our entire region.

The reason it is so significant is because our region is the fastest-growing part of Australia and, in fact, one of the fastest-growing parts of the world when it comes to comparable regions. So, if we don’t invest with all three levels of government focused on the same thing and the same priorities, then our liveability will suffer. We do not want that to happen. We want to make sure that our liveability continues to improve as it has in recent years, and so this deal, this arrangement between the three levels of government will help achieve that.

Now, this also adds to the fact that we’ve had the three levels of government supporting investment as a result of the Olympics, as well. So, South East Queensland is now the only region in Australia that has two major infrastructure and improvement deals, the Olympic Deal and the City Deal. I must admit, I expected at least one of them to happen, but I was—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —increasingly concerned that both of them may not happen due to the proximity to a federal election, but I’ve got to say, both the Federal and State Government have worked incredibly productively together and we’ve seen what I didn’t expect would happen, and that is they have agreed on this deal. So, I want to thank the Premier, I want to thank the Prime Minister, I want to thank Minister Paul Fletcher, and I want to thank the Deputy Premier, Steven Miles, for working cooperatively with myself and other councils to achieve this positive outcome.

Obviously, you’re all aware of some of the major initiatives in the City Deal, but one that I am particularly excited about is the $40 million investment in Resilient Rivers. This is a program which will see targeted major investment in the catchments of the Brisbane River, and it will see work being done to replant and regenerate and stop erosion happening, and to improve the quality of water in our waterways and our river and our bay, and that is very, very important. We want to make sure that, as we head towards the Olympics, we get a river and a bay that has improving water quality, and that is possible with the target investment that we’re talking about.

So, I’m very excited to see that, as I am excited to see the major transport infrastructure investments, but there’s also one that was sort of buried in there that didn’t get a lot of coverage which I’m particularly excited about. Three levels of government signing up to a program to prioritise the removal of open level crossings in South East Queensland. So, this is one that I’d previously talked to the former Deputy Premier, Jackie Trad, about. She agreed that we should put this in the draft deal. Steven Miles has also agreed to that, and now we’ve got all three levels of government working together to prioritise the next round of open level crossings to be removed.

Now, we know that this is a major task. We know there are many, many open level crossings right across the region that would benefit from removal, but this is about identifying the highest priority ones and initiating a program to do that. So, you would have seen that. You would have seen the investment in Brisbane Metro from both the Federal Government and the State Government with the new Gabba Metro station, a fantastic outcome and one that links up Cross River Rail and Brisbane Metro in another really important way.

Now, we know that in the past, there would have been important interchange locations between rail and Metro and rail and bus. Those are locations like Roma Street, like the cultural centre, but now we have a really important one at the Gabba. It’s a new one, so another opportunity to interchange between different modes of travel which is incredibly important. If you look at all of the world-class transport systems in the world, the best ones always have multiple interchange points between different modes of travel, and that’s what we see happening both in the Gabba, in Roma Street, the Cultural Centre, and other locations, so Buranda, as well. So that’s a really exciting project and a program for the future of our region and our city, Mr Chair.

Chair: LORD MAYOR, your time has expired. Thanks very much.

Further questions?

 Councillor CASSIDY.

**Question 2**

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair. My question is to the LORD MAYOR.

 LORD MAYOR, when disasters hit, people’s priorities often adapt, but yours stayed true. In the last two weeks, you cut round two of the Better Suburbs grant for community facilities. Clubs and organisations right across our city were banking on this funding to pay for much-needed upgrades and repairs. The one thing you didn’t cut, of course, was your *Living in Brisbane* newsletter, your favourite piece of political propaganda. The March edition of the *Living in Brisbane* flyer still went out to every letterbox, only this time featured a photo of you playing dress-ups in khaki and patting yourself on the back—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: —for flood recovery efforts. When the chips are down for tens of thousands of people, you cut community grants and use the flood crisis to promote yourself at residents’ expense. LORD MAYOR, just how willing—how low are you willing to—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: LORD MAYOR, just how low are you willing to stoop?

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: That’s a bit rich coming from the Leader of the Opposition, the person who rarely emerges from the gutter, and when he’s not slinging mud around the place just focuses on petty politics, which have the interests of the Australian Labor Party at heart, but not the interests of the people of Brisbane, and we’ve—

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

LORD MAYOR: —seen that again today from this petty question.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Meetings Local Law requires no debate about a question, but the question must be directly answered. The LORD MAYOR is engaging in unsuitable meeting conduct and he should be ruled out of order.

Chair: I don’t agree with you, Councillor JOHNSTON. There was a long preamble to that question. The LORD MAYOR is answering the question.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: The Labor Party defence force springs into action again. They can’t do it themselves, so someone else tries to do it for them, but look, Mr Chair—

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: I find the LORD MAYOR’s comments about me today to be inappropriate and unsuitable meeting conduct, and I ask that they are withdrawn.

Chair: LORD MAYOR—Councillor JOHNSTON, I don’t agree with your assertion.

 LORD MAYOR, you have the floor.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair. Look, there was a—

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor JOHNSTON.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: No? Okay.

 LORD MAYOR.

Councillor JOHNSTON: No, I have a point of order.

Chair: Oh, okay.

Councillor JOHNSTON: I just thought you might like to do something about the interjections from the LNP there.

Chair: If you’re going to make a point of order, please do so, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Mr Chairman, I would seek clarification on your ruling. Whilst you are saying you do not agree with me, your obligation under the Meetings Local Law is to either uphold or refuse a point of order. It’s not a matter of whether you agree or not. So I would like some clarification around whether you say I’m making a valid point of order or not.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, I don’t believe you’re making a valid point of order. The LORD MAYOR was only a few seconds into answering the question. I believe the LORD MAYOR was answering the question.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Then point of order, Mr Chairman.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor JOHNSTON.

|  |
| --- |
| **543/2021-22**Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON moved, seconded by Councillor Steve GRIFFITHS, that the Chair’s ruling be dissented from. Upon being submitted to the Chamber, the motion of dissent was declared **lost** on the voices. |

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair. We had the basis of Councillor CASSIDY’s question being the peddling of misinformation, which is not surprising, it happens every week, but I am keen to call out the misinformation included in that question. First of all, this year, the grant funding available for communities is higher than it was the year before. We have continued to increase that level and, in fact, last year in 2020‑2021, there was around $5.3 million made available in community grants in different categories. This year, there’s $5.75 million available for community grants, so the funding continues to go up for community grants.

But if you listen to the wording that was used, Councillor CASSIDY claimed that there was a cut in funding for community grants. In fact, he said there was a cut in funding and implied that community groups would miss out. So, this is completely inaccurate. What has been done here is that the next round of funding that was going to be made available for the Better Suburbs grants has been redirected to flood affected community groups. Every single dollar of it, plus more, is going to support community groups that were impacted by the floods.

Now, he said apparently the priorities don’t change, yet the example he used indicated exactly how we nimbly changed the program to make sure it was directed to the area of most need, those groups that have been affected by the floods. So it is a completely false question that has been asked, and as I said, not surprising, but once again disappointing. We will continue to support the targeted recovery of our city through initiatives such as the community grants, and all Councillors would be aware of the $5,000 grants or donations that have been provided to community groups that are flood affected.

That’s helping with the recovery process and the clean-up process, and many grants have already hit the bank accounts of those organisations, are being put to use as we speak, and so we made sure we nimbly not only changed the grant program, but also made sure it was really quick and that we had a fast turnaround, so that the money was in the hands of those community groups as quickly as possible. So, that will continue. We’ll continue with initiatives such as the $250 rebate on rates for flood-affected properties.

We will continue with our free parking initiative until the end of this month and we will continue—and these things are all on top of the support that we had provided during the pandemic, as well. As you know, there was significant support that we provided, whether it was support for local business, whether it was the COVID rate freeze, whether it was the free parking and discounted parking that was provided for the COVID recovery and now the flood recovery, or whether it was the six days of free bus travel that occurred in the lead-up to Christmas to get people out and supporting local business.

We have continued to support our community in a targeted way that will make a difference in a time of need, and that has been consistent, whether it’s pandemic support or flood relief support. We will continue to do the right thing by our community.

Chair: Thank you, LORD MAYOR.

 Further questions?

 Councillor OWEN.

**Question 3**

Councillor OWEN: Thank you, Mr Chair. My question this afternoon is to the Chair of the Transport Committee, Councillor MURPHY.

 Councillor MURPHY, the LORD MAYOR has just spoken about how important the signing of the City Deal is for Brisbane. Could you please update the Chamber on the transport outcomes in this agreement, including the brand-new proposed Woolloongabba Metro station?

Chair: Thank you.

 Councillor MURPHY.

Councillor MURPHY: Thank you very much, Mr Chair, and thank you to Councillor OWEN for the question. As we have just heard from the LORD MAYOR, the announcement of the City Deal yesterday is a major milestone in Brisbane’s future. Our region and our city—actually our soon-to-be Olympic city—are growing at a rapid pace, so we need to invest in infrastructure to keep ourselves connected. There’s no better way to keep our city moving than to upgrade, to renew, and to create public and green transport options to relieve congestion and to make it easier for people to choose not to drive.

The LORD MAYOR and I, of course, very proud to be able to champion projects like the award-winning Brisbane Metro which will deliver a world-class public transport system for our city. It is the biggest public transport project tackled by a local government in Australian history, a now $1.7 billion gamechanger. In fact, the value of our investment in Metro now exceeds the biggest project that Council has undertaken to date, the previously $1.5 billion Legacy Way project. We do it because it’s important, Chair, because two-thirds of public transport trips in Brisbane are taken on a bus.

Metro will free up the bus network and it will make it easier to travel through the city and out to the suburbs. We will also be the first city in the southern hemisphere to use our next generation battery electric metros, which give us the capacity of a tram with the flexibility of a bus at a fraction of the cost of light rail. What we’ve seen in the South East Queensland City Deal is the Palaszczuk Labor Government now getting onboard and wholeheartedly endorsing Brisbane Metro.

Now, we know the Morrison Government has long been supportive of the project with $300 million commitment to be now bolstered by the City Deal. Now, State Labor have endorsed our plan alongside the Cross River Rail project as something that is much needed for our transport network. The only people left standing at the station, Chair, is the Opposition leader here in this Council and his team. While the Premier of our State calls metro a critical piece of infrastructure, the Leader of the Opposition is now the only one left standing who remains critical of our project.

Chair, Councillor CASSIDY cannot stop talking down Brisbane Metro because we know that he and his team have no plan for bus congestion, no plan for turn up and go services, no plan for state-of-the-art metros, and no plan at all. Thankfully, Chair, no one is listening to the Leader of the Opposition, especially not the Labor Premier, who called Metro an important—quote—chunk in the armour of South East Queensland’s transportation infrastructure. Chair, Brisbane Metro is well on its way with works already in progress at several sites across the city, including Adelaide Street, Countess Street, South Brisbane, and the Metro depot at Rochedale, and we’re very glad to have State and Federal Government onboard to continue this delivery.

One of the key projects in this deal is the addition of the new $450 million Gabba Metro station. This Metro station will transform the location into a truly multimodal transport hub that will not only connect residents across Brisbane, but also across South East Queensland. It positions the Gabba as a transport hub and an Olympic hub at the same time, and with the support of the South East Queensland City Deal, the new Woolloongabba Metro station will be located next to the Gabba Cross River Rail station.

By creating an integrated transport interchange, the new station will allow easy and efficient connections between Metro, between bus and train, as well as to the Kangaroo Point Green Bridge. Brisbane Metro will connect our city and our suburbs, so the ability to easily transfer between train and bus services will add benefits to the project for residents that are travelling right across the entire South East Queensland region. For commuters, integrating our public transport services and extending high-frequency Metro services to the Gabba will also help to reduce travel times.

Of course, we can’t forget the impact that this new station will have on the 2032 Olympics. With the Gabba set to be the centrepiece of the Brisbane Games, the new station will undoubtedly transport tens of thousands of spectators to this once-in-a-generation event. The City Deal also provides funding for the Metro project to complete a transport study at South Bank, and this study will help us ensure that our transport network can cater to future population growth and tourism demand. We need to make sure that we plan for the future to enhance integration and transport connectivity through South Bank, which has become one of our city’s premier destinations.

Mr Chair, I mentioned how the Gabba Metro station will help with active transport connections to the Kangaroo Point Green Bridge. Well, I’m very glad that in the City Deal, we are seeing the Morrison Government sign up to deliver green transport options, and I believe that the Kangaroo Point Green Bridge is the first ever Active Transport project funded by the Federal Government, and I thank them for that commitment to green transport.

Chair: Councillor MURPHY, your time has expired.

 Further questions?

 Councillor SRI.

**Question 4**

Councillor SRI: Thanks, Chair. My question is to the Mayor.

 LORD MAYOR, you might have seen the—in part as a response to rising petrol prices, the Tasmanian Government has just announced that public transport will be free for a month, which I think is a really good thing and I applaud the Government of Tasmania for doing that. As I’m sure you’re aware, the petrol prices are also rising here in South East Queensland and a lot of residents are finding it more difficult to afford to get around.

I wonder, would you be supportive of and would you join me in my calls on the State Government to introduce free public transport in South East Queensland, or at the very least, free off-peak public transport so that we can get residents off the more congested peak hour services while also providing free travel for those who are currently finding it very difficult to afford to get around?

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you—through you, Mr Chair—Councillor SRI for the question. Look, I think a discussion about public transport fare and incentives to get people on public transport is a really positive thing. We’ve obviously done a number of things ourselves in a targeted way to try and help achieve that. As Councillor SRI is aware, we introduced free off-peak travel for seniors, which has been well used. Obviously, the numbers are down a bit because of the pandemic, as you would expect, particularly with some of our senior vulnerable residents not wanting to be on public transport at the moment. I understand that, but we are at a point now where there needs to be a good plan to get people back onto public transport.

I think there’s various ways that that can be achieved, but certainly looking at fares is one of them, and it’s something I would support. In fact, I think I’ve written to the Minister now three or four times asking that exact same question. It’s like, what can we do with fares to encourage people back on? Now, I understand the financial realities of ongoing free public transport. That is a very costly thing to provide, but certainly a targeted initiative that can be done at least in the short term to get people back onboard I think is a really good thing—

Councillor SRI: Point of order, Chair.

LORD MAYOR: —and it’s something that—

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor SRI.

Councillor SRI: Just, the key thrust of the question was about free off-peak transport. Just on relevance.

Chair: Thank you.

 Relevance, LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Yes, and so free off-peak travel for seniors is something we support, and is something we budget more than $3 million a year for. Is that right, Councillor MURPHY? If you made that more widely available, it would be a good way of help—as Councillor SRI has pointed out, potentially spreading the demand in peak time, spreading the load, so yes, that is something that I would be happy to talk to the Minister about. I’m not sure if the fourth or the fifth attempt will change his view on this, but we have seen some good cooperation with Minister Bailey on issues such as the former Drift restaurant.

So hopefully, that cooperation can extend to other areas, as well, but yes, it’s certainly something that we need to be working with the State Government on to encourage people back onto public transport. The reality is, as we see the pandemic tail off, if people continue their pandemic travel behaviours, we will see a city that is more congested in the future. I think that’s not something any of us want to see, and so getting people back onto public transport is critical. Obviously, we’re making the big investments at both levels of—well, at all levels of government now in major transport infrastructure.

So, whether it’s the Cross River Rail project or the Brisbane Metro, those major projects are coming, but we actually need people to be catching public transport. So, I think that it’s a fair suggestion that Councillor SRI has raised, and one that I’m happy to take up with the Minister for Transport.

Chair: Thank you, LORD MAYOR.

 Further questions?

 Councillor LANDERS.

**Question 5**

Councillor LANDERS: Thank you, Chair. My question is to the Chair of the Economic—of the Environment, Parks and Sustainability Committee, Councillor DAVIS.

 Councillor DAVIS, the recent rain event saw Brisbane receive the most rainfall on record. Could you please update the Chamber on why it’s so important to invest in our drainage infrastructure, including setting the record straight on our investment—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor LANDERS: —in this space?

Chair: Councillor DAVIS.

Councillor DAVIS: Well, thank you—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor DAVIS: Thank you, Mr Chair, and I’d like to, through you, thank Councillor LANDERS for the question. Mr Chair, Brisbane is a subtropical city built on a floodplain, with the Brisbane River being the central identity to Brisbane’s unique character. As a result, we have a history of severe flooding events, since recordkeeping began in the early 19th century. When, of course, our most recent major events occurring in 1974, in 2011, and of course in 2022.

This year’s flood event saw more than 740 millimetres of rain fall over four days, when the average rainfall in a year is just over one metre. Which is more rain than we saw in 1974 with 500 millimetres of rain falling over Brisbane in 24 hours. However, each flood event is different and unique, and complex factors influence the severity and impact of flooding on residents and businesses. The 2011 floods were considered a dry flood, with most of the rainfall received in the upper catchments causing river flooding in Brisbane.

Brisbane unfortunately sustained more than $1.2 billion of damage back in 2011, but following the 2011 floods, we undertook an independent investigation to look at how we can improve on our flood management strategies, which saw the ramping up of backflow devices along our riverbank. Flooding that occurred this year was not only a river flooding event. It was also due to creek flooding and overland flow flooding. Just like we have in previous severe flooding events, we have investigated our flood management strategies and this event will be no different.

Overall, we need to be flexible and resilient in how we manage the risk of flooding, using several methods that include both structural and non-structural flood management activities, and undertaking ongoing flood modelling to understand how floods impact areas around Brisbane, as well as offering resources for residents to help protect themselves, their property, and their businesses from flooding and other severe weather events, including the *Flooding in Brisbane* guide, preparing checklists, early warning alerts, and access to flood awareness maps and FloodWise Property Reports through Council’s flood information online.

What we have seen after this year’s flood event is the importance of our drainage infrastructure in helping manage heavy rainfall in the city, and that is why we continue to invest in infrastructure and modern technology to improve our stormwater drainage network. By proactively improving and maintaining the stormwater drainage network, we are helping residents reduce the impact of flooding on their properties and helping neighbourhoods recover more quickly from flooding events. In the past 11 years, we have delivered $130 million in infrastructure and flood management programs.

This year alone, we are investing over $24 million in new drainage projects, as well as rehabilitation and repair on existing drainage projects. We are also investing an additional $13 million on stormwater infrastructure and a further $3 million on our Flood Resilient Homes program. Council undertakes a range of maintenance and rehabilitation activities, including planned and reactive maintenance, and as part of our investment, we are investing over $7 million in this space. We have an ongoing inspection program of the drainage network to proactively identify situational and potential failures.

Our Maintenance program ensures that Brisbane’s 4,000 kilometres of stormwater pipe network, such as enclosed drainage, operates at its optimum capacity. It is clearly demonstrated every year in our budget book in black and white what the Schrinner Council is delivering regarding drainage and stormwater infrastructure. Mr Chair, Labor has been out there telling furphies once again about our drainage funding.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor DAVIS: They have been trying to say that the drainage funding has been cut. Well, nothing could be further from the truth. Let me set the record straight again, that in this financial year alone, we are investing $24 million in funding, which is an additional $2.4 million on last year’s budget amount. Mr Chair—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor DAVIS: —the Schrinner Council—

Chair: Councillors, please.

Councillor DAVIS: —is committed to making sure that Brisbane is prepared for the impacts of varied and changing climate with a management approach that empowers a resilient community, natural environment, and built form during these times of flood and drought.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor DAVIS.

 Further questions?

 Councillor GRIFFITHS.

**Question 6**

Councillor GRIFFITHS: Yes, thanks, Mr Chairman. I direct my question to the LORD MAYOR.

 LORD MAYOR, last week, I moved a motion calling on you to meet with me and one of my residents to talk about floodproofing this city and, in particular, about buying back his property. After voting against my motion, you then slipped out of the Council meeting and drove to Rocklea to meet with my resident without me. He was under the impression I would be at that meeting, and was quite shocked to learn that you turned up unaccompanied and without the local Councillor.

LORD MAYOR, first of all, you block local Councillors on your social media account, then you won’t—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Excuse me. Excuse me, please.

Councillor GRIFFITHS: Yes, thank you. Then you won’t communicate with us when the city has a major flood event, and now you’re avoiding meeting us in our own wards and resorting to petty political games. LORD MAYOR, what are you so afraid of?

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Well, Mr Chair, I didn’t come down in the last shower and I can see a political ambush when it comes up, but what Councillor GRIFFITHS is not aware of is that the person that I met with had no such expectation that he would be there, no such, because I made it clear when I called him in advance that I wouldn’t be getting involved in the petty politics and gameplaying that Councillor GRIFFITHS wanted me to get involved in, and that I’d be happy to meet with him and have a chat, also with his neighbours if they were available, to talk through the process.

It was a really productive meeting, and it just goes to show what Councillor GRIFFITHS’ priorities are. I actually met the person that he wanted me to meet with, yet he’s complaining about it. Why? Because he didn’t get the chance to play politics with it. What a shame.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Look, Councillor GRIFFITHS, you were using a resident who was in a very difficult situation for political purposes and you should be ashamed of yourself, but I’ve got to say, that person—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor HAMMOND.

LORD MAYOR: —and his wife and children who I met with was very reasonable, and that person wasn’t interested in playing politics. He just wanted to talk about the issues and what options were available down the track, and that’s exactly what we talked about. The meeting went for over an hour, and it was very productive. So, look, you know, in the end, I’m sorry, Councillor GRIFFITHS, you didn’t get your opportunity to play silly political games. I’m sorry about that, but in the end, if you really care about the residents, you shouldn’t be worried about playing political games. You should be worried about the outcomes that can be achieved when people work productively together.

Councillor GRIFFITHS has made it clear in the past he has no interest in working with anyone in Administration, not myself, not my predecessors. He has always engaged in political games whenever the opportunity arose. I remember local neighbourhood planning issues in his ward where there was appalling behaviour, appalling behaviour from Councillor GRIFFITHS, and I’m not going to engage in that. I’m not going to engage in that. In the end, what is important here is getting the right outcome, not petty political games.

Chair: Thank you, LORD MAYOR.

 Further questions?

 Councillor HUTTON.

**Question 7**

Councillor HUTTON: Thank you, Mr Chair. My question is to the Chair of the Economic Development and the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games Committee, Councillor ADAMS.

 DEPUTY MAYOR, the past two years have been extremely tough for businesses, having to navigate through lockdowns and tough COVID restrictions. Regrettably, a number of these businesses have had their operations stung in another way, with the recent damage done by the floods. Could you please update the Chamber on how the Schrinner Council will continue to back Brisbane business, and what services are on offer to help them get back onto their feet?

Chair: Thank you.

 DEPUTY MAYOR.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair, and thank you, Councillor HUTTON, because in our Committee of Economic Development, small business is always front of mind, and what we have seen in the rainfall event, as we just heard from Councillor DAVIS, is one of the worst on record, and while many businesses were not directly flood affected, the impacts have been felt far and wide. It has been a tough blow for those who have already been struggling with what has been nothing short of a devastating two years for our small business community.

While our attention is absolutely turned to the mammoth clean-up efforts happening right across the city, we are determined to get on with the job and help everyone get back on their feet as soon as possible, and more importantly, to build back better. So, to assist businesses dispose of their flood-affected items, we’ve dropped the fees at our resource recovery centres which everybody has known about for a couple of weeks. Council’s website has a range of factsheets and resources available to support businesses to navigate their return to their premises, including safety and insurance considerations, as well as useful links to other information on how to get your business up and running again.

Before entering flood-damaged properties or undertaking any rebuilding works, I urge residents and businesses to take the time to understand what needs to be done and how to go about this safely. It’s a huge task and that will be quite confronting and, in many cases, very distressing for a lot of people, especially if this is their second time cleaning up from floods, but we are determined to play a part to relieve some of the pressure that these businesses are feeling at this time.

The Brisbane Business Hub and the Suburban Business Hub in Nundah have coworking and meeting spaces available for those in need. The Nundah Hub has been particularly busy, giving displaced local business owners a space to continue working while their clean-up continues. Our Business Liaison Officers are available for one-on-one sessions—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Excuse me, Councillor JOHNSTON, please.

DEPUTY MAYOR: —or even just to offer a bit of support and guidance, as we know the road to recovery can be overwhelming and we don’t want anyone to have to face this alone. We may not have all the big levers to pull in Council, but we do know that every little bit helps when you’re a small business. That’s the attitude we’ve taken over the past two years, and we’ll continue to support our small business community through tough times. The LORD MAYOR recently announced that thousands of flood victim residents and businesses will receive a $250 rebate off their next rate bills. If your property was affected by flood in any way, you will be eligible for this rebate.

I’m sure the next rates bill is the last thing on their mind at the moment, which is why they’ve also been delayed for a month and made available that 60-day extension to flood victims facing financial difficulties. Hopefully, that will mean for our businesses that they will have a little bit of extra cash in their pockets to help them get back on their feet sooner and open their doors to start trading sooner. As for the little bit of extra cash for those who were not flood affected to spend locally and support—so, for those are not with businesses, but are flood affected to spend locally and support those businesses through this time, as well.

Hopefully, people will be able to get to their local shopping precincts. We’ve kept the parking meters free for this month through the end of March, and the extension available throughout February when we turned off the meters was all about Brisbane’s economic recovery. It’s one simple measure that we’ve taken to help businesses get back on track while also giving flood-affected residents one less cost to worry about. These initiatives have built on an economic relief package already available for small businesses in Brisbane, which now totals more than $60 million waived in fees, rents and charges over the past two years.

We are the most small-business friendly council in Australia, and we will always step in to do what’s right and lend these businesses a helping hand. Our Small Business Roundtable met last week and had a very productive conversation about recovery measures to determine how best we can support local businesses, ranging across a range of industries, as well. The LORD MAYOR’s Flood Recovery Taskforce is being set up to further support and guide our recovery efforts. I look forward to working through any of the outcomes on that when it comes to the economic recovery that may come out of this taskforce, as well.

Our Economic Development Team, as well as BEDA, the Brisbane Economic Development Agency, will be feeding information through to the taskforce and through to us here in Council to make sure that a set of priority actions are set up to get Brisbane businesses back on track. It’s certainly a setback, after what many businesses have said in January was the worst part of the lockdowns in the pseudo‑lockdown that we saw in January, on the back of COVID starting to move through staff and staffing shortages, as well.

We are now looking, of course, at petrol prices increasing, goods and services being difficult to get into the city, on top of insurance rates, which are going to be crippling for many businesses. Again, not many of the levers that we can pull, but we are determined to support them to build back stronger and better.

Chair: DEPUTY MAYOR, your time has expired.

 Further questions?

 Councillor STRUNK.

**Question 8**

Councillor STRUNK: Thank you, Mr Chair. My question is to the LORD MAYOR.

 In August last year, and again in February this year, the Finance Committee received a presentation on storm season resilience. After each presentation, I asked the LNP Chair if they would put together a form for Councillors on Council disaster response plans and our role as Councillors in that. Both my requests were denied. It may surprise residents watching, but Councillors don’t have any regular disaster training.

When I tried to raise the issue, it fell on deaf ears. The failure to provide coordinated training to all Councillors meant that the flow of information and the announcements throughout the crisis was utterly dysfunctional. LORD MAYOR, why did your Administration refuse to train Councillors in disaster response?

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Well, I’ve never refused to train anyone when it comes to disaster management, so I’m not sure what Councillor STRUNK is referring to, but I can assure Councillor STRUNK that, as with any natural disaster situation, whether it’s a bushfire or a flood, whether it’s a severe storm event, we always make sure that our procedures are updated and lessons are learnt from any natural disaster, and—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, please.

LORD MAYOR: —and we will do so after this one, as well, and that’s an important part of the process. The reality is that we’ve seen Queensland’s disaster management framework, the Council’s disaster management framework, followed very closely when it comes to the response with this disaster. After the 2011 flood, there were a lot of changes that were made to the way that natural disasters are managed, and those changes were implemented and those changes operate not only in Brisbane but in all of the Council areas across Queensland.

We have a State framework that we operate under, and we operate strictly in accordance with that framework, and so that framework involves an approach that empowers local councils to work with other agencies, whether they’re State agencies, whether they’re charities, whether they’re defence forces, police and other agencies to respond appropriately, and the response is always a multi-agency response. It’s not Council is the only responder. It is the police. It is the Queensland Fire and Emergency Services. It is the military. It is various State agencies.

Councillor STRUNK: Point of order, Mr Chairman.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor STRUNK.

Councillor STRUNK: Thank you. I know the LORD MAYOR has not finished his answer, but I did ask specifically about Councillors’ training for disaster management.

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Yes, thank you. So, we always run a multi-agency response, and that’s why, when we have our local Disaster Management Committee meetings, that those agencies are always represented on those. It is, as I said, really important that lessons are always learnt. Now, if Councillor STRUNK believes that he can benefit and other Councillors can benefit from more training, well, it’s a fair suggestion. It’s a fair suggestion. So, that is something that I don’t have a problem with at all. I think that, you know, the more training with situations like this the better.

We’re facing increasingly unpredictable weather conditions, and we need to be as ready as we possibly can, so yes, that’s certainly something we can have a look at as part of the lessons learnt from this particular flood event, and training is something that, as I said, is something we should have a look at to see if it can be bolstered, if it needs to be changed in any way, and I’m certainly open to that. Councillors would recall, after the 2011 flood, one of the challenges that we had in the 2011 flood was, because of the extent of the flooding and because of the impacts on the mobile telecommunications network, a significant part of the mobile network went down.

One of the responses from that was to make sure that every Councillor had access to a radio system, which should be sitting on all of your desks. Who’s got it on their desk? Yes, okay. Those radios have just been recently updated and replaced. It’s just one of the many practical responses that Council has taken since previous disasters, and—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Councillors, please.

LORD MAYOR: —and certainly, as I’ve said now repeatedly, if training needs to be bolstered, then that’s something that I’m absolutely open to.

Councillor CASSIDY: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor CASSIDY.

LORD MAYOR: I think it’s a really positive thing.

Councillor CASSIDY: I think the LORD MAYOR might have misunderstood Councillor STRUNK’s question. It wasn’t about more training. It was about training. There is no training provided. So, the LORD MAYOR seems to be under some misapprehension that there is in fact training currently going on.

Chair: Thank you.

 LORD MAYOR, do you want to add anything further?

LORD MAYOR: Look, yes, Councillor CASSIDY has made what he believes is a comment. Look, as I said, I’ve made my position clear. There’s always lessons to be learnt from every natural disaster and we will make sure that those appropriate lessons are learnt. So I think, you know, I can’t be more clear than that, Mr Chair.

Chair: Thank you.

 Further questions?

**Question 9**

Councillor HUANG: Yes, thank you, Mr Chair. My question is to the Chair of the Infrastructure Committee, Councillor WINES.

 Councillor WINES, Brisbane roads are back open and carrying residents to and from home, school, and work. Could you please update the Chamber on the work that has gone into making this happen over the past three weeks?

Chair: Councillor WINES.

Councillor WINES: Thank you, Mr Chair, and thank you so much to Councillor HUANG for his question and his keen interest. I know that his community, like so many, depends on the road network operating efficiently and safely. To give the city—to give the Council some context, the city has 16,185 local streets, equating to about 5,820 kilometres, lineal kilometres of road network. Of that, more than 314 kilometres of that road network was flooded during the recent flooding event, with more than 50 roads of significance closed due to the recent—due to that rainfall, and a further 120 traffic signal faults.

During the event, our own BMTMC (Brisbane Metropolitan Traffic Management Centre) was a very important source of gathering information and then distributing information around to ensure or to provide people the best opportunity to move safely and, in most instances, attempt to return home where they could. There was—the BMTMC manages traffic and both planned and unplanned incidents in real time, provides travel information, manages 600-plus CCTV cameras, and more than 1,100 Bluetooth vehicle detectors. The best way for people to get information is actually through a source called queenslandtraffic.com is the best and most up-to-date source for people who wish to find out which roads are closed when and why.

That is a collection of both Council and State and QPS (Queensland Police Service) information and other Local Government authorities into one place in a real-time manner. So, can I encourage Councillors to investigate that particular website so that they can use it if they ever have to in the future? During the flood event, there were 30 crashes and more than 150 abandoned stationary or broken‑down vehicles. There were 119 flooded road jobs for major arterial and feeder roads. The BMTMC provided advice to the community through a whole range of measures and attempted to again provide safe passage for people who found it necessary to be on the roads at that time. Closures were significant, but not merely due to flooding.

There were a number of road slips, and I can happily provide advice to the Chamber tonight that the final road to open, Mount Nebo Road in the western parts of The Gap Ward, has been partially reopened in the last few days. So, Settlement Road and Mount Nebo Road were the last two roads that we were waiting on to open. Mount Nebo Road still has some traffic control in place, but it is open for the residents who use that. The residents of the Mount Nebo Road community, the residents of places like Peewee Bend and those who choose to live in that community can now return to their normal access.

This is an interesting and remarkable thing—achievement that was delivered by both our City Standards and TPO (Transport Planning and Operations) Officers. Council manages more than 1,006 traffic signals. During the flood event, 129 of those signals ceased operations for a range of issues. Of those 129, 78 failed due to a loss of power supply from the Energex system, 31 were damaged due to flood, and 20, we are working on to determine what the nature of the fault was. Three signalised intersections in the city had water above the traffic light lantern, and 60 site visits were—have been conducted during the period to rectify the damage incurred.

There was a particular day, it was two Sundays ago—that our officers were able to bring 52 traffic signals back online in one day, a remarkable achievement. Dare I say, the ability to turn on those lights makes this branch and these teams a shining light, a beacon for our city to be able to move around safely and efficiently, and I want to thank them for their efforts. It is really remarkable what they were able to achieve, so can I recognise the efforts of those officers and thank them for their commitment to bringing our traffic systems back into operation?

The final two were one not far from your constituency, Mr Chair, that was Widdop Street in Nundah, which was the second-last set of traffic lights to become operational. They were an example of water above the lanterns. The final one was actually Land Street at Toowong, which was operational, but it was the last one to come into operation because there were some traffic closures that were linked to that traffic light failure that meant that it was not able to become operational again into the evening of Thursday, two Thursdays ago. So, can I just recognise the efforts of those officers who were able to get the system back online? Thank you.

Chair: Councillor WINES, your time has expired.

 That ends Question Time.

Councillor CASSIDY: Oh, point of order, Chair?

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor CASSIDY.

**544/2021-22**

At that juncture, Councillor Jared CASSIDY moved, seconded by Councillor Kara COOK, that the Standing Rules be suspended to allow the moving of a motion.

Chair: We have a motion for the suspension of Standing Rules under 9(3).

 Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Yes. Thanks very much, Chair. I, at the outset will say I couldn’t have put this as a notice of motion, what I’ll detail shortly, because we’ve only just heard in Question Time an answer given by the LORD MAYOR about this issue, about his response to the cuts to community grants. As we know, it’s been publicly announced that the LORD MAYOR’s Better Suburbs grants have been cut. This current round of grants—

LORD MAYOR: Point of order, Mr Chair.

Chair: Point of order to you, LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Claim to be misrepresented.

Chair: Noted.

Councillor CASSIDY: I didn’t say the LORD MAYOR said that. I said that has been publicly announced by Council to community clubs, that these grants have been cut. So, clubs are relying on this money, Chair. They needed it on top of the emergency flood recovery funding, that $5,000 one-off payment. Clubs needed this funding on top of that, but quite clearly, this LORD MAYOR has no intention, as we’ve heard in Question Time, of reinstating these grants for community clubs.

Now, these grants were between $10,000 and $200,000. The difference this kind of money could make across the city would be significant, and I was shocked, shocked at the LORD MAYOR’s answer in Question Time. He either doesn’t know what’s going on in the cuts to these community grants programs and is wilfully ignorant about that, Chair, or is trying to hide the fact that they have been cut. So, I will move that Brisbane City Council reinstates round two of the LORD MAYOR’s Better Suburbs Grants for Community Facilities Category.

Chair: Thank you.

 The motion before is for the suspension of Standing Rules under 12(3).

The Chair submitted the motion for the suspension of the Standing Rules to the Chamber and it was declared **carried** on the voices.

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY, please move your motion—

**545/2021-22**

At that juncture, Councillor Jared CASSIDY moved, seconded by Councillor Kara COOK—

*That Brisbane City Council reinstates round two of the Lord Mayor’s Better Suburbs Grants for the Community Facility Category.*

Chair: Okay. Thank you.

Councillor LANDERS: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor LANDERS: Mr Chair, as per section 42(2)(b) of the *Meetings Local Law 2001*—

*Councillor interjecting.*

**546/2021-22**

At that juncture, it was moved by Councillor Sandy LANDERS, seconded by Councillor Sarah HUTTON, that debate on the motion now before the meeting be adjourned until the conclusion of business on the meeting agenda.

Upon being submitted to the Chamber, the motion that debate on the motion be adjourned, was declared **carried** on the voices.

Thereupon, Councillors Jared CASSIDY and Kara COOK immediately rose and called for a division, which resulted in the motion being declared **carried**.

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 20 - The Right Honourable, the LORD MAYOR, Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER, DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Krista ADAMS, and Councillors Greg ADERMANN, Adam ALLAN, Lisa ATWOOD, Fiona CUNNINGHAM, Tracy DAVIS, Fiona HAMMOND, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Sarah HUTTON, Sandy LANDERS, James MACKAY, Kim MARX, Peter MATIC, David McLACHLAN, Ryan MURPHY, Angela OWEN, Steven TOOMEY and Andrew WINES.

NOES: 7 - The Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Jared CASSIDY, and Councillors Kara COOK, Peter CUMMING, Steve GRIFFITHS, Charles STRUNK, Jonathan SRI and Nicole JOHNSTON.

Chair: Councillors, we move on with the rest of Question—

Councillor GRIFFITHS: Actually, point of order.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor GRIFFITHS.

**547/2021-22**

At that juncture, Councillor Steve GRIFFITHS moved, seconded by Councillor Kara COOK, that the Standing Rules be suspended to allow the moving of a motion.

Chair: Please.

Councillor GRIFFITHS: Yes, thank you. So, I wasn’t able to move this motion as a notified motion by 1pm yesterday, as I was waiting to see if the Prime Minister (PM) would today agree to jointly fund a disaster relief package with the Labor State Government. So far, the PM has not committed to do that. Unfortunately, we’ve had announcements about a City Plan deal, but no announcement for those hundreds and thousands of residents affected by flooding in this city. There’s been no Federal funding for flooding for residents in this city.

It is really crucial the Federal Government comes to the table on this particular issue, as we have seen the reluctance of this LNP Council and this LNP Mayor to commit to any such relief package or buyback scheme for residents impacted by flooding. So, I therefore move the suspension of standing rules to allow me to move a motion that Brisbane City Council calls on the Federal Government to jointly fund a 771 million disaster assistance package proposed by the Labor State Government.

Chair: Councillors, Councillor GRIFFITHS has moved a motion for the suspension of Standing Rules under 9(3).

The Chair submitted the motion for the suspension of the Standing Rules to the Chamber and it was declared **carried** on the voices.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor GRIFFITHS. You're moving the motion?

**548/2021-22**

At that juncture, Councillor Steve GRIFFITHS moved, seconded by Councillor Kara COOK—

*That Brisbane City Council call on the Federal Government to jointly fund a $771 million disaster assistance package, proposed by the Labor State Government.*

Councillor GRIFFITHS: The point here is that we have an amazing opportunity here that the State Government have presented us, with a disaster assistance package of $771 million that they are proposing that they go halves with, with the Federal Government.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor GRIFFITHS: What an incredible opportunity for the residents of this city, but the residents of this State. It’s a major package that can be used to make homes flood resilient and to allow residents to renovate, raise, or even sell their homes back to Council. In fact, we debated this last week and the LORD MAYOR voted against the motion that I put up. We tried to move a motion, of course, last week calling on this LNP Council to offer a buyback scheme, but once again, the LORD MAYOR and the Liberals refused to support it.

Well, here’s your opportunity to support a motion that actually calls on your mates, your mates in Canberra, to actually come in with the State Government and deliver something that is great for the residents of Brisbane and also great for the residents of our State. Unfortunately, all we have had with this LORD MAYOR is the opportunity to play politics with people’s lives and actually not really deliver a result for them.

A prime example of that was last week, when he visited the resident of Rocklea, but didn’t tell that resident that the money was conditional upon State and Federal funding. Oh, that got missed in the conversation. Also, LORD MAYOR, according to that resident, it was 10 minutes you were there, not an hour, and you didn’t meet with neighbours.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor GRIFFITHS: So, there are two accounts, there are two accounts here. It’s almost like two people attended.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor GRIFFITHS: This is an amazing opportunity for us as a Council to work with the State, and I remember hearing before in this Chamber the LORD MAYOR ranting and raving and saying what a great thing it is to see the State, Local Government, and Federal Government all work together to deliver a city initiative. Well, here’s a great opportunity for us to work together with State and Federal Governments to actually deliver real change for the residents of Brisbane. It actually means that, in 10 years’ time, if and when it floods again, we won’t be going through these debates. We’ll have solutions. People won’t be flooding in their homes. This will have been resolved.

That’s what we should be aiming for, LORD MAYOR. We should be aiming for a bigger picture, a bigger vision. So, this is the opportunity to do that. LORD MAYOR, I call on you to talk to your mate, ScoMo. I call on you to talk to your other Liberal mates who all want to get re-elected, to say that this is a good deal that they should be supporting for our residents, for the residents of Brisbane and for the residents of the State. I call on you to support this motion.

Chair: Thank you.

 Further speakers to the motion?

 Which hasn’t been circulated yet, Councillor GRIFFITHS, but let’s proceed.

 Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, I rise to speak on the motion before us, the—for Council to support the application by the State Government for disaster funding. I woke up yesterday morning and read an article in the newspaper that was all about politics. It was all about a City Deal for South East Queensland, and to read that there would be some $1.8 billion made available for the Olympics and other infrastructure was quite shocking when I’d spent the past three weeks dealing with—

DEPUTY MAYOR: Point of order, Mr Chair.

Chair: Point of order to you, DEPUTY MAYOR.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Can I request that we have the motion, please, on email as soon as possible? It’s impossible to debate this if we haven’t got the motion. It’s like—

Chair: Yes, Councillor GRIFFITHS, can you comply, please?

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: A hard copy is part of the Meetings Local Law, but Councillor JOHNSTON, please proceed. You articulated, I think, so please proceed.

Councillor JOHNSTON: I haven’t got a copy, but—

Chair: No.

Councillor JOHNSTON: —I listened to what Councillor GRIFFITHS—

Chair: Yes, I know.

Councillor JOHNSTON: —said and I presume I’m going to get the minute back that Councillor ADAMS just wasted, Mr Chairman.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, please.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Is the clock still running or are you going to give me the time back?

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Oh, Councillor JOHNSTON, please.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes—

Councillor SRI: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor SRI.

Councillor SRI: That is a fair question that her clock should be reset.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, please proceed. Yes, the clock has been reset.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: I’ll now read the motion that’s been handed to me and I’ll ask the clerks to make a copy please for circulation.

 The motion before us is that the Brisbane City Council calls on the Federal Government to jointly fund a $771 million disaster assistance package proposed by the Labor State Government.

 Councillor JOHNSTON, you’re speaking to that motion? Thank you. Your clock has started.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Thank you. Yes, I woke up yesterday morning to news reports of a $1.8 billion South East Queensland deal which included money for the Olympics. Meanwhile, for the past three weeks, I’ve been dealing with extremely distressed and homeless residents who are still trying to clean out their homes and try and get their lives a little bit back on track. To date, the only thing that has been announced by the Federal Government is $1,000 in disaster payment, and there is some income subsidy support for certain flood victims. That is actually less than other states, but I won’t—that’s a whole different issue.

The big problem we’ve got here is there is no money from this Council, limited money from the State Government as part of their existing disaster relief packages of up to $14,000, and no money from the Federal Government to help residents rebuild. I have thousands of flooded residents of all various types of flooding, from, you know, the Chelmer residents on the river whose pontoons have been lost or smashed through to residents in Fairfield and Oxley who flooded to the roof of their second storey. There are houses in my ward that are uninhabitable. There is no help for them.

I have been contacting the LDCC (Local Disaster Coordination Centre) every single day for weeks, asking for help. Council won’t send help to these people. Let me be clear. The response is no, Councillor, we don’t take walls down that are flood damaged walls from people’s homes. We’ve had the Army allegedly helping. The Army can’t apparently knock some Gyproc down and carry it out the front. There are homes that have not been touched in my ward because there are people who cannot do it. They are elderly. They have no help. It is horrifying to think that these people are living in these conditions and that there is no help for them.

We now know the full folly of the Mud Army with the questions on notice today, and I understand why Councillor ADAMS was so defensive last week about that. It was obviously a complete failure. I understand that Council is saying it will help, but after almost two weeks of watching that, it is not the help that is actually needed. We need project management skills. We need people who are able to assist vulnerable homeowners for whatever reason to get their lives back on track. I’ve put a letter in to the DEPUTY MAYOR and to the LORD MAYOR about this yesterday. We need project management skills. Now, last time around, the QRA (Queensland Reconstruction Authority) did that.

LORD MAYOR: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order to you—

LORD MAYOR: This has got nothing to do with the motion.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, it does.

LORD MAYOR: You’re going totally off on a tangent.

Chair: Yes. Can I bring you back to the motion, please, Councillor JOHNSTON?

Councillor JOHNSTON: Let’s be clear. The $771 million, I bet the LORD MAYOR hasn’t even read it. The—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: —$771 million that the State Government is asking for is to do the things that I am talking about. So silly me for presuming the LORD MAYOR might have a modicum of awareness about what it is the State Government is asking money for. They’re asking for money to put in resilient flood materials into people’s homes. They’re asking for money to raise people’s homes. They’re asking for money for buyback for people’s homes. Let me tell you, out in my ward where I’m talking about exactly what happened in the flood and why people need these things, this LORD MAYOR thinks it’s a funny thing—he’s chuckling away with the DEPUTY MAYOR—to say, I’m not talking about the motion.

The motion is about helping people and the funding that has been proposed by the State Government appears to do that. All I want for the residents in my ward and everywhere else in Brisbane that are flooded is help. Now, that is not always, as I said to the LORD MAYOR yesterday, going to be cash. We need project management, and that’s why I have suggested the Brisbane Housing Corporation. If the Queensland Reconstruction Authority is going to take on that role, that is great, but we don’t know because neither the State nor Council nor the Federal Government have bothered to put together a flood recovery plan for the city.

The LORD MAYOR has announced $5,000 for community sporting clubs. Meanwhile, the electrical bill to get the power back on itself is $18,000. They’ve said to me, Nicole, where’s the money coming from? LORD MAYOR hasn’t announced any money. Even again today, there’s $5,000. Not even going to touch the sides of what is needed in some of these flooded communities. Boat Club’s lost its roof. That’s going to cost a fortune. There is no money, no communication, and for the last day and a half, all the LORD MAYOR and the LNP Council want to talk about is the Olympics.

Three weeks after a natural disaster that has devastated the city like no other natural disaster in their own words, and all they want to talk about is the Olympics and the Metro. For God’s sake, we need money. We need resources and we need project management to help people recover in their homes. The State Government package may not be perfect. It may not be everything that we need, but at least it’s an option on the table that’s going to move us forward, and I’ve not heard anything from Council about how we’re going to do that. All I get back is no, Councillor, we can’t send the Army to take down flood-damaged walls for an elderly resident in Oxley.

Meanwhile, I’ve got to go then to church groups and ask church groups to do it. Do you understand? I don’t know why the Army can’t help. What instructions have the Army been given that they can’t pull some Gyprock off a wall? A week ago, we asked them to overturn the cubby house down at Benarrawa so the Nature Babes could maybe come back and the little kids could come back to Benarrawa. No, that hasn’t happened. I don’t know what this Council is doing. All they’re talking about are non-flood related things, and I think that is because of how badly they’ve botched the whole process of dealing with this natural disaster.

Now, this Council yesterday—and the LORD MAYOR better get up and speak and he’d better say today that he sat down and he begged ScoMo for money for this city, because all I saw last night on the TV was happy images of them all walking along together, looking happy and shiny and talking about the Olympics.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: The city has flooded. The city has flooded. I hope the LORD MAYOR stands up and clarifies that he puts his full support behind this package. I hope he actually stands up and says what this Council is going to do, because if he’s going to do it in the budget in a few months’ time, it’s too late. It’s too late. I don’t want to see at-risk people being left in the vulnerable conditions that they are in now. I’ve got young men living in a park at Fairfield. A resident is trying to get them up to the Yeronga Community Centre. Micah can’t do outreach because they’re overwhelmed trying to find people houses. People are in distress and they need help. We need an agency that is going to coordinate this process.

Now, as I said in the letter to the DEPUTY MAYOR and to the LORD MAYOR, I think Brisbane Housing Corporation can do it, but if the QRA is going to do it, that’s great, but three-and-a-half weeks after the flood, somebody needs to put their hand up and say, yes, we will lead the flood recovery response for Brisbane because the Prime Minister’s not doing it. He came up here to talk about the election campaign he’s running, not the floods. The Premier was busy talking up the Olympics and the LORD MAYOR was busy talking up his Metro. Not a single one of the leaders in this city is talking about the biggest natural disaster this city has faced, and meanwhile people are homeless and in need.

So let me be clear, LORD MAYOR. You need to tell us what discussions you had with the Prime Minister yesterday about funding. You need to be transparent so this city knows more help is coming. You need to wholeheartedly put your support behind the State Government package because it’s the only one on the table, and if Council’s got another package, please tell us and I will support that, as well, but at the moment, all you’re doing is talking about the bloody Olympics and the Metro, and that is the wrong message to be sending to vulnerable residents in Queensland.

This motion is important. We need to support it and we need to make sure that the Prime Minister of the country provides the necessary disaster funding to support the recovery of this city. The Olympics are 11 years away. In 11 days, I might have another dead person in my ward because they don’t have a home and they’re not being supported. It’ll be too late for them, and they’re not interested in the Olympics. So, LORD MAYOR, let’s do the right thing here.

Let’s use your political influence with the Prime Minister, who is desperate to retain his seats in Brisbane, desperate to do so. Get him to prioritise funding for flood recovery and make sure that we can help everyone in need. We can ensure that all of these small houses that are in terrible areas that flood all the time, three and four times, that they can be rebuilt better or they can be bought back. You need to immediately extend the Resilient Homes program to all suburbs in Brisbane. Your failure to do this is appalling, and I note in answer to the—

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, your time has expired.

 Further speakers?

 The LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Yes, thank you, Mr Chair. Of course we’ll be supporting this motion, because it’s exactly consistent with the motion that we voted on last week.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Exactly consistent. So, Councillor GRIFFITHS might be a little bit slow, but this is exactly the type of thing we said last week about all levels of government needing to be onboard for the recovery process. So I’m not sure what Councillor GRIFFITHS was expecting here, but it was quite clear that he wasn’t prepared for an actual debate. As usual, we see the stunt motion moved. They think that it’s going to get voted down, and then they’re completely unprepared to actually talk about the issue that they claim they want to talk about. It’s quite clear that someone else has tried to cobble together some notes for him, because—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —when he ripped off the top section and photocopied, he left the section that says notes. I assume that the notes explain why he couldn’t move the motion yesterday.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: So, look, it’s just amateur hour from someone that only plays politics, only plays politics. Look, I’ll keep it brief. We want to see this package funded by the State and Federal Government. We absolutely want to see that—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —because, at the moment, the only level of government who is doing anything is us. The only level of government that has any such programs or has had any such programs is us.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: So welcome aboard, State Government. Welcome aboard, Federal Government.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Let’s do this together. Let’s get a much bigger, much more well-funded program, and we can achieve so many more things together. So, we will be supporting this motion, just as we supported the one last week. By the way, Councillor GRIFFITHS claimed that I voted against the motion. I wasn’t even in the Chamber because I was meeting with residents in his ward at the time. So, he can’t tell the truth if he’s given the opportunity to, but that’s alright. We’ll keep telling the truth for him.

So, we will happily support this motion. We want to see the Federal Government come to the table. We want to see the State Government come to the table, and we look forward to working with both of those levels of government to achieve some great things. Look, I can’t sit down, though, before pointing out the hypocrisy of claiming that yesterday, I was apparently talking about the Olympics. Well, I wasn’t the only person there—

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —because I saw the Deputy Premier all excited about the Olympics and the Premier excited about the Olympics, and they were both excited about Brisbane Metro, too.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: They were both really excited. So, you know, that’s another own goal there.

Chair: Thank you.

 Further speakers?

 Councillor SRI.

Councillor SRI: Thanks, Chair. I rise to speak on the motion. I’ll endeavour not to repeat too much of the commentary that’s already been shared in the Chamber. I do agree with quite a lot of what Councillor JOHNSTON has said, and I think the point was well made, in particular that, unfortunately, the Army has really failed to help people who are in a lot of need. I don’t know why that is. I doubt that’s the responsibility of the individual soldiers on the ground.

I suspect it’s probably more of a command issue, but the reality is that, whereas in 2011, we had self-organising volunteers working in large numbers to undertake tasks such as pulling water damaged ceilings and walls out of homes, this time the quote-unquote official Mud Army volunteers were told that that’s probably not safe for them to do. So, those Mud Army volunteers this time were really doing more sweeping and hosing and not much else.

Then, after they were stood down, the Army and the fire services, *et cetera*, they’re getting callouts to properties they’re attending, and then they’re telling the residents, sorry, we’re not meant to help with that. I’ve had a couple of similar stories in my ward, and I think that is a little bit disappointing. So, I offer that as feedback for the Administration to take note of and improve on next time.

I hope particularly the teams responsible for coordinating future disaster responses will recognise that, whether they’re volunteers or whether they’re paid workers, when those people have quite narrow scope as to what they’re allowed to help with, that creates some pretty significant inefficiencies, because you don’t always know what a resident needs help with until you actually get out to the home, but if someone rocks up with a broom ready to sweep mud and, actually, what’s needed is another form of assistance, it can be pretty demoralising and disempowering for the resident when they’re told, sorry, I’m only here to sweep mud. I’m not here to help with anything else, even though you’ve got a long list of other tasks that you could really use assistance with.

That was a really noticeable difference between both the Army and the quote‑unquote official Mud Army volunteers, as distinct from the many self‑organising local groups of volunteers who were out there in the days before 4 March and the Council system kicked into gear. In regards to this motion and the proposed funding for the disaster assistance package. I just did want to highlight a few other priority needs which I think really need to be addressed urgently, and which I think this Council Administration could also be taking more responsibility for. I take the Mayor’s point that it would be great to see a bit more support from the State and Federal Government, but I think the Council could also be stepping up a bit more proactively.

One of the most obvious of those is—I think Councillor JOHNSTON referred to it as project management advice, but being there on the ground with residents and giving them some guidance on what sorts of options they have and what sorts of tasks they should be prioritising, and for those residents for whom maybe English isn’t their first language or they have other barriers that make it hard to coordinate trade services and other services, that maybe Council could even go a step further and do what councils used to do, which is a bit more of that community development work and wraparound support service.

There was a time when Brisbane City Council put a lot more funding into community development workers who had the flexibility and the time to do that complex case management which is often needed at times like this. Right now, what seems to be happening is that there are some one-size-fits-all systems which are pretty good for some residents, but those complex cases are being shunted around between Council to non-profit groups to grassroots community orgs.

That’s causing a lot of inefficiencies where residents have to repeatedly tell their stories and repeat their requests for assistance to multiple groups, but it also means that all those different groups and entities are wasting a lot of time working out what they can and can’t help people with, when in fact I’m seeing on occasion, such as with my ward office, if a staff member sits down with a resident and really works through the issues with them, they can get a lot done within a short space of time if those staff members have the resources and the scope to do so.

That’s really what I hope some of this disaster assistance funding will go towards, is that wraparound casework support, without which many more residents are going to fall through the cracks. So, I’m not deploying this as a specific criticism of this LNP Administration, but I think it highlights a structural failure on the part of Brisbane City Council where, over many years, it has gradually hollowed out its capacity to coordinate and provide community responses in disasters like this, to the point where now I think a lot of the Councillors in this Chamber even struggle to imagine what it would look like for Council to provide that kind of support work, because it’s so long since Council was a player in that field.

So, in addition to that wraparound case support, I think a related issue is the need for that Flood Resilient Homes program to be scaled up and more specifically deployed with drop-in sessions, with community meetings or advice areas where, for example, in the suburb of East Brisbane, it would be a simple thing to set up a Council gazebo, publicise a time, and have a few officers from the Flood Resilient Homes program there on the ground, who residents can go to and say, look, I’m trying to work out whether I should do A, B, and C, and someone can be there and offer some immediate assistance on the ground.

That would be a really great way for the Council to direct some of that employee resources right now. It’s put Council staff with expertise out on the ground in public spaces in close proximity to flood-affected neighbourhoods, so that residents can go and ask those questions. I think if Council doesn’t have that capacity in-house anymore, it needs to be hiring those people, but I know that there are people out there in the city who could be paid to offer that drop-in advice, not dissimilar to the talk to a planner sessions, but hopefully a bit more nuanced so that people can rock up and ask those questions.

They might not need a full sit-down meeting and they might not need detailed case management work, but that’s really what this disaster assistance package funding should—some of this money should be going towards. I did also want to reiterate the very strong need for assistance for people who are experiencing homelessness. I think our latest count within my ward is about 50 people have been made long‑term homeless by this disaster. I think that figure pales in comparison to some of the other wards in some of the other parts of the city.

We’ve had a lot of people who’ve had various serious issues because the power’s been out for a prolonged period and landlords are trying to jack up the rent when they should be offering rent discounts, *et cetera, et cetera*. That’s certainly an issue, too, but I’m most concerned about the people who’ve been made homeless and the fact that, from what I can see in the commentary about these disaster assistance packages, there’s not really a holistic solution to housing there.

I would be suggesting that the Council should be using a bit of money and maybe partnering with the State and Federal Government to actually buy up some existing properties for use as crisis accommodation which could be gradually transitioned to long-term public housing down the track. There are models there that have been used in the past. Just buy up a couple of those old six pack apartment blocks, get people housed, and then later on you can decide whether you’re going to sell the apartment blocks off to recoup some of those costs or whether you’re going to retain ownership of that housing stock.

The point is, the Council does have the money to acquire housing at short notice, and could just go out and start purchasing some of these sites. If you need to sell them later, then sell them later. The point is, we’re in a crisis, and what’s funny to me or weird to me is that maybe 75% of the Councillors in this room still don’t appreciate the full gravity of the fact that this is an ongoing emergency. There’s been this weird cognitive dissonance where, for the suburbs and neighbourhoods that weren’t as directly impacted by the flooding, people are quote-unquote trying to get on with their lives and rebuild and get back to normal and all that sort of stuff, whereas some parts of the city are still really struggling.

I think the emotional impact of that on residents is really hard to deal with, because you’re there. Maybe you’re homeless or your home’s been destroyed and you’re just trying to pull the pieces back together, and down the road everyone’s just going off to work like normal. The emotional impact and the mental health impact of that is quite significant, and I think Councillor JOHNSTON is right to identify that it can come across as a little insensitive when our city’s leaders are rushing off to talk about the Olympics or other big projects on the horizon, when in the here and now there’s a very serious issue that hasn’t been fully addressed and that Government has really failed to come to the table on.

So, I do support this motion. I’d go so far as to say that the money should come from the coal mining and gas mining companies that have helped contribute to this disaster. We know climate change has been a major factor behind the intensity of the rainfall and the severity of these floods, and the real villains here who’ve profited from the burning and extraction of fossil fuels for years are those mining corporations that have screwed over workers, that have destabilised the climate and helped destroy the environment. They’re the ones who should help pay for the flood recovery because they’re the ones who are complicit in this and they shouldn’t be allowed to get off scot-free.

Chair: Further speakers?

 Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Yes, thanks very much, Chair. I rise in support of Councillor GRIFFITHS’ motion, and he once again, as he did last week, led the debate on this kind of ongoing long‑term flood recovery and rebuilding, and once again, Labor has led the debate on this. So, what we see the LNP bring to the Council today is their pre-prepared questions about their City Deal and the Metro and all these sorts of things, the Olympics, as has been pointed out, and in the E&C (Establishment and Coordination) today, a couple of City Plan amendments, but we don’t see any great leadership on ongoing flood recovery from this LORD MAYOR.

He didn’t outline in his contribution, Chair, that he had any conversation with the Prime Minister about this. What we heard from the Federal Government on Saturday, Minister Tien said on the public record that they had received the request and they would be responding in the next 24 to 48 hours. Well, it’s now Tuesday afternoon and the Federal Government still hasn’t bothered to get around to agreeing to this funding. This fund, this $771 million disaster assistance package, is the single largest package that has been put together in terms of flood recovery and ongoing flood resilience.

This is—and it has been put together in quite a rapid way, really. I do give credit where credit’s due there, in that only in the weeks after this major, major event, we’ve seen this package put together which not only deals with the implications in the immediate and medium-term. A lot of those things have been canvassed by Councillors SRI and JOHNSTON, those ongoing concerns that people will have around where they live, how they live, how they can continue on with their lives as they knew it just a month ago, but also into the next decade, also making sure that, as a city, we are ready for these kinds of disasters.

The response that we’ve seen from this LNP Mayor, Adrian SCHRINNER, is to say that community groups can have $5,000 while we’re taking away your $200,000 grants for the facilities that Council makes them maintain at great cost, at great cost to volunteers on behalf of Council. So they take a massive grants program away, give $5,000, and then a one-off $250 package that, on the day of its launch, a rates rebate—on the day it was launched, the scripting in the call centre was all wrong. People were left confused. It was hard to apply for. Our ward offices had to become drop-in centres to make these applications on people’s behalf.

So you can get a sense, you can get a sense from this LORD MAYOR’s behaviour over the last three weeks that he’s been more interested in the photo ops, more interested in getting those *Living in Brisbane* newsletters, those special edition *Living in Brisbane* newsletters that he had corporate comms, corporate comms working around the clock to produce at record speed to make sure that he was out there in front of people, in their letterboxes. Those photo ops were prioritised over the support for the community and the support for community organisations.

So, this package is a good package. It’s a package obviously, now that after Labor has been leading the debate on it for the last two weeks in the Council Chamber, the LORD MAYOR says he supports, but we don’t know if he’s actually raised it with the Prime Minister. So, we can say this to you, LORD MAYOR. I’m sure you won’t bother doing anything after we have the vote on this, but we will write to the Prime Minister and we will let him know what has happened in this Council Chamber, that Labor has led this debate, but all Councillors, including LNP Councillors, have called on his Government to finally do something, to finally do something about supporting not only the immediate response to the flood disaster, where we are still living through right now today, but also making Brisbane a more resilient city.

You know, we hold out great hope that they will come to the table and they’ve sort of indicated they might, but if the Prime Minister’s behaviour also is anything to go by, he really doesn’t seem to care much about Brisbane and much about Queensland. They still haven’t declared a natural disaster up here, which means all those people who were relying on those $1,000 grants from Centrelink, a lot of them are in my community, who applied weeks and weeks and weeks ago, still haven’t got them, are relying on that money to just pay their insurance excess to ensure that they can then get a payout to know what they do for the rest of their lives, whether they can have their contents covered, whether they can have their buildings repaired or rebuilt.

They don’t know that yet, and down in New South Wales, those residents who have been hit particularly hard, as well, are being offered $3,000. So, we see the Prime—we see the LORD MAYOR dither about and tinker on the edges in his response, make sure that the photo ops are there, crystal clear for him to attend to. Then, we see the Prime Minister not only provide the appropriate level of support to people in their darkest hour, we also see him dithering and delaying on putting this package together alongside the Queensland Government, as well. So it is great news and congratulations once again, Councillor GRIFFITHS, in leading the debate on this, because we certainly don’t see that leadership from any, any LNP leader, whether it’s the Prime Minister or the LORD MAYOR on this issue.

Chair: Thank you.

 Further speakers?

 Councillor GRIFFITHS.

Councillor GRIFFITHS: I’ll summarise.

Chair: You—sorry? You’ve got summing up, yes?

Councillor GRIFFITHS: Yes, why not. Yes, yes.

Chair: If there’s no other speakers.

Councillor GRIFFITHS: Yes. Thank you, Mr Chairman. I’ll take this as a win. I will certainly take this as a win, just like last week was a win when the LORD MAYOR went out and met with that resident. Do you think that resident would have ever been met with if that had remained an email and not come to this Chamber? Do you think the LORD MAYOR would have raced out there to meet that resident and to actually see one of the worst-affected streets in Rocklea? I don’t think so. I don’t think so.

So here he is saying, oh, I’m not playing politics. Yes, you are. Yes, you are, and you’re not interested in those residents, but what I did want was I wanted you to walk through that house. I wanted you to walk down that street. I wanted you to see what those people are living with, because once you’ve seen that, you can’t unsee that. That’s what I wanted you to see, and I have to say, with your predecessors, they have always met with me to do that. Campbell Newman actually met with me. We had a discussion about—

Councillor MURPHY: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor MURPHY

Councillor MURPHY: Just on a matter of addressing comments through the Chair. Councillor GRIFFITHS is speaking directly to the LORD MAYOR.

Councillor GRIFFITHS: Fair enough.

Chair: Through the Chair, Councillor GRIFFITHS.

Councillor GRIFFITHS: I know that’s very threatening. I’ll speak through you, Mr Chair, but as—I’ll go back to what I was saying. This is a win. This is a win for our city, this is really good, but we need to remember a few things. Let’s not lose a few things in this discourse. The ALP brought in buyback. It was the ALP who brought it in, in this Chamber, voted for it. It’s been the LNP who cut the Buyback program. You were in this Chamber when that was cut, so let’s not pretend it wasn’t cut. You cut it. All of you sat there and cut it. This is a great initiative because it reinstates—it allows people to reinstate their properties. It allows people to buyback and it allows them to raise.

What I would say with our program with raising properties is that it’s too narrow. Most suburbs in my area can’t get it and neither can yours, Councillor JOHNSTON. So we need to expand that program, not limit it with sneaky games. As I said and other Councillors have said, Councillor SRI has said, there are people out there without insurance. There are people out there without money or electricity. There are people out there in pain.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor GRIFFITHS:They are in terrible pain and I know the Council circus and the Council media team want to move on with the Olympics but there are so many people in pain in our city that we need to be dealing with.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor GRIFFITHS: I have to say, I’m really positive about the fact that the State have supported this. I just hope and I—as Councillor CASSIDY said, we haven’t heard anything from the LORD MAYOR about have you written to the Prime Minister? Could you table the letter that you’ve sent? Did you raise it in discussions? Did you have a vigorous discussion about it? Did you say, Prime Minister, we need this money now. Look, this is too good an opportunity to turn down. Did you say that? I don’t think so.

 I don’t think there was any enthusiasm there. I don’t think there was any joy there. I don’t even think there was any thought there for those residents. That’s my feeling on the matter. I think you had to be dragged kicking and screaming and say, we support this motion but you actually didn’t come in with any of these motions.

 You didn’t come in in Question Time and say, hey, well look at what we’re doing. We want to do this. This is a great opportunity for the city. No. You were talking about Olympics. I see you laughing now but it’s not a laughing matter. This is too important for our city. It’s too important for our residents.

I just hope the LORD MAYOR is genuine. I would ask him, by the end of this meeting to be able to table the letter that he sent to the Prime Minister. It would be good to have—backed up with what you’re saying here and how you’re voting, with an actual let’s see the correspondence because the media should be able to see that. We should all be able to see that. in fact, we could all sign it.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor GRIFFITHS: Wouldn’t that be wonderful? If we all signed the letter. Showed joint support from the whole Chamber. This needs to happen for Brisbane.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor GRIFFITHS: ‘I’m the Mayor, I’m going to do it.’ Yeah, no. Anyway, let’s see. The ball is in your court, Mr Mayor. What I think is that this has been a great win for the Labor team. We have got this rock of an Administration to move a little bit and we’ve got a—I hope, a good outcome for our residents. If not, they’ll be going out there and telling them that it lies solely with the LNP. Thank you, Mr Chair.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor GRIFFITHS. Can you to turn your microphone off? Thank you.

 We now have the motion circulated and can I remind all sides that the motions need to be sent around by the Whips. You can’t rely on the clerks to do that every time but we have now got a copy of it sent around and also sent electronically.

 I now put the motion as circulated.

The Chair submitted the motion to the Chamber and it was declared **carried** on the voices.

Thereupon, Councillors Jared CASSIDY and Kara COOK immediately rose and called for a division, which resulted in the motion being declared **carried**.

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 27 - The Right Honourable, the LORD MAYOR, Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER, DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Krista ADAMS, and Councillors Greg ADERMANN, Adam ALLAN, Lisa ATWOOD, Fiona CUNNINGHAM, Tracy DAVIS, Fiona HAMMOND, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Sarah HUTTON, Sandy LANDERS, James MACKAY, Kim MARX, Peter MATIC, David McLACHLAN, Ryan MURPHY, Angela OWEN, Steven TOOMEY, Andrew WINES, and the Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Jared CASSIDY, and Councillors Kara COOK, Peter CUMMING, Steve GRIFFITHS, Charles STRUNK, Jonathan SRI and Nicole JOHNSTON.

Chair: Please resume your seats.

 LORD MAYOR, Establishment and Coordination Committee report of 14 March 2022.

## CONSIDERATION OF COMMITTEE REPORTS:

### ESTABLISHMENT AND COORDINATION COMMITTEE

The Right Honourable, the LORD MAYOR (Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER), Chair of the Establishment and Coordination Committee, moved, seconded by the DEPUTY MAYOR (Councillor Krista ADAMS), that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 14 March 2022, be adopted.

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair. Before I move on with other items on the agenda, I just wanted to touch on the ongoing flood recovery efforts and also some recent developments that have happened as well in that field.

 It’s interesting because if you hear the commentary, the manufactured commentary that we just heard, apparently Steven Miles and the Premier, when they raised this with the Federal Government, apparently it was their idea. It was Labor’s idea.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: So they were trying to re-write a bit of history there. We’ve been leading this. All they’ve been doing is in the gutter playing politics with a natural disaster. It’s been disgusting and disgraceful and they should be ashamed of themselves. They should be ashamed to show their face in public, the way that they have dealt and responded to this.

 But interestingly, I had a chat with the Deputy Premier yesterday and I congratulated him on the package that he’d put forward and mentioned that I wanted to talk to him a bit more about it. I have also reached out to him to see how we can support them in their efforts and so he’s promised me that someone senior from his office will get in touch to work out what we can do.

 So I didn’t need some kind of confected Labor motion to do that. In fact, as I said before, it was consistent with our approach last week on the motion—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —where we have consistently said that we wanted to have all three levels of government involved in this response. Why? Not because of politics but because we can achieve more when all three levels of government are doing something.

 Whatever Council may be able to muster together in terms of support will always pale into insignificance when it comes to the might of the Federal and State Governments combined. So it is much better that we have their support. Whether it’s the Flood Resilient Homes program or whether it is a new Buyback program or whether it is other initiatives, it is much better that we have that support from other levels of government.

 So we’ll continue pushing for that and Labor can try and re-write history all they like. In the end, we’ve been very consistent on this.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: So it’s been interesting. We’ve been progressing with the biggest clean up that the city has ever had and just in recent days, we’ve cracked 3,000 streets that have been cleared in that first pass. Three thousand streets.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: I mean, that is an incredible effort and I want to call out some of the commentary in this Council Chamber by Councillors like Councillor JOHNSTON and Councillor SRI that somehow seem to think that we’re going to go in and demolish people’s homes for them and manage their projects.

Councillor SRI: Point of order, Chair.

LORD MAYOR: Like, we have—

Chair: Councillor SRI, point of order?

Councillor SRI: Claim to be misrepresented.

LORD MAYOR: We have never done that.

Chair: Claims of misrepresented noted.

LORD MAYOR: It has never been a Local Government or in fact a Government responsibility to go in and demolish people’s homes for them and to manage the project of re‑building. To suggest—and we heard Councillor SRI suggest that we previously had this capacity and now we’re not doing it? Rubbish.

That has never happened ever. There’s never been a Government responsibility to demolish private individual’s houses—

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —and to manage the project of rebuilding. Now, if the new package involves some State and Federal support to do that, that is a great thing but it’s certainly never been a capability that we’ve had. It’s certainly never been anything that we or I—or as far as I’m aware, any level of government has ever done.

 So it’s just complete misrepresentation to suggest that somehow Council is responsible for going to private homes and managing the rebuilding of those private homes. Now, the closest we have gotten to that is through our award winning, ground breaking, flood resilient homes program.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: What happens with that, just to point out, is that we work with an architect and designers to go into people’s houses and talk to them about how that house can be made more flood resilient. But that’s not in the immediate aftermath of a flood, that’s a program that was launched in 2018 and then has since been rolled out as a pilot to six different suburbs.

So that’s done in a very planned and coordinated way and we are obviously committed to continuing that program. It’s a great program and it’s achieved some great results but yes, I am absolutely puzzled—

Councillor SRI: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor SRI?

Councillor SRI: Would the Mayor take a quick question?

LORD MAYOR: No.

Chair: Sorry, Councillor SRI, no.

LORD MAYOR: I’m absolutely puzzled that it would be suggested that somehow a Council responsibility is to demolish people’s flood-affected homes and to manage the project of rebuilding. That is not the case.

So when it comes to the stage we’re at, when it comes to the clean-up and the recovery efforts, obviously there’s been an incredible effort put in by so many different people. Both within Council, with outside of Council, workers, volunteers, contractors, Defence Force personnel are all with their shoulder to the wheel doing the best they can.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: I’ve also been concerned that our Defence Force troops have been criticised in this meeting for apparently what they’re not doing and apparently, they’re not demolishing people’s homes and that’s apparently a bad thing. So really, I just wonder if this is an appropriate comment to be made about the troops that are doing a fantastic job in supporting our community in that initial response.

 The initial response is about fundamentally making sure that flood damaged material is removed from properties onto the curb and then Council and its contractors and support can take it away. That’s what it’s about.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: So that has always been very clear. So that work continues. We’re now into the position where we have—we’re working through the second and third rounds of collection in a number of areas and so a significant amount has been achieved and now we’re going back for a second time and sometimes a third time in various streets to make sure that flood waste has been removed.

 We also know that the Defence Force personnel, the ADF personnel, have visited around 400 individual properties in recent times where there’s been requests for help. So as you know, we maintain a system of people that are requesting help and then we make sure that people can be visited by our Defence Force personnel and also in some cases, Council workers as well but we make sure that they are visited.

 So just shy of 400 different visits across the city and this is over and above the general work where the troops go into an area and help the general clean up. This is specifically going to a street to visit a resident or residents in that street who have asked for help. I want to commend the people involved in that program to make sure that they get the acknowledgement for the great work they’ve been doing to support our community recovery.

 Now, as we move from that initial response stage and now into the rebuilding and recovery phase, one thing is becoming increasingly clear. While we have—it’s been clear that we’ve got funding support at different levels from both the State and the Federal Government through the disaster relief arrangements, it is also clear that there will be a significant gap. A significant funding gap. A gap that is not covered by Federal and State Governments. A gap that will be borne by the rate payers of Brisbane.

 So this obviously will continue to become apparent over the coming weeks but there are many things that cannot be recovered through those disaster relief arrangements and I’ll give you an example. One example is where community facilities have been damaged by flooding. The work to repair or rebuild those facilities is not covered by the Federal and State disaster relief arrangements.

 So we’re talking a very significant bill just in that area alone. So if you think about the many community facilities that were impacted and damaged and the work that needs to be done now on those, that will—unless we get a change to the relief arrangements, be a cost borne directly by the rate payers of Brisbane and it will be a very significant cost.

 So this is just one example of many that we can see are costs that are coming up. What we see now is a pandemic being followed by a flood, both of those things having a significant impact on the budget of this Council.

So this is very real challenge as we go forward and one that I’ll continue to keep you updated with but what I can say is this. This cost and the costs that are expected to be borne entirely by the ratepayers of Brisbane is likely to go into the realm of hundreds of millions of dollars.

Chair: LORD MAYOR, your time has expired.

**549/2021-22**

At that point, the LORD MAYOR was granted an extension of time on the motion of the DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Krista ADAMS, seconded by Councillor Sandy LANDERS.

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

Councillor SRI: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor SRI.

Councillor SRI: Do misrepresentations get addressed after each 10-minute section?

Chair: At the conclusion of the LORD MAYOR’s speech.

Councillor SRI: Okay.

Chair: Thank you.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair, and thank you for the Chamber. As I was saying, so the cost to ratepayers, excluding when you’re talking about the support of other levels of government, the support and the costs that are not covered by other levels of government is likely to be in the realm of hundreds of millions of dollars.

 So this is what we are talking about here in terms of the recovery and a lot of those recovery efforts will take time as well. We’re all very familiar with some of the stark examples of where significant assets, community assets, have not only been damaged by flood, they’ve been completely destroyed.

 For example, sections of Kedron Brook Bikeway that are completely gone. The concrete path stops and then it drops down into the creek and there’s nothing left of the Bikeway.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: It’s washed away entirely so that is not a short-term fix. That is something that will require a significant earthworks, bank stabilisation works, significant engineering to plan—because the literal path of the creek has changed. It now flows in a different spot than it previously did. So this is not something that’s going to be fixed overnight and there are other examples like that across the city.

In fact, we understand that up to 40 different structures such as bridges have been damaged in this event and some of those have been damaged, requiring complete replacement. So things like bikeway bridges that are stuffed. They can’t be repaired. They will have to be replaced and as we know, some of those projects can be very expensive in themselves.

So there’s a lot of work to be done. We’re working hard to make sure that the things that can be recovered and put back into action quickly are recovered quickly and put back into action quickly.

I acknowledge the announcement from Councillor MURPHY today about the return of some Cross River services very soon. Preceding the return of a wider ferry network as soon as possible. So I commend all the Chairs, the Civic Cabinet Chairs for the work they’re doing in their portfolios to try and get this process happening as quickly as possible while acknowledging there’s some more long‑term work to be done that will take time.

We also are aware that some particular types of supplies that we need are simply not available at the moment and I think I may have mentioned this last week about fencing. Yes, the fencing.

So for example dog off leash areas that have been damaged. Very difficult to get fencing at the moment. There’s a lot of demand right across—in fact the country, for fencing. So some of these things will unfortunately take time due to market conditions and just the shortage of qualified tradies and also the supplies that are required to make this happen.

So I will keep you updated as we have more information to hand about the recovery process but I do just warn everyone that this will be a costly process and it will take time, even as we work to make sure it happens as quickly as possible.

As I always do, I wanted to comment on the lighting up of Council assets for the coming week and in fact, last night all of the Council assets were lit up in orange to celebrate Harmony Day. Harmony Day celebrates Australia’s cultural diversity. It is celebrated on 21 March each year. It began in 1999, coinciding with the United Nations International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination.

Tonight, the Story Bridge, Tropical Dome and Reddacliff Place will be lit up in red, purple and pink to support National Playgroup Week. National Playgroup Week is about supporting and empowering parents through their children’s early learning and development through play. It sees parents as teachers and the ultimate educator of their child.

Tomorrow night, the Story Bridge, Victoria Bridge, Tropical Dome and Reddacliff Place will be lit up in red for the eve of Tuberculosis Day. This day is a global campaign that raises awareness and shows solidarity for the 1.5 million people who die from tuberculosis each year.

On Thursday night, City Hall, the Story Bridge and Victoria Bridge will be lit up in green and gold to support the Brisbane Cycling Festival and the Australian Cycling Track Nationals. Beginning today, the Track Nationals are the biggest domestic track event in the country and will see the Anna Meares Velodrome at Chandler host several different categories of events for riders across several weeks.

This Friday night, the Story Bridge, Victoria Bridge and Reddacliff Place will be lit up in purple to support Make March Purple. Make March Purple is a campaign run by Epilepsy Queensland and aims to help build awareness of epilepsy. Breaking down barriers for those living with the condition.

Saturday is Bangladesh Independence Day and to mark this occasion, Brisbane City Hall and the Story Bridge will be lit up in green and red. In 1971, Bangladesh fought a nine-month long war to become an independent country. They obviously won this war and now have independence and have had so for over 50 years.

On Sunday night, the Story Bridge, Victoria Bridge and Reddacliff Place sculptures will have their lights turned off to support Earth Hour. The lights will be turned off from 8:30pm to 9:30pm and then revert back to the colour purple for the Make March Purple campaign.

In terms of the items in front of us, number one is the major amendment to the *Brisbane City Plan 2014*. Package G. This amendment is the return of the amendment for rooftop gardens. So we’ve sent it off to the State, it’s come back with the tick.

The consultation took place between 16 November and 13 December 2020. In response to the community feedback, we have proposed these amendments. They’ve been signed off by the State and they will become effective from 27 May. We received State Government support in late January for this amendment and we’re progressing it through in the normal manner.

Finally, item B is a minor administrative amendment package to the *Brisbane City Plan 2014*, Package K. As the title suggests, this has minor administrative changes to City Plan to keep it relevant and up-to-date. It includes changes to reflect current development approvals, updates to the building regulation, matters of State interest in the planning policy as well as the commencement of the Roma Street and Albert Street Cross River Rail priority development areas.

Should the Chamber resolve to approve the proposed amendment, Minor K will take effect also from 27 May. Thank you, Mr Chair.

Chair: Thank you.

 Councillor SRI, your point of misrepresentation?

Councillor SRI: Thanks, Chair. The Mayor suggested that I had been advocating that Council and/or Council-coordinated volunteers would be responsible for demolishing resident’s homes. That is not what I said. I think there’s an important distinction between suggesting that volunteers could carry out a few pieces of flood damaged wall or ceiling, which is what happened in 2011, as distinct from demolishing homes. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you.

 Councillor LANDERS, point of order.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

|  |
| --- |
| **550/2021-22**At that time, 3.04pm, it was resolved on the motion of Councillor Sandy LANDERS, seconded by Councillor Sarah HUTTON, that the meeting adjourn for a period of 15 minutes, to commence only when all Councillors had vacated the Chamber and the doors locked.Council stood adjourned at 3.07pm. |

**UPON RESUMPTION:**

Chair: Thank you. Further speakers on E&C?

 Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair. I rise to speak on just Clause A. I won’t speak on Clause B today. Clause A is of course the final step, as we’ve heard, in the amendment to Council’s City Plan, allowing the development of—or developments to include rooftop gardens.

 As I said last time, generally speaking, Labor Councillors are in support of rooftop gardens but only when they are genuinely greenspace and they genuinely add to open space and they are actually gardens on the roofs of developments.

 But this hasn’t changed from what the LNP brought to Council last year, which essentially means only 15% of the space needs to actually be a genuine rooftop garden. So we raise these concerns that while the concept is good, the delivery of this is not so good, which is what we’ve come to expect largely from this LNP Administration.

 When the Chair of the City Planning Committee did his media opportunity on this last time, before it came to Council last time, the evidence was there to see what the LNP intended to see as rooftop gardens. There were things like pools and rooftop bars and, on the particular development that Councillor ALLAN was at, it was pot plants. There was a number of palm trees in pot plants.

 That was the example given for additional greenspace. So called greenspace for these developments. So what we know is if a developer is able to over and above the height limit of a development put a pool on the roof or put a bar on the roof or recreational space, that certainly adds to that development. Adds to the profit yield that developer will get but it is being done in the name of rooftop gardens but we see they’re not really gardens.

 So while again, generally supportive of rooftop gardens but we just don’t think the LNP Administration have done enough in this amendment to ensure that that will be the case. So Labor will not be voting in favour of this amendment.

Chair: Thank you.

 Further speakers?

 Councillor SRI.

Councillor SRI: Thanks. Yes, I speak on the rooftop garden amendment as well and I guess, yes, it kind of feels like the LNP has been suckered in here. I think the development industry has taken them from—for a bit of a ride and I don’t know, I guess I don’t—it just seems like someone, somewhere in the process, has been really gullible and has been talked into this change without really understanding the implications because as the previous speaker said, there’s some pretty weak requirements in terms of the actual garden space and greenspace that’s going to be required on the rooftops in exchange for the height bonus.

 So you’re actually allowing a lot more built form on the rooftop now. It really does look like an extra storey of building as opposed to a shade awning over a garden area and that’s a pretty important distinction in my view because as we’ve said in this Chamber before, developers already have the power to put gardens on a roof if they really wanted to. They can easily do that. That doesn’t count as another storey if you want to put some trees and plants.

 The reason that this amendment was proposed was that to make some of those garden spaces more functional, it was seen as desirable to also have additional shade awnings to improve the usability of those rooftop garden spaces but that desire to ensure that a couple of shade awnings didn’t count towards the height limit has now morphed into really broad general leeway to include all sorts of stuff on the roof without it being counted as an extra storey.

 So really, what the LNP is doing here is handing a gift to property developers that you’re just giving them free vertical real estate. On some of the larger developments and this is not an exaggeration, on some of the larger developments, this amounts to as much as $5 million worth of additional free real estate for some of those larger towers.

 So you’re saying to a developer, here you go, here’s $5 million for free. All you have to do is put a couple of pot plants on the roof next to all that other stuff you’re crowding on there because that extra level isn’t counted as a storey anymore.

 So you’re handing over vertical real estate which is public space. It’s not a particularly usable form of public space in a sense but it’s public airspace and by allowing the developer to put on an extra storey in the name of a rooftop garden, you’re depriving neighbours of natural light and airflow and you’re putting upward pressure on land values which in turn makes houses more expensive, which in turn makes apartments more expensive, which in turn makes housing insecurity worse.

 So you’re—while the intentions behind this amendment might be noble, the net impact is simply going to be to increase land values. Maybe that’s what the LNP likes because a lot of your friends are property investors, I don’t know but what’s clear from this amendment is that it’s not achieving its stated purpose.

I’m sorry, I saw Councillor MARX roll her eyes over here. I’m not saying you have a lot of friends who are property investors, Councillor MARX—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor SRI: I’m sure you—I’ll be your friend but the point is, it’s quite clear that this is an amendment that suits property developers but doesn’t offer much benefit back to the broader public. It—and that’s really the question that I hope Councillor ALLAN will have the courage to stand up here and answer, is what exactly is the public getting out of this apart from a couple of extra pot plants?

 Because the developers were already able to put on rooftop gardens if they wish. What this really does is allow developers to put on rooftop gyms and enclosed entertainment areas and even enclosed home cinemas, I’m seeing on the tops of some roofs and putting all those buildings on the rooftop level without it counting as a storey.

 That’s what this amendment really does. It’s a height bonus across the board for developers of residential and mixed-use towers. So my question to Councillor ALLAN is, what does the broader public get in terms of new garden space on rooftops that wouldn’t otherwise have happened?

 I’m willing to concede that at the margins, there might be one or two developers who will create genuine high-quality new gardens on rooftops who otherwise might not have done so. I think that’s going to be a very small number though. I think in most cases—and I stress that this is really an issue that’s probably most prominent in my electorate and perhaps Councillor HOWARD’s because we’ve seen the most of this kind of high-rise development.

 In most cases, developers are just going to use this as an excuse to cram more built form onto their roof and dodge that height limit. I have to say, the height limits were already pretty loose as it was. The State Government and the Council have a performance-based planning system which basically creates fertile ground for corruption and allows developers to negotiate all sorts of exemptions in terms of height limits *et cetera*.

 So as it was, the height limits in City Plan were nowhere near strict enough but now you’ve added more confusion to the mix, created more uncertainty, created a bigger grey area and a situation where I think a lot of residents are going to be really disappointed because they thought they were buying in a site that’s zoned for five storeys, for example, and it turns out the developer is now building to six storeys.

 That can have a quite material impact on neighbours if they’re losing solar penetration on their solar panels on their roof. If they’re losing views. If they’re losing airflow, *et cetera*. So while it might not sound like much, Councillor ALLAN, your decision here is having a really big impact on the lives of residents of this city.

The negative impacts are going to be borne by neighbours and the broader community. The positive impacts are going to be reaped by a few wealthy property developers who get to fatten out their profit margins a little bit but there’s no real material benefit flowing to the broader community.

Maybe if these were public gardens and developers were required to actually open up these rooftop gardens to the entire general public? Maybe then there’d be enough benefit to justify it if you said yes, these are publicly accessible rooftop gardens and that’s going to be a condition of the approval.

Maybe then there’d be scope to justify this in some cases and some contexts but I don’t think that’s what’s proposed here. These are not publicly accessible gardens. These are only going to be small gardens with a lot of rooftop private facilities that are only accessible to the people who are fortunate enough to live in those apartments. So there’s no benefit to the broader public beyond those few residents who live there.

To be honest, those few residents are going to be paying through the nose anyway so it’s not like they’re getting something for free, either. The residents who live in the apartments are paying for it, the neighbours are copping the consequences. The only people who are getting something for free here are the property developers themselves.

Like I said, you’re handing them free real estate and you’re not getting anything in return back for the city as a whole. That is a mistake. You’re trading away public airspace and handing it over as private real estate with no material benefit to the broader public. I think that’s a lost opportunity and I think even a liberal party, even a neoliberal conservative administration could do better and could negotiate a better deal out of developers.

You could have gotten better terms out of this compromise and this trade off you’re doing with the property development industry but like I said at the outset, someone’s been naïve. Someone’s been suckered in here.

Someone’s been sold a lemon and thought that they were securing a really good outcome for the city but you’ve compromised too much and traded away too much. In the end, it’s a real picnic for the developers and a bit of a storm for the rest of us.

Chair: Thank you.

 Further speakers?

 Councillor ALLAN.

Councillor ALLAN: Thank you, Mr Chair. I rise to speak on item A and B. I’ll start with item A, the major amendment Package G which has been termed Rooftop Gardens Amendment. Look, I see this as a really positive amendment and it’s something that was flagged in the Brisbane Future Blueprint. It’s something that if we adopt it in this Chamber today, will in fact be fulfilling one of our actions under the Brisbane Future Blueprint.

 The Rooftop Garden Amendment will see Brisbane’s buildings become even greener and more sustainable. These changes will make it easier and quicker for new buildings to incorporate rooftop gardens and greenspaces without being included in the designated height limits.

 We have so many exciting projects in the pipeline at the moment that will transform Brisbane’s skyline. For some time now, we have put a heavy emphasis on ensuring new buildings are well-designed, sustainable and incorporate as much greenery as possible, whether that’s at the ground plane, on building facades and now on rooftops. So this needs to be seen as a suite of options to help green our buildings.

 We have a comprehensive suite of award-winning design strategies and documents such as buildings that breathe and design-led city that are critically important when working with industry and the community to achieve design excellent.

 The green building elements report developed in association with design firm, Lat27 specifically to inform this amendment package, recently won the National Landscape Architecture Award for best Research, Policy and Communications.

 With all eyes on the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games, there is a real opportunity to lift the standard of design in Brisbane and put our own stamp on this city. We’re not Melbourne or Sydney. We have our own unique style, charm and climate. With over 300 days of sunshine a year, we need to make sure that buildings embrace our subtropical climate and outdoor lifestyle.

*Councillor interjecting*.

Councillor ALLAN: Natural cooling, lush landscape, shade and comfort are key elements to achieving sustainability, amenity and resilience in new buildings.

 Not only do we need to see green landscaping on roofs but they also need to be functional and useable throughout the entire year, particularly during the very hot summer period. This amendment strikes a balance between creating greenspaces and spaces for residents to use and enjoy.

 Rooftops will need to meet certain requirements, including providing a minimum—a minimum of 15% landscaping areas, most of which will be on the perimeter of the buildings. A maximum of 40% of the rooftop for all roof structures and, as I mentioned, we need to keep out of the sun in this state. With a maximum combined total gross floor area of 15% of the rooftop for all fully enclosed structures.

 The amendment applies to buildings in the medium- and high-density residential zones and also mixed use and commercial buildings in the centre zones, located throughout the city and suburbs. This amendment is a great achievement for the city and another step towards the Schrinner Council’s vision to build a better Brisbane that is clean, green and sustainable.

 Having received final approval from the state in late January, we are seeking to adopt this amendment in the Chamber today and incorporate it in the City Plan 2014 before the end of May.

Initially, I had hoped that the whole Chamber would support this amendment. Unfortunately, Councillor CASSIDY has indicated that they won’t. I think that’s a really negative step. I think that this is a really positive amendment and I was hopeful that the Labor Party would support this. I didn’t think that his rationale for choosing not to was strong—

Councillor SRI: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor SRI.

Councillor SRI: Would Councillor ALLAN take a quick question?

Councillor ALLAN: No.

Chair: Will—

Councillor ALLAN: No. It’s really clear that the amendment provides enough scope to ensure that minimums are set for greenspace. That maximums are set for roof structures. So it’s had to be done in a way that achieves a balanced outcome and we believe this does that.

 To Councillor SRI’s points, you know, this is all about trying to get balance. It’s about trying to green our city. This notion that he has is that everything that developers do is negative. It’s so deeply ingrained in his attitudes that he can’t see past it.

This is an opportunity to do something special for this city and he says, what does the community get out of this? Well they get much better buildings. They get better design. They get more appealing buildings. They get more accommodation. They improve the supply of accommodation in this city. That’s a positive for the city.

We are here providing something that not only triggers additional supply but also provides fantastic amenity and visual appeal for the community. I think that to talk this down is negative. Can things be improved? Certainly they can over time but as a first step, we hope that this encourages all developers to sit up and notice and should choose to lift their standards. To build better buildings. To provide better amenity for their residents. To support the supply that we need in this city.

We are a city that’s challenged with supply at the moment and particularly supply that is affordable. That provides the community with a range of housing choices and certainly, we believe that this amendment does that.

Look, I’ll quickly turn to item B, which is the minor administrative amendment, Package K. This is really an administrative amendment to City Plan. It proposes a few changes to mapping, current development approvals and other regulated requirements under the Planning Act.

So in the context of the key elements of this amendment, there are updates to the State’s planning policy mapping and this is to reflect changes in overlays such as the biodiversity overlays, coastal hazard overlays and heritage overlays.

There are some changes to zoning as a result of recent development approvals. There are some text changes related to building regulations. There’s also a recognition in this amendment for state PDAs (Priority Development Areas). Particularly the Roma Street and Albert Street Cross River Rail development scheme. So they’re reflected in this amendment.

Ultimately, this is all about making sure that the City Plan is current. That it reflects the changes that occur over time and we would be seeking to—under the assumption that the Chamber supports this amendment, we’ll be seeking to have it take effect from 27 May 2022. I’ll leave further debate to the Chamber.

Chair: Thank you.

 Further debate?

 Councillor STRUNK.

Councillor STRUNK: Thank you, Chair. I rise to speak on item—or Clause B, actually. The administrative amendment to the City Plan. As it says, it’s an administrative amendment, a little bit of housekeeping but I thought I’d just have a look at that for my ward to see if there was anything that actually popped up that I—that looked a bit interesting, to say the least.

 Anyway and there was only one item that I want to talk about here this afternoon. That was a—some open space—designated land for open space that Council actually identified some years ago in the Ellen Grove acreage area. There was four blocks between Lovat and Bagnall Street at Ellen Grove and if I could ask, through you, Chair, that the Planning Chair maybe take a few notes and—because I’m going to ask if he can follow this up for us.

 But if—so there was four blocks and at the rear of each of the four blocks, there was a space that—there was some greenspace that Council said needed to be retained for park purposes or open space purposes. Of course, the owners of the property—two‑and-a-half acres, weren’t really happy about that simply because, of course, some of the developers had wanted to develop their blocks and they withdrew their offers.

 Anyways, so back in September, during an E&C report on 6 September, to be precise, the LTIP (long term infrastructure plans). It was indicated that with the LTIP for these particular four blocks that it would be added to the LTIP, right? Oh, sorry, the LGIP (Local Government Infrastructure Plan) and the—it seemed fair to me that it was going to go from the LTIP to the LGIP so I let that one go through, obviously, because that’s probably where I thought it should go anyways.

 But then, the administrative amendments came through and I found out that looking at the maps—and they’re always challenging, I’ll tell you. Trying to go through those maps, I’ll tell you, if we could do something better with those maps, it’d be great. I wouldn’t go cross-eyed after looking at them for about an hour.

 Anyways, so what happened was, those four blocks ended up being one block in one of the two-and-a-half acres and it’s already been developed with housing but the only access to this block is by private road. So I don’t think accessing to a particular—an area, a block, that Council owns that will potentially be developed, obviously, for open space and park space in the future and the only access point is actually a private road is probably all that good.

 So what happened was, it went from the LTIP. It was supposed to go to the LGIP. It never arrived in the LGIP during that report and I have a copy of it here but then with the administrative amendments that are coming through today, the four blocks ended up being one block. So I just want to know where the other three went. The other three sections went because it really has reduced it to a point where it’s not really a lot of space anymore. It’s not really a lot of space—open space anymore.

 So that’s between Bagnall Street and Lovat Street at Ellen Grove. If the Chair could possibly follow that up, through you, Mr Chair, that would be very much appreciated. I don’t expect him to have an answer today, he’s already given his reply on this anyway. So anyway, thank you.

Chair: Thank you.

 Any further speakers? No?

 We now move to the vote on this motion.

Upon being submitted to the Chamber, the motion for the adoption of the report of the Establishment and Coordination Committee was declared **carried** on the voices.

Thereupon, Councillors Kara COOK and Charles STRUNK immediately rose and called for a division, which resulted in the motion being declared **carried**.

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 18 - The DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Krista ADAMS, and Councillors Greg ADERMANN, Adam ALLAN, Lisa ATWOOD, Fiona CUNNINGHAM, Tracy DAVIS, Fiona HAMMOND, Steven HUANG, Sarah HUTTON, Sandy LANDERS, James MACKAY, Kim MARX, Peter MATIC, David McLACHLAN, Ryan MURPHY, Angela OWEN, Steven TOOMEY and Andrew WINES.

NOES: 1 - Councillor Jonathan SRI.

ABSTENTIONS: 4 - The Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Jared CASSIDY, and Councillors Kara COOK, Peter CUMMING and Charles STRUNK.

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

The Right Honourable, the Lord Mayor (Councillor Adrian Schrinner) (Chair); Deputy Mayor (Councillor Krista Adams) (Deputy Chair); and Councillors Adam Allan, Fiona Cunningham, Tracy Davis, Vicki Howard, Kim Marx, Ryan Murphy and Andrew Wines.

#### A MAJOR AMENDMENT TO *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014—*MAJOR AMENDMENT PACKAGE G

 **152/160/1218/379-003,** **152/160/1218/379-001 and 152/160/1218/379-002**

**551/2021-22**

1. The Divisional Manager, City Planning and Sustainability, provided the information below.

2. At its meeting of 22 October 2019, Council resolved to amend *Brisbane City Plan 2014* (the planning scheme) to make it easier for new development to include rooftop gardens and landscaped greenspace (the proposed amendment). Council also resolved to send the proposed amendment to the then Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning (the then Minister) to request a state interest review and approval to publicly consult on the proposed amendment.

3. By letter dated 18 December 2019, the then Minister confirmed that state interests were appropriately reflected in the proposed amendment and gave approval to proceed to public consultation.

4. Public consultation on the proposed amendment was undertaken from 16 November 2020 to 13 December 2020 in accordance with the *Minister’s Guidelines and Rules* (the Guideline). At its meeting of 23 November 2021, Council resolved to modify the proposed amendment in response to submissions received and requested the consideration of the Minister for State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning (the Minister) to adopt the proposed amendment.

5. By letter dated 21 January 2022 (refer Attachment B, submitted on file), the Minister granted approval for the proposed amendment to be adopted into the planning scheme without any conditions.

6. The schedule of proposed amendments to both the planning scheme and the planning scheme policies is set out in Attachment C (submitted on file) and the proposed amendments are set out in Attachments D and E (submitted on file).

7. The Divisional Manager, City Planning and Sustainability, provided the following recommendation and the Committee agreed.

8. **RECOMMENDATION:**

**THAT COUNCIL RESOLVE AS PER THE DRAFT RESOLUTION SET OUT IN ATTACHMENT A**, hereunder.

**Attachment A
Draft Resolution**

**DRAFT RESOLUTION TO AMEND *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014 TO* INCLUDE MAJOR AMENDMENT PACKAGE G**

As Council:

1. decided, pursuant to section 16.1 of Part 4 of Chapter 2 and section 2.1 of Part 1 of Chapter 3 of the *Minister’s Guidelines and Rules* (the Guideline) to amend *Brisbane City Plan 2014* (the planning scheme) and planning scheme policies to encourage rooftop gardens and other green building elements
2. sought, pursuant to section 21.1 of Part 4 of Chapter 2 of the Guideline, the Minister’s approval to adopt the proposed amendment to the planning scheme to include the Major amendment package G (the proposed amendment)
3. was advised by the Minister, by letter dated 21 January 2022 (refer Attachment B, submitted on file), that it could adopt the proposed amendment without conditions,

then Council:

1. decides, pursuant to section 22.1(a)(i) of Part 4 of Chapter 2 of the Guideline, to adopt the proposed amendment to the planning scheme as set out in Attachments C and D (submitted on file)
2. decides, pursuant to section 5.1 of Part 1 of Chapter 3 of the Guideline, to adopt the proposed planning scheme policy amendment as set out in Attachments C and E (submitted on file)
3. directs that notice of the adoption of:
4. the proposed amendment be given in accordance with section 22.1(b) and section 22.2 of Part 4 of Chapter 2 of the Guideline
5. the proposed planning scheme policy amendment be given in accordance with section 5.2 and 5.3 of Part 5 of Chapter 5 of the Guideline.

**ADOPTED**

#### B MINOR AND ADMINISTRATIVE AMENDMENT TO *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014—*PACKAGE K

 **152/160/1218/496-002 and 152/160/1218/496-001**

**552/2021-22**

9. The Divisional Manager, City Planning and Sustainability, provided the information below.

10. Council is committed to facilitating economic growth and maintaining prosperity in Brisbane through sustainable development regulated by *Brisbane City Plan 2014* (the planning scheme). This requires a robust and resilient planning scheme that reflects changes over time, in line with community and industry expectations. Minor and administrative amendments are proposed to the planning scheme and associated planning scheme policies (the proposed amendment) (refer Attachments B and C, submitted on file) to maintain their effectiveness and currency.

11. The proposed amendment will achieve the following outcomes.

- Maintain the currency of the planning scheme through undertaking zoning and overlay map changes to reflect:

- current development approvals

- updates to State Planning Policy mapping, including the following overlays:

 - Airport environment overlay map – Australian Noise Exposure Forecast Contour

 - Biodiversity areas overlay map (Matters of State environmental significance)

 - Coastal hazard overlay map

 - Extractive resources overlay map

 - Heritage overlay map

 - Regional infrastructure corridors and substations overlay map

- Transport noise corridor overlay map – State designated noise corridor – State controlled road

- Transport noise corridor overlay map – State designated noise corridor – Rail network.

- Improve the effectiveness and usability of the planning scheme through enhancing the format and presentation, undertaking mapping and text refinements and making typographical changes.

- Maintain the currency of the planning scheme though changes to reflect the update to the *Building Regulation 2021*.

- Maintain the currency of the planning scheme though changes to reflect commencement of the Roma Street Cross River Rail Priority Development Area (PDA) Development Scheme and the Albert Street Cross River Rail PDA Development Scheme.

12. Should Council resolve to approve the proposed amendment, it is proposed that the amended planning scheme will take effect from 27 May 2022.

13. The Divisional Manager, City Planning and Sustainability, provided the following recommendation and the Committee agreed.

14. **RECOMMENDATION:**

**THAT COUNCIL RESOLVE AS PER THE DRAFT RESOLUTION SET OUT IN ATTACHMENT A**, hereunder.

**Attachment A
Draft Resolution**

 **DRAFT RESOLUTION TO DECIDE TO ADOPT MINOR AND ADMINISTRATIVE AMENDMENTS TO *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014* AND AN ADMINISTRATIVE AMENDMENT TO A PLANNING SCHEME POLICY – PACKAGE K**

As Council:

1. decides, pursuant to section 5.1 of Part 2 of Chapter 2 of the *Minister’s Guidelines and Rules* (the Guideline) made under the *Planning Act 2016*, to make minor and administrative amendments to *Brisbane City Plan 2014* (the planning scheme)

1. pursuant to section 2.1 of Part 1 and section 5.2 of Part 2 of Chapter 2 of the Guideline, has prepared the proposed minor amendment and the proposed administrative amendment to amend the planning scheme in the manner stated in section 1 of Attachment B (submitted on file) and as identified in the Schedules in Attachment B (the proposed amendment)
2. decides, pursuant to section 2.1 of Part 1 of Chapter 3 of the Guideline, to make administrative amendments to planning scheme policies contained in Schedule 6 of the planning scheme
3. pursuant to section 2.2 of Part 1 of Chapter 3 of the Guideline, has prepared the proposed planning scheme policy amendments to amend the planning scheme in the manner stated in section 1 of Attachment B (submitted on file), and as identified in the Schedules in Attachment B (the proposed planning scheme policy amendments),

then Council:

1. decides, pursuant to section 3.1 of Part 1 and section 6.1 of Part 2 of Chapter 2 of the Guideline, to adopt the proposed amendment
2. decides, pursuant to section 5.1 of Part 1 of Chapter 3 of the Guideline, to adopt the proposed planning scheme policy amendments
3. directs that notice of the adoption of:
	1. the proposed amendment be given in accordance with section 3.2 and section 3.3 of Part 1 and section 6.2 and section 6.3 of Part 2 of Chapter 2, and Schedule 5 of the Guideline
	2. the proposed planning scheme policy amendments be given in accordance with section 5.2 and section 5.3 of Part 1 of Chapter 3, and Schedule 5 of the Guideline.

**ADOPTED**

Chair: DEPUTY MAYOR, Economic Development and Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games Committee report, please.

### ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND THE BRISBANE 2032 OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC GAMES COMMITTEE

The DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Krista ADAMS, Civic Cabinet Chair of the Economic Development and the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Sarah HUTTON that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 15 March 2022, be adopted.

Chair: DEPUTY MAYOR.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair. I shouldn’t have put that peanut in my mouth. Look, I would have just a bit of an announcement for the Chamber before I get to the Committee report from last week and it’s an extension of what I was talking about in the support of businesses over the last couple of weeks through this flood recovery.

 I’m very excited to announce that out of one of the discussions we had at the Small Business Roundtable last week and the work of the fantastic Economic Development Team in Brisbane, that we are now formally setting up business recovery hubs as well.

So something that we saw out of the Brisbane Business Hub was that a lot of businesses came in there, not just for physical space but for emotional support and to try and find out what they needed to do to get back on their feet.

I think at one stage, Miriam Kent was calling it the Business Evacuation Hub for the Business Hub in the centre and we realised that there was quite a need there for businesses to get some advice and support on how to take the next step forwards.

So we realised in supporting small businesses, coming out to them was definitely going to be easier. The Business Hub is great if you are coming into town for other reasons and you can drop in there if you’re a flood affected business or maybe if you’re in Councillor MATIC’s area, it’s a closer one as well but we knew that there was something that we needed to do here to support the local businesses as well.

So we are actually launching our Business Recovery Hubs from Thursday. They will be up and running at three locations across the city. Obviously in the Business Hub in Brisbane, in Queen Street—at 155 Queen Street. I don’t need to tell anybody where that is, we’ve all been there and we see the great work they do.

We’ve also got, obviously the Suburban Business Hub in Nundah, which will convert into that specific Recovery Hub over the coming weeks with the demand from 8.30am to 4.30pm, Monday to Friday. Which is in Aspinall Street in Nundah. We will also be setting up a Business Recovery Hub in the Moorooka Bowls Club, to make sure that we can support those on the outside as well that need that support from 10—no, sorry, from nine till five, from Monday to Friday as well.

So each day there will be Council officers there and representatives from services and funding providers on hand to answer questions for business support. There’ll be general Council information and support, licensing, permits, rebuilding and waste solutions. There will be access to information about future mentoring programs and support networks because we did hear, right now it’s not the mental health support so much as the just, get back on the feet. But we know these are sometimes delayed and they will definitely be there in the coming months as well.

Assistance and small business advocacy. There will be state support and assistance as well. So there will be representatives from the Department of Employment, Small Business and Training and the Office of the Queensland Small Business Commissioner joining us as well. Also, all the information that the businesses may need about grant support and financial assistance through the disaster recovery funding.

So I hope that Councillors who stand in this place and say we do nothing to support people through the issues that we’ve been seeing over the last few weeks, are quick to make sure that those—particularly mum and dad businesses, that need the information about their insurances, that the permits they need, about the electrical works and what they can do, permits, whether they’re required or not to get straight back up and operating because what they need is trade through the door and being able to open, make sure they share that information.

From this Thursday, Nundah Business Hub will be a Recovery Centre. The Business Hub in the Queen Street from 10 till two and the Club House at Moorooka from nine till five, Monday till Friday.

On top of that, of course the Brisbane Business Hub continues with its workshops and mentoring programs over the coming week. We’ve got workshops coming up around businesses who want to create genuine and lasting connections with Middle Eastern counterparts. So that’s with the Middle East Connect and cultural advisors.

There is a hiring for small businesses workshop that covers short quick wins for small businesses on long-term strategies being presented by Relate. On The Couch with Duku Forè, so we all know Duku, he’s presented here in Council before and talking about how he is now an internationally renowned inspirational speaker entrepreneur, TEDx speaker, UN delegate and author. Anyone who’s met Duku does not forget him. He is amazing.

On 29 March, Resilience in the Face of Adversity. So that one is about mental health and how when times are tough, you can dig deep. So Libby Trickett is going to be talking there on how to navigate difficult times in business and the way that her and her husband, Luke, have worked through their futures with the program Marmalade, as well.

The Committee report last week was a bit of a history lesson on what we have done to support businesses over the last 12 months through the local precinct support line in the budget in visual merchandising and digital marketing.

We launched the pilot program after offering small businesses in seven local business areas that were part of the LBPI (Local Business Partnership Initiative) program, the opportunity to take up new, more targeted program with the focus on two topics. Visual merchandising and digital marketing.

So this was an opportunity for businesses to access training and knowledge through various forms and programs but what we’re hearing, that many of the business owners struggle to apply these learnings to their own business so it’s a more personal and consultative approach that was tailored specifically to the businesses and their needs as well.

So we did one-on-one specialist training to 51 businesses across precincts in Bulimba, Mount Gravatt Central, Nundah Village, Sandgate, Stones Corner and Wynnum. The feedback was overwhelmingly positive and the results have been outstanding as well. I can say that from personal experience. I’ve seen the changes in some of the ones in Mount Gravatt Central as well.

So stay tuned for further information as they come up over the next 12 months. Mr Isles also looked—talked about the additional support services available to businesses to get them back on their feet.

Our webpage is there as well as the one-stop shop, right first off, to see how you can get help for those businesses as well. Temporary workspaces as we were talking about in Nundah and in Queen Street and of course, now, I’m very, very happy to announce the Business Recovery Hubs at Nundah, in Queen Street and at the Moorooka Bowls Club, which will continue until demand is no longer required in those areas as well. Thank you, Mr Chair.

Chair: Thank you, DEPUTY MAYOR.

 Further speakers? Any further speakers? No?

 We now put this report.

Upon being submitted to the Chamber, the motion for the adoption of the report of the Economic Development and the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games Committee was declared **carried** on the voices.

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

The Deputy Mayor, Councillor Krista Adams (Civic Cabinet Chair), Councillor Sarah Hutton (Deputy Chair), and Councillors Greg Adermann, Jared Cassidy and Steven Huang.

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE:**

Councillor Kara Cook.

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – LOCAL PRECINCT SUPPORT – VISUAL MERCHANDISING AND DIGITAL MARKETING PROGRAMS

**553/2021-22**

1. The Economic Development Manager, City Planning and Economic Development, City Planning and Sustainability, attended the meeting to provide an update on local precinct support – visual merchandising and digital marketing programs. He provided the information below.

2. Council’s Economic Development team engaged with local business owners and received feedback that, while opportunities were available to access training and knowledge on business improvement topics and themes, some business owners struggled to interpret that knowledge and apply it to their own business. Business owners would benefit from receiving more personal and ‘consult’ style assistance which is specific to their business. Council introduced a new pilot program with ‘on-premises support’, with a focus on the two topics of Visual Merchandising (VM) and Digital Marketing (DM).

3. The pilot program was delivered in 2021 and was initially offered to businesses in seven Local Business Areas, within both current and former Local Business Partnership Initiative areas. Businesses which undertook the training were in Bulimba, Mt Gravatt Central, Nundah Village, Sandgate, Stones Corner and Wynnum. The pilot program provided one-on-one specialist training and consults and was delivered by local Brisbane businesses who were experts in these fields. The pilot provided a total of 51 business training opportunities, and businesses could apply for the topic of either DM or VM, or for both topics.

4. The three stages of the VM consultations included:

- a two-hour on-site consultation

- a four-hour visual merchandising on-site visit

- provision of a digital workbook including future design suggestions.

5. The DM topic within the pilot program was initiated in response to COVID-19 challenges and an identified need to help businesses with their online presence. The training was delivered to 37 business owners within the suburbs of Wynnum, Nundah Village, Mt Gravatt, Bulimba, Sandgate, Moorooka and Stones Corner. Each DM consult included:

- an audit of the existing digital presence

- an on-site consultation

- preparation of a custom strategy

- on-site presentation of the developed custom strategy.

6. The Committee was shown before-and-after images and positive testimonials from business owners, which included the following:

- ‘Indigo’ (Bulimba) which received suggestions for improved merchandising and entrance

- ‘This ‘n’ That’ thift store (Mt Gravatt) which received suggestions of a new window display including a new logo decal

- ‘Bay Blends’ store (Wynnum) which received suggestions of new signage design and awnings

- ‘Books’ store (Stones Corner) which received suggestions of a new window display

- Elaine Francis Podiatry (Wynnum) which received suggestions for improved DM

- ISLPR Language Services (Mt Gravatt) which received suggestions for improved DM.

7. Due to the outstanding feedback received, Council’s Economic Development team is in the process of procuring suppliers for the next round of training to enable this successful program to continue in 2022. It is anticipated that applications will open in April 2022 with training to be delivered in May and June 2022.

8. Council is offering direct financial support, and a list of financial assistance options available to businesses to support their flood recovery efforts.

Support is available from the following:

- Council’s Flood Rate Relief

- Australian Government Disaster Recovery Payment and Allowance

- Queensland Government Small Business Disaster Relief

- Small Business Debt Helpline can help you find and apply for grants, concession loans and bill relief and can help with your insurance.

Council will continue to update this information as additional support from Council and other levels of Government is announced. Council is committed to supporting businesses recover from flood impacts.

9. Council’s Business Liaison Officers will commence visits to businesses within flood affected areas from next week. Businesses can book a one-on-one session with the officers to learn about the resources and programs available to support flood recovery efforts. Council has free food waste bins around the city and businesses can dispose of flood damaged goods at their closest resource recovery centre free of charge.

10. Temporary workspaces and business recovery hubs are available for businesses on a temporary basis. The Suburban Business Hub at Nundah is available for co-working arrangements and to hold meetings, and the Brisbane Business Hub in the Queen Street Mall has casual hot desking spaces available. Council has prepared a range of factsheets to help businesses navigate returning to their premises, which provides information on how to safely return to operation, covering topics including insurance processes, safe electrical work, food safety and waste disposal.

11. Following a number of questions from the Committee, the Civic Cabinet Chair thanked the Economic Development Manager for his informative presentation.

12. **RECOMMENDATION:**

 **THAT COUNCIL NOTE THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THE ABOVE REPORT.**

**ADOPTED**

Chair: Councillor MURPHY. Transport Committee report, please.

### TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

Councillor Ryan MURPHY, Civic Cabinet Chair of the Transport Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Angela OWEN, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 15 March 2022, be adopted.

Chair: Councillor MURPHY.

Councillor MURPHY: Mr Chair, last week the Committee was provided an update on impacts to construction as a result of COVID-19. Issues with resourcing, long supply chain lead times and availability of materials has impacted on our infrastructure delivery.

 As the Committee heard, the recent flood event will only increase demand for materials and labour as we go and enter the recovery phase. On that note, Mr Chair, I do want to give an update to the Chamber and the community about our work to restore Brisbane’s transport network over the past few weeks, starting with ferries and terminals.

 Chair, we know that our ferries and terminals were the hardest hit in our transport network and services have been suspended since the flood conditions on the river remained dangerous. Earlier today, I outlined our plan to restore Brisbane’s iconic CityCats to the river for residents and visitors to enjoy. That’s going to take some time before our entire ferry network can return but we are hard at work on the necessary repairs and have devised a recovery plan for services.

 Our ferry services will be restored in three stages based on the repair work needed at each terminal. We also want to make sure that each service comes back online as soon as possible. Under stage 1 of what we’re calling River to Recovery where we’ll restore the Bulimba-Teneriffe Cross River service as a priority, commencing from Monday 4 April. This terminal is amongst our most popular and it caters for thousands of commuters every week.

 Fortunately, they were also least hit by the flood and it has minimal infrastructure damage to that terminal. So, to prepare the Bulimba and Teneriffe terminals for service, we will be completing final repairs which includes reconnecting the power, the CCTV and the emergency panic call buttons over the next two weeks.

 Stage one will also see the introduction of a second cross river service between West End and Guyatt Park from Monday 11 April and once we reach stage two, our priority will be servicing the rest of the New Farm and Bulimba Peninsula.

 Stage three then will see services once again connected to the city and South Bank as well as terminals in the east, including Northshore Hamilton, in your ward, Chair. Apollo Road and Bretts Wharf.

Councillor SRI: Point of order, Chair.

Councillor MURPHY: I want to thank everyone—

Councillor SRI: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor SRI?

Councillor SRI: Will Councillor MURPHY take a quick question?

Chair: Will you take a question, Councillor MURPHY?

Councillor MURPHY: Sure.

Councillor SRI: Thanks. Through you, Chair, just how bad is—are things with Holman Street? I assume there was a lot of sunken debris there? With that terminal?

Chair: Councillor MURPHY?

Councillor MURPHY: Happy to take the question, Chair.

 Councillor SRI, the damage to Holman Street is moderate amongst the terminals we have. Some that are significantly damaged, so they include UQ (University of Queensland), QUT (Queensland University of Technology), Milton and Regatta. Then there’s moderate damage and I would say that that’s probably where it sits. Then there are some that have suffered very little damage at all. You know, Teneriffe and Bulimba would be amongst those. But I’m happy to provide you with a list of those if that would help you out.

Councillor COOK: Point of order, Mr Chair.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor COOK.

Councillor COOK: Would the Councillor take a question?

Chair: Councillor MURPHY, will you take a question from Councillor COOK?

Councillor MURPHY: Happy to take a question.

Councillor COOK: Thank you. Could he give an update on the Hawthorne ferry terminal?

Councillor MURPHY: Yes, sure. Sure.

Chair: Councillor MURPHY.

Councillor MURPHY: The Hawthorn ferry terminal, Councillor COOK, as with some of those other moderately damaged terminals, it wasn’t one of the worst hit but of course we are focussed on getting our crewing facilities and the fuelling facilities there back up and running as well. So it will probably enter service in that stage two or stage three. So it’ll be one of the next tranche to come back online.

 Now, where was I? So I want to thank, Chair, everyone who has worked and who continues to work on restoring our vessels and our terminals. That has involved Maritime Safety, Queensland. It’s involved the Royal Australian Navy. It has truly been a collaborative cross-government effort to clear our river of debris and I think—I certainly have been personally very impressed at the speed and the professionalism at which they have done that.

 There’s still, obviously, a lot of work and some heavy engineering that needs to be done offsite with some of the gangways. That will take time and precision but it has truly been a tremendous collaborative effort and I want to particularly single out our great team led by Geoff Beck in Transport for Brisbane.

All of his staff, particularly in the Ferries team and of course the leadership at River City Ferries and all our hard-working ferry masters and operators. Our maintenance people. They’ve been keeping busy during this downtime, refurbishing vessels, cleaning vessels. They’ve been doing a great job so I want to just pay testament to them.

Chair, there’s five vessels that will need repairs before they can return to the river as well. Sadly, we lost one CityCat, *Beenung-Urrung* but the majority of our fleet is in good working order. Our River City Ferries crew worked very hard in the past few weeks to attend to those vessels and I want to thank them for that.

Our ferry terminals also withstood very significant flooding, strong river currents and impacts from debris. However, unlike in 2011 where we lost seven terminals, all of our terminals have remained in place. Which I think is a great testament to their engineering that was put into them.

Assessments are still underway on the remainder of our terminals but Council is working on immediate works to make these sites safe to access and to complete the assessments to begin planning further work where it will be required.

As I’ve said before, the river remains dangerous and closed, actually, to private watercraft. Commercial watercraft are still now allowed to go back into the river. However, some of our terminals remain dangerous and with debris on them so I want to reiterate what I said last week, no one should be entering our terminals or climbing onto them.

MSQ (Maritime Safety Queensland) crews are still working to remove debris from the river and are finishing their hydrographic surveys which will continue to potentially reveal hidden damage to those terminals or sunken debris that will keep them inaccessible from being used. We’re also doing electrical safety audits and restoring power to terminals where possible, Chair.

The community will see barges in the river over the next few weeks that will undertake those immediate works on Regatta, UQ, North Quay and QUT terminals. These terminals were amongst the seven which were built to replace the ones we lost in 2011 and these are the ones that have the swinging articulated gangways. They’re located in parts of the river with the fastest water currents and they were the worst affected by the flood waters and the debris. Due to their position in the river, these are the hardest hit.

Some of the gangways released due to the velocity of the floodwaters so work is underway on planning the assessment and re-attachment of those gangways, as I said previously. We’ve also seen strengthened flood resistance impact pylons due to their work to protect against the currents and the large amount of debris that did accumulate.

In terms of cleaning, we’ve made great headway while those surveys on the pylons continue to take place. We’ve now completed cleaning at several terminals. West End and Riverside are actually scheduled for cleaning today. So there’s not a day that goes past where work on cleaning up our ferry network isn’t happening.

Just quickly Chair, on buses, our bus services of course are back up and running very quickly after the floods. We’ve been exploring how we can use our bus network to support our ferry patrons who are high and dry at the moment.

As part of our River to Recovery plan, this morning I also announced that we’ll be launching two ferry replacement services from tomorrow, Wednesday 23 March. These services will target key areas along the river impacted by the ferry network being closed. So we’ll be adding the P233 bus service, which will run from Apollo Road into the city in both the morning and afternoon peaks, stopping at each of our ferry terminals on the way.

We implemented a similar service, Chair, after the 2011 floods. This service will support commuters who would normally use Apollo Road, Bulimba, Hawthorne, Mowbray Park and Riverside ferry terminals and it will transport them into the city and then back out again along Wynnum Road.

Additionally, we will be introducing a free personalised public transport service between Northshore Hamilton and Teneriffe, which would allow those residents who would normally be boarding a CityCat at Northshore Hamilton and may have then got on the Blue CityGlider are—that will allow them to transfer into that service, which they will be very appreciative of, I hope. That will operate in peak times every night of the week as well as during the day on weekends.

Chair, just in the remaining time that I’ve got, quickly on bikeways. We know that the combination of river and creek floods has had just an enormous impact on our bikeway network. As I’ve mentioned previously, 234 kilometres of 395 kilometres of off-road bikeway was inundated by flooding.

Our city’s busiest bikeway, the Bicentennial, remains cut by the Drift restaurant. After 10 very long years, Chair, it’s time for that restaurant to be dealt with and while I’m glad that the State Government, through the Queensland Reconstruction Authority, is getting on with the job, it’s becoming very clear to us that it will remain an obstacle on the bikeway for many, many weeks to come.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor MURPHY: We understand today, LORD MAYOR, I take your interjection, that it may take up to six, potentially seven weeks, before the Drift restaurant will be cleared. So it’s very disappointing that it will take that long for the restaurant to be moved and to keep—so to keep walkers, riders and drivers safe, we will continue to be looking at a feasible longer-term solution to the dismount that is currently in place along Coronation Drive.

 We did consider that that was feasible for one-to-two-week closure of the Bicentennial but any longer than that and it’s—we’re really, I think, starting to put cyclists in an untenable situation so we’re looking for a more permanent solution to that problem as we speak.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor MURPHY, your time has expired.

Councillor MURPHY: Thank you, Chair.

Chair: Further speakers?

 Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair. I have a couple of questions I’m sure Councillor MURPHY will be able to respond to in his summing up, hopefully. Particularly around—he talked about damage to ferry terminals. We know there was obviously that boat that sunk and has been re-floated so it would be interesting to know when or if, if CityCats, ferries and KittyCats were ordered out of the river during the flood event? When that occurred and if not, why not.

That certainly should be something that needs to be considered in terms of learning from this disaster and making sure it doesn’t happen again. Of course, in 2011, those boats were ordered out of the river and we didn’t see any damage sustained to them in the way that we did three or four weeks ago. Three-and-a-half weeks ago now.

In terms of the construction industry impacts, the presentation we received in the Transport Committee, it was very interesting, in fact, because what the Council officers told us very clearly is that Council’s ability to deliver major projects going forward will be non-existent without funding from other levels of government essentially.

So what we were told is that all of the risk, all of the risk for what used to be covered by contingencies in projects. We all remember those, like the Kingsford Smith Drive project, the—all of that risk had to be borne by the contractor. Had to be borne by the company. It inevitably cost that contractor one of their businesses.

In future, the Council officers said we as a Council, as an organisation, are going to have to assume all of that risk going forward. So they also made very clear that the current projects that had the old model where contractors had to assume all that risk, projects like the Kangaroo Point Green Bridge and the Metro, those contractors are probably looking at very slim, if not negative profits. Potentially losing money on those projects now in the current circumstances.

Any future projects like the other two green bridges or used to be three more green bridges back a couple of years ago, one of those quietly disappeared from that project and the LORD MAYOR no longer talks about the five green bridge projects but just the Green Bridge Project. Without an intervention from other levels of government and we have heard the State Government have ruled out funding the two West End to Toowong and St Lucia green bridges and we didn’t see any announcement yesterday as part of the city deal from the Federal Government.

So I think what this presentation was about is softening us up for the—more cuts to that project. More cuts to the Green Bridge Project and other major projects as well because what we’re going to see is that in the case of the projects like the Kingsford Smith Drive project or the Kangaroo Point Green Bridge Project or the Metro Project, where it is the contractor that takes a bath on them. It will be ratepayers in the future.

Where there used to be nine contractors tendering for a project, a major project, there are now five. Where there used to be five, there are three and where there used to be three, the Council officers tell us there are quite often none. Council then has to go out and negotiate with the private sector about getting a project that is acceptable to the private sector to deliver.

So this does put an enormous amount of risk on the table now for the rate payers of Brisbane and for this Administration’s ability to carry out election promises. We know the Metro is now $1.7 billion project. We heard that this morning—earlier today but Councillor MURPHY’s answer to a question. So it’s now costing a lot more than it was originally proposed to cost and delivering a lot less.

The old $1.5 billion one that Graham Quirk announced was of course that underground subway system which had trains running on tracks and was going to rival the Paris Metro. Now we’re getting this project that is $1.7 billion, delivering an awful lot less return for the ratepayers of Brisbane but in future, in future, those ratepayers are also going to have to assume all of that financial risk going forward because the private sector simply won’t accept that anymore.

That’s what this presentation was all about. Very interesting and certainly going to be a challenge for this LNP Administration to deliver on their promises. They of course promised five green bridges at the last election. They’ve ditched one of those already and I think—I suspect, Chair, what they’re doing is softening us up to ditch the next two because they haven’t been able to secure Federal funding or State funding for these projects.

Chair: Thank you.

 Further speakers?

 Councillor MURPHY, summing up—

 Sorry, my apologies, Councillor SRI.

Councillor SRI: Cheers. No, that’s all good. Just really quickly, I wanted to note that it was really good to get the update on the repairs and I found it one of the most constructive committee—instructive and constructive and useful committee presentations compared to some of the other ones I’ve seen from some of the other committees lately.

 It was a bit of a shame that the time was so tight for that Committee presentation because I know we all had a lot more questions and—as I guess as a reflection for how Council manages these things in the future, it would be nice to be able to set aside a bit more time for those important Committee updates so that we don’t have to feel so tight and rushed and maybe that’s something the Mayor could look into. If you’re going to have two Committee meetings back-to-back, maybe half an hour’s not quite enough time for that.

 Just in terms of how Council manages the repairs going forwards, I think it’s good to see that temporary Cross River service starting up between UQ and—sorry, between West End and Guyatt Park while the UQ terminal’s out of action. I would note it’s a little disappointing that it’s still two weeks away but I appreciate that these things take a bit of time.

Maybe it’s telling that Hamilton gets—Council is essentially paying for private Maxi Taxis to run from Hamilton into The Valley and I wonder if that’s sort of—like I see the logic of that but it does seem like maybe the same thing could be offered for West End. Between West End and UQ or West End and the city.

 It’s sort of like, why does Hamilton get those private taxis and West End doesn’t? If—yes, maybe Councillor MURPHY wants to speak to that briefly. I appreciate there might be genuine reasons for it but I know there’s a lot of West Enders who relied on that West End ferry terminal, both to get to UQ but also to get into the city.

 In the city route, at least UQ is complemented by the Blue CityGlider service so that should be a little bit better but it—if for the next two weeks, I think it’s now—it’ll be a total of five weeks that West Enders won’t have had that public transport link back to UQ.

So if for the next two weeks the ferries still aren’t going to be running and the best option that people will have is to get the ferry to Guyatt Park and then walk the last half a kilometre, were taxis considered in that respect? Could, for example, Maxi Taxis pick up at the UQ terminal, head over Highgate Hill and then over the Eleanor Schonell Green Bridge?

I offer this as a serious suggestion and question. I don’t—I’m not just keen to hustle for taxis but if there is a—yes, if there is a possibility there for that connection, it would seem like a logical one where Maxi Taxis or PPT (Personalised Public Transport) could pick up passengers at the West End ferry terminal, head over Dornoch Terrace and then cross over at the Eleanor Schonell Bridge to drop commuters at the UQ Lakes Bridge.

At least for the next two weeks until the Guyatt Park Cross River service is restored and perhaps even beyond that. Obviously my preference was still to see improvements to the 192 bus service and I think it’s a shame that that hasn’t been able to happen but I appreciate that that was probably an issue of negotiating with the State Government.

I was just still a little bit unclear and maybe Councillor Murphy can touch on this again, just with debris in the river. I understand boats and sunken pontoons are being pulled out of the water at the moment.

Residents saw a lot of stuff go down in the vicinity of Holman Street so I appreciate that the Holman Street terminal itself probably hasn’t been too damaged but does that give us any indication—like what should I be telling residents who are asking about services to Holman Street? Do we have a rough indication of how much longer that might be before that terminal is up and running and before some of those Cross River services are installed?

If it’s going to be a little bit longer, will the Council consider improving the frequency and operating hours of the shuttle bus running between Kangaroo Point and the city? That’s the bus that was installed after the Dockside and Thornton Street terminals were shut down. Now the Holman Street terminal’s down as well, maybe the bus service could be improved slightly so that residents at least have that connection in and out of the city as well. Thanks.

Chair: Thank you.

 Further speakers?

 Councillor COOK.

Councillor COOK: I just want to speak—no? There we go. Thank you, Mr Chair. I just want to speak briefly on this item and I will always give credit where credit’s due and I do want to thank Councillor MURPHY, through you, Mr Chair, for restoring that Cross River service from Bulimba to Teneriffe.

We have noticed over the last couple of weeks, the impact that has had on our local road network and it has been significant but I would also like just a bit of clarification around the Apollo Road to CBD service. Obviously with the Hawthorne ferry terminal out of action, there are many residents who would appreciate a stop at Hawthorne. I think that Councillor MURPHY mentioned that during his speech but I just wasn’t sure of the particular detail around that.

The other impact we’ve seen, obviously, to the transport network during this period of time as well, has been to the bus services. So we have seen situations where school students in particular have been left at stops because of the bus services being full, particularly the 232. I have written to the Head of Transport for Brisbane about that issue and just asked for some review of the patronage numbers to know if additional services can be provided, particularly on those routes.

The other thing around the ferry terminals, repairs and the timeframe for that is whether or not also it might be possible to have particularly the Hawthorne terminal potentially a cross-river service there. Even if full CityCat services aren’t able to be restored once that terminal is up and running or some sort of mini route between Apollo Road and Hawthorne. Just so people can hop across the river at those locations to connect with bus services on the other side.

So I just want to say thank you for that update today because I know that many residents have written to myself, to the LORD MAYOR and certainly to Council—made contact with Council about the impact that the lack of services has had on them directly. So any further information that Councillor MURPHY can provide today would be appreciated in his summing up. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you.

 Any further speakers?

 Councillor MURPHY.

Councillor MURPHY: Thanks very Chair—thanks, Chair. Just very quickly, I want to address Councillor CASSIDY’s comments. He asked a couple of questions there in his remarks and isn’t here in the Chamber to listen to the answer but perhaps his colleagues can inform him of my response.

 There’s been this discussion around a comparison to 2011. It’s a good question. I actually did cover off on the answer to that question in my Committee report last week but I can go over it again this week for his convenience.

 Now, we know that the weather event that we experienced last month was very different to 2011. As we know, it was an unprecedented weather event in terms of the volume of rain that dropped over Brisbane. More than 1974. Brisbane received over 80% of its annual rainfall in just three days.

 Now, what that—what happened as a result of that, Chair, was that created extremely unsafe conditions on the Brisbane River. We had rising flood peaks. We had strong river currents and we had a very significant amount of debris. Now, that debris wasn’t just coming downstream from the upper catchment of the Brisbane River and the Bremer River, that debris was coming from all of our creeks which were also severely inundated.

 I don’t think there’s a Councillor in this Chamber that wasn’t touched by severe creek flooding or didn’t have residents who were impacted by that.

 So on Saturday 26 February, we made the decision to stop ferry services as conditions were becoming extremely unsafe for our passengers and our crews. Our operator, River City Ferries, then executed their—what they call their extreme weather and emergency response plan.

Now, they had minimal warning for that and there were changing conditions in the river. Now, keep in mind, in 2011 we had several days’ notice to remove our vessels from the river and we were actually able to relocate them to the Manly Boat Harbour and marinas in Redland Bay.

Unfortunately, this time around, our crews had to work very quickly in increasingly dangerous conditions to secure the fleet and that would be the key difference between the 2011 flood event and the event that we just experienced.

Our masters and our deck hands, they worked to remove as many vessels as possible to safe docks that we had at Rivergate Marina and the shipyard at Murarrie in the Brisbane River for hardstanding and berthing. So some were actually taken out of the water.

Due to space restrictions at Rivergate, the remainder of the fleet were moored downstream of our terminals, Chair. The unsafe river conditions meant it was too dangerous to attempt the relocation of any vessels to the bay at Manly. If we could have done it, if it was safe to do so, we certainly would have done it.

Whilst of course it’s very upsetting that some of our vessels—in fact five CityCats have sustained some form of damage, I am of course extremely thankful that all of our crew remain safe and none were injured or worse during this event.

Our vessels, of course, are insured. They’re insured, Chair. We will be able to repair the damage. We’ll be able to restore the services but our staff that work for River City Ferries are absolutely irreplaceable so that is a decision that we made at the time. Of course that will be subject to the de Jersey review, like everything else will be, but I would be—and I’m sure the LORD MAYOR would back me up, he would be happy to make that decision every time again because it is just not worth risking a crew member to save a vessel that is insured.

Councillor SRI had some points that he made around Hamilton versus West End. You know, I am not sure what you’re alluding to there, Councillor SRI. Whether there’s some favouritism towards Hamilton and West End. Whether that might be what you’re alluding to or maybe the fact that they’re better off there? Look, the—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor MURPHY: Okay, it was a genuine question, he’s saying. Well the reality is that I think Councillor McLACHLAN will tell you, public transport service levels in Northshore Hamilton are far less than they are in West End. In fact, so I—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor MURPHY: I think the residents of Northshore Hamilton should obviously be thankful for this service but I know that if they had the access to the services that were available in West End, then they would feel that all their Christmases had come at once. So this is just a small thing—

Councillor SRI: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor SRI.

Councillor SRI: Will Councillor MURPHY take a quick question?

Chair: Will—

Councillor MURPHY: I’ve taken enough questions, Chair. I want to move on.

Councillor SRI: It’s just about the Gold CityGlider.

Chair: No, no—

Councillor SRI: What’s the latest on that?

Councillor MURPHY: Look, we’ll get to that next week.

Chair: Are you taking a question, Councillor MURPHY?

Councillor MURPHY: I also had some questions from Councillor COOK regarding that 223 bus service and access to—whether it would be passing Hawthorne terminal. Councillor COOK, the 223 will go past Lindsay Street where Hawthorne terminal is located. So that will service passengers who would have used the Hawthorne terminal.

 You mentioned a suggestion of a cross-river service. Happy to take suggestions from you, like I have from Councillor SRI on what services we can augment. We won’t be able to do everything. Of course, we have to get agreement from TransLink as well but happy to take your suggestions on that.

 Finally, just the issue of buses not picking up school students. If there’s any school student in the city that’s not picked up by a Brisbane City Council bus, we want to know about it. We have a no child left behind policy in Transport for Brisbane. If there is a child at a bus stop, whether they have a fare or not, they should be picked up. If they’re not being picked up, we need to know about it so that we can take corrective action. Thank you, Chair.

Chair: Thank you.

 We now put the motion for the Transport Committee report.

Upon being submitted to the Chamber, the motion for the adoption of the report of the Transport Committee was declared **carried** on the voices.

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

Councillor Ryan Murphy (Civic Cabinet Chair), Councillor Angela Owen (Deputy Chair), and Councillors Jared Cassidy, Steven Huang, David McLachlan and Jonathan Sri.

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY IMPACTS

**554/2021-22**

1. The Manager Project Management, City Projects Office, Brisbane Infrastructure, attended the meeting to provide an update on Infrastructure Delivery Challenges due to COVID-19 impacts. He provided the information below.

2. COVID-19 continues to impact infrastructure delivery and supply chains across numerous sectors. Global supply chain disruption has impacted a range of Council’s procurement activities. The Omicron outbreak has exacerbated existing labour shortages due to isolation or quarantine requirements, significantly restricting staff availability and business output. Infrastructure and service delivery impacts include time, quality, certainty, and cost. Current trends are having real time and longer-term impacts for current and future planned infrastructure and services. Government stimulus injection has assisted local economy recovery, and (locally, nationally and overseas) has increased pressure on supply, transport and manufacturing, and service delivery. Council is observing increasing pressures on supply chains, competition, approach to risk and availability of resources. Shortages have developed in some markets, worsened by the continued growth with both building and engineering construction activity. Market conditions are creating tension, escalating risk and uncertainty.

3. The IBISWorld Special Report: Supply Chain and Labour Challenges, 19 January 2022 addressed labour and supply chain impacts. Job vacancies have increased by 18.5% in the three months to November 2021, with over a fifth of businesses reporting job vacancies. Prior to the pandemic, February 2020 vacancies were 11%, representing a 74.2% increase since it began. Some construction firms have reported as much as 25% of their labour force being unable to attend work. These shortages have been concentrated in Australia’s two most populated states, Victoria and New South Wales, where over 60% of the industry is located. Vaccine mandates across most Australian states have further constrained the sector’s access to labour. Upstream labour shortages and factory closures have caused shortages in inputs such as plasterboard, cement, prefabricated wooden structural components, and construction metal forging and casting.

4. Firms have indicated anywhere from 10% to 50% of truck drivers are not available for work due to returning a positive COVID-19 test or isolation requirements. Staff shortages are contributing to increased congestion at container terminals with ports in Melbourne and Sydney experiencing the most significant delays. Common mitigation strategies from the construction industry and road freight transport providers include increasing the wages of existing staff to promote retention and enticing staff from other companies by offering short-term salary increases. Engineers Australia released a report on 25 February 2022 noting a 12-month engineering vacancy growth rate of 67% due to demand. The top three drivers of change in January 2022 were hospitality & tourism, trades & services and manufacturing, transport and logistics.

5. Multiple levels of government have committed to spending in shovel-ready infrastructure projects to generate jobs in local communities, and to bring forward investment in large-scale infrastructure projects to help support the economy. Global pressure has been placed on supply chains as a result of countries increasing construction packages to stimulate economic recovery (similar to Australia), combined with ongoing shortages from key global manufacturing hubs due to a lack of freight options (sea, air and land), and the need to cease manufacturing due to outbreaks of COVID-19, have caused a surge in prices, availability and delays. A combination of major South East Queensland projects (such as Brisbane Metro, Cross River Rail and Queens Wharf) and government stimulus are increasing demand on the market. Revenue for the heavy and civil engineering construction subdivision is forecast to strengthen over the next five years, due to continued record investment in transport infrastructure projects.

6. Depending on the duration of these conditions, road freight and broader logistics firms could benefit from higher prices across more modes of transport. Sea freight container prices have recorded significant increases with congestion at ports and limitations on road freight space are contributing to greater competition and rising prices. Supply chain impacts are being experienced across a range of areas, resulting in increased pricing, delays and reduced market risk appetite in sectors including:

- labour including trades, professionals, traffic controllers

- commodities and goods including steel, aluminium, timber, oil derived products, resins and polymers and imported IT hardware

- vehicles and equipment including cars, trucks, and specialist equipment such as commercial lawn mowers.

Recent developments between Russia and Ukraine have led to an increase in the oil price which will further impact various commodities such as fuel and petroleum-based products, for example bitumen. The flood recovery event places additional pressures and risks on supply chains and materials.

7. These conditions are impacting Council’s service delivery. Upward pressure on wages and candidate availability are impacting Council’s staff retention and attraction. Labour and resource shortages in different sectors and supply-side constraints are impacting the availability of market resources across varying trades. Council is experiencing increased delays with materials, plant, equipment and availability as well as an escalation of costs for steel (30%), formwork (40%), concrete (10%), and timber (20%). Council contractors are also exposed to price escalation and supply issues.

8. The construction industry is experiencing trades being impacted by resourcing issues and subcontractors holding prices, escalating delivery risks, and putting pressure on project costs and delivery durations. Supply chain and subcontractor reliability has the potential for longer delivery durations. Government stimulus and investment has had a positive impact but has also increased pressures on supply chains and labour availability. Public utility authorities are impacted by similar risks to Council, and coordination and delivery of the services they provide is integral to Council’s infrastructure delivery. Property price escalation is impacting on land acquisition budgets.

9. The Committee was shown images of the flood impacts on the Bicentennial Bikeway and the Milton Park ferry terminal. Council is still assessing the extent of damage across all asset classes, and flood recovery priorities are impacting on Council’s current programs of works and agreed projects. Flood recovery activities are experiencing similar and exacerbated challenges with resourcing, long supply chain lead times, material availability and market engagement.

10. Council has a number of preparedness strategies to mitigate construction industry impacts in the areas of communications, planning, procurement, delivery, budget and funding, and resource strategy attraction and retention. Communications will be used to improve awareness within Council of current construction impacts as well as longer-term implications and risks. Council will conduct market-sounding and engagement with the industry to understand pain points, challenges and risk exposure, and recognises the need to accurately forecast longer-term uncertainty. Delivery and service areas are monitoring trends regularly and will incorporate impacts into service delivery, project plans, budgets, escalation, and risk assessments. Council will identify alternative strategies for delivery and dependency on suppliers, materials or manufacturing for projects, services and key deliverables.

11. Procurement strategies include increased market and supplier engagement to improve understanding of impacts across all Council providers. Council is reviewing high-impact areas to assess key cost input changes, supply challenges and contracting approaches, including risk allocation and sharing and rise and fall provisions. Council is exploring opportunities to improve security of supply and to mitigate volatility for example supply partnerships, bundling and early procurement of long-lead time items.

12. Program delivery management strategies include packaging works into pipelines secured by contractors, labour, and material supply; increasing the number and range of principal sourced items due to longer lead times to minimise delays and secure critical elements; developing rolling work programs on a 10‑year outlook; and forward planning including industry engagement, delivery models and risk sharing. Council is reviewing its forms of contract to ensure contractor comfort and interests, including sharing risks and benefits.

13. Budget and funding strategies include flexibility and agility, budget reviews based on up‑to‑date trends and projections; reviewing cost estimates pertaining to risk and review of project contingencies reflecting market conditions; and to work with the Queensland Government and the Australian Government on approaches to funding partnerships that consider current industry risks and market uncertainty.

14. Resource strategy attraction and retention strategies include talent strategies to bolster South-East Queensland as a destination for employment, and to promote new and emerging opportunities to attract professional, technical and construction resources.

15. Following a number of questions from the Committee, the Civic Cabinet Chair thanked the Manager Project Management for his informative presentation.

16. **RECOMMENDATION:**

 **THAT COUNCIL NOTE THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THE ABOVE REPORT.**

**ADOPTED**

Chair: Councillor WINES, Infrastructure Committee report, please.

### INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE

Councillor Andrew WINES, Civic Cabinet Chair of the Infrastructure Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Peter MATIC, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 15 March 2022, be adopted.

Chair: Councillor WINES.

Councillor WINES: Thank you, Mr Chair. The report was a fulsome review of the flood response with a range of graphs and further information to Councillors. That will be made available to Councillors on request if they’d like to see it, who are not members of the Committee.

 The—can I take this opportunity, please, to recognise and thank the many officers who worked through very difficult and trying conditions to make sure that our traffic network returned to us quickly and that our road network works in a safe and efficient manner. To go on from some comments I was making earlier today about the traffic signal return, can I draw Council’s attention to paragraph 11?

Or section 11, which says 31 traffic controllers were destroyed during the flood and 25 had to be replaced at a cost of $25,000. Six were rebuilt through Council’s City Standards. All were operational by 10 March.

There was some concern about that because we had to bring in the traffic control systems. The traffic controllers that fit within the traffic signal box. They come from southern locations and there was a point where we were not sure that we were actually able to get them into Brisbane but we were able to secure them. They have been put in place.

As I’ve said on a number of occasions, the traffic network for the flood-affected and inundated traffic signal box would have returned to, and may still be operating on, the default balanced setting rather than the optimised throughput setting. So that may be having some effect on the traffic network still but we are working on rectifying that.

There may also be—it’s also important for the Council to know that potentially the water damage to the ones that were able to be rectified on site may cause failures in the future which we’ll be monitoring and to ensure that the traffic signal boxes continue to work and they continue to work efficiently using the SCATS (Sydney Coordinated Adaptive Traffic System) system to put through as much traffic as possible and make our road network efficient.

As I say, the report itself is quite fulsome in the detail provided about how the road network was brought back to full use and can I also just once again thank all of our officers who worked on both the traffic signals but also on road opening? It is a great—to be able to stand here and say that all of our roads are open with only one having an encumbrance on it, that being Mount Nebo Road. So I look forward to further contributions.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor WINES.

 Further speakers?

 Councillor STRUNK.

Councillor STRUNK: Yes, briefly, Chair, I want to speak on that presentation in Infrastructure. It was very illuminating. Very timely as well. We got the issues or the—those bits of infrastructure that needed to be fixed were done fairly quickly, which was great work by the officers. But it occurred to me after the presentation that we were very lucky, actually, in a lot of respects, to those 25 control boxes that we were able to source from down south.

We were lucky in a couple of ways. First of all that they had that much stock on the shelf ready to go. We were probably a bit lucky as well that the rain bomb actually started here in South East Queensland and worked its way south. So those councils further south that were probably having the same issues with control boxes, we probably got in and ordered what we needed first. So we were a bit lucky there too.

Then also at the presentation, which the Chair did mention was we were told that the transport of those control boxes up to Queensland was not easy. It was very challenging. But they found a transport company that was able to do it in a timely fashion. So there was three bits of luck there. One was that the storm started up here first and moved its way down south. Secondly, they just happened to have that amount of stock available off the shelf. I’m sure that—I don’t know what their normal stocking—the stockage is on that type of a device. But I’m sure it probably—sure that it’s not hundreds and hundreds. But maybe I’m wrong and maybe the Chair can clear that up.

Thirdly, of course it was very fortunate they were able to find a transport company to ship those as quickly as they did up to Queensland. So that those 25 intersections were up and running again within a pretty short period of time. Thanks to the good work of the Council officers.

So I’m just thinking that maybe in the future that some of those aspects should be looked at. Potentially for future—for flood future issues that maybe we’re probably going to have, from what all the experts tell us. That maybe we should take that on board and make sure that—somehow make sure that that stock is available when we’re needing those control boxes. Especially in a large quantity. Thank you, Chair.

Chair: Thank you Councillor STRUNK.

 Further speakers?

 Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, thank you. I rise briefly to speak on Council’s flood response regarding the transport network. I just—oh sorry, yes, I just got a very disturbing email and I just—

*Councillor interjecting****.***

Councillor JOHNSTON: —no, I don’t know what to do. Look, I just want to put on the record that what’s happening with these flood responses in the committees is completely inadequate. After the last flood a committee was set up, Margaret de Wit was the Chair who ran it. Now I said this a couple of weeks ago, it was a bit useless. But we at least—all the Councillors who had flooded wards had a place where they could go and meet on a regular basis to discuss flood recovery.

Now I raised this issue with the CEO almost three weeks ago and I’ve had no response from him. I know there are people from Brisbane Square who listen to this and I find that quite appalling. He did say he would look at what was happening.

What I want to note in response to how these committees are briefing us on what’s happening. They’re briefing us on an initial incident, they’re not briefing us on how things are going to recover. We’re not getting any information from our local officers at this stage. Like I spoke to my Parks officers on Friday, we had a clear plan for five parks to be cleaned on the weekend. None of them happened. The resources they were told would be available weren’t available. This is the kind of thing that we need to be having an ongoing dialogue with the Chairs about.

In preparing for my motion that’s on the agenda later today I actually came across this memo, back when we used to get hard copy memos. Which is from Margaret de Wit, it’s dated 24 June 2011. That’s almost six months after the floods. She’s dissolving the Ward Recovery Sub Committee. So for six months after the floods in 2011, Councillors had the opportunity to come and ask questions. We were promised outcomes, we’d be given advice and that went on for six months.

Now some of that process was not efficient and it wasn’t the best thing. But there was at least somewhere we could go and get help. The LDCC has been stood down, we don’t have committee meetings. I think I’m going to have to now write to the CEO on the form and ask for information through that process to find out what’s going on. Because if the local Council officers don’t know—and that’s what they’ve told me today—and I don’t know.

We’re not having any more Council meetings so this kind of briefing with just a list of Fairfield Road was closed, well der. That’s just not going to cut it in terms of how we’re going to recover. Especially when I get messages like what I’ve just got. I think I need to call the police. So excuse me.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Thank you.

 Councillor WINES, summing up.

Councillor WINES: Thank you, Mr Chair. Just a couple of comments. Just to tidy up some of the issues there. The issues identified by Councillor STRUNK were about flood resilience and flood resilience of the traffic control box, the traffic signal box that sometimes go by either of those names.

But if I can refer Councillors to section 8, item 8. That of the 129 traffic signals that ceased operating, 78 of those were due to Energex supply problems. Energex have—at a preliminary view—too many of their transformers and distribution boxes too close to the river and places are losing power before—as a result of flooding—before the flood reaches a particular place. So there is an issue there about the transformers and the distributors inside Energex. Also resilience within the TSB will be something that’s also considered.

Can I also recognise that on a report where half of it was discussing the operation of traffic signals. That it was described by the Opposition as illuminating and timely. Something I hope that we all think our traffic signals do. I thank the Chamber for their contributions.

Chair: Thank you.

 We now move to the report—the vote on this report.

Upon being submitted to the Chamber, the motion for the adoption of the report of the Infrastructure Committee was declared **carried** on the voices.

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

Councillor Andrew Wines (Civic Cabinet Chair), Councillor Peter Matic (Deputy Chair), and Councillors Steve Griffiths, Fiona Hammond, Sarah Hutton and Charles Strunk.

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – COUNCIL’S FLOOD RESPONSE – TRANSPORT NETWORK

**555/2021-22**

1. The A/Manager, Transport Planning and Operations, Brisbane Infrastructure, attended the meeting to provide an update on Council’s flood response on the transport network. He provided the information below.

2. Brisbane City Council has 16,185 streets in Brisbane which equates to approximately 5,820 kilometres of road network. In total, 314 kilometres of the road network was flooded, with more than 50 significant roads being closed and more than 120 traffic signal faults recorded, due to the flood event in February 2022.

3. The Traffic Management Centre (TMC) forms part of the Brisbane Metropolitan Transport Management Centre and:

- manages traffic movement, including planned and unplanned incidents, in real time

- provides travel information

- manages more than 600 CCTV cameras

- manages 1,100 Bluetooth vehicle detectors

- receives intelligence from within Council and external agencies.

4. From 26 February until 2 March 2022, the TMC managed:

- 30 crashes

- 155 abandoned, stationary and broken-down vehicles

- 119 flooded road jobs for major arterial and feeder roads

- more than 1,300 phone calls.

5. The TMC provides advice to the community regarding updated road conditions via the following channels:

- online (www.qldtraffic.qld.gov.au)

- phone (131940)

- social media (Facebook and Twitter)

- media (Australian Traffic Network)

- variable message signs.

6. Closures of significant roads were required due to flooding, which included:

 - Fairfield Road, Yeerongpilly

- Milton Road, Milton

- Stanley Street East, East Brisbane

- Abbotsford Road, Bowen Hills

- Brunswick Street, New Farm

- Ann Street, Fortitude Valley

- Ipswich Road, Rocklea

- Creek Road, Carina

- Wynnum Road, Tingalpa

- Manly Road, Tingalpa

- Newmarket Road, Windsor

- the Breakfast Creek Tunnel

- Coronation Drive, Auchenflower

- Lutwyche Road, Lutwyche

- Blunder Road, Oxley

- Settlement Road, The Gap

- Paradise Road, Larapinta

- Mt Nebo Road, Mt Nebo.

The Committee was shown an image of flooding at the intersection of Fairfield Road and Ashby Street, Fairfield, and the road closure at Coronation Drive.

7. Mt Nebo Road was subject to 24 landslips, of which up to 15 were deemed significant. The height of the landslips were between eight to 15 metres, and approximately 50 cubic metres of soil required removal.

8. Council manages 1,006 traffic signals, and during the flood event, 129 traffic signals ceased operating due to:

* Energex power supply problems (78 traffic signals)
* flood damage (31 traffic signals)
* unknown faults (20 traffic signals).

Three signalised intersections were completely inundated in the flood, and 60 site visits were conducted to rectify the damage incurred.

9. The Committee was shown a graph of traffic signal faults between 27 February to 10 March 2022. The peak of faults recorded was on the afternoon of 28 February 2022.

10. The Committee was shown images of flood damage to traffic signal controllers at Widdop Street, Clayfield; Bridge and Wharf Streets, Chelmer; Fairfield and Sherwood Roads, Rocklea; and Kate and Twigg Streets, Indooroopilly. Due to the loss of electricity supply, five traffic signal sites were operating on generators, which required refuelling approximately every four hours. The traffic signal controller, which is mounted inside the traffic signal cabinet, operates the:

- control of vehicle movements, through visual indication using LED lanterns and inductance loops

- provision of safe and controlled access to the road intersection by switching lantern displays

- detection of vehicles and pedestrians at the intersection, through inductance loops and pedestrian push buttons

- safe crossing of roads for active transport users

- throughput of traffic on the network in co-ordination with SCATS (Sydney Coordinated Adaptive Traffic System).

11. Thirty-one traffic controllers were destroyed during the flood, with 25 needing to be replaced at a cost of $25,000 each, and six being rebuilt by Council’s City Standards, Brisbane Infrastructure. All traffic signals were operational on 10 March 2022, and generators will remain operating as required until electricity supply returns. Council will monitor the traffic signal network as normal for premature faults.

12. Following a number of questions from the Committee, the Civic Cabinet Chair thanked the A/Manager for his informative presentation.

13. **RECOMMENDATION:**

 **THAT COUNCIL NOTE THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THE ABOVE REPORT.**

**ADOPTED**

Chair: Councillor ALLAN. City Planning and Suburban Renewal Committee please.

### CITY PLANNING AND SUBURBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE

Councillor Adam ALLAN, Civic Cabinet Chair of the City Planning and Suburban Renewal Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Fiona HAMMOND that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 15 March 2022, be adopted.

Chair: Councillor ALLAN. Just a moment Councillor ALLAN.

 You’re leaving? Thank you.

Councillor ALLAN: Thank you, Mr Chair. Before moving to the committee report. I did want to provide a little bit of background and clarity to a motion that’s listed later in the agenda. Because I think that there’s some factual information that is missing from there. This relates to the Shafston House development application and specifically it’s worth bearing in mind that this is a code assessable development application. It is currently with Council’s Development Services team. They will obviously be assessing it through well-established processes.

You know the development assessment process in this place is very well structured. It’s an accepted process, it’s a legislated process and Councillor SRI you’re well aware of that. That is something that we know ourselves as local Councillors. The Development Services team assess thousands of applications each year and the process is well understood. So it does beg the question, I guess, the motivation for your motion. But be that as it may. This is something that will go through the normal process.

I would like to make a couple of points which I think provide further clarity for this. First of all, Council has never questioned the historical significance of the site in question. In fact we recognise Shafston House as a State Heritage Place on the Queensland Heritage Register. The assessment process considered the proposal’s potential impact on the heritage values of the site and in turn Council officers will be referring the application to SARA (State Assessment and Referral Agency). Which is what we do with all State Heritage Places.

So there are not only the process that Council pursues. But the State Assessment and Referral Agency also plays a key role in this and will continue to be active as this particular application goes through the assessment process. Now the other thing that’s worth bearing in mind and that is in the heritage report associated with this development application, it said that there will be no demolition of any heritage buildings or any components of any heritage buildings at the site. That the elements that will be removed, or potentially removed, are not part of the original heritage elements. They are additions that have been included in latter years.

Once again, anything along these line obviously needs SARA approval. So it is a well scrutinised application. It will be a well scrutinised application. The application currently sits with Council’s assessment officers and they will obviously assess it against the State Planning Act and City Plan 2014. They will continue to engage relevant experts to support the heritage considerations of the site. I think that the notion that this Chamber should reject the application when it’s still in assessment is not appropriate.

So I think at this point in time the process should be allowed to proceed. It is a process that’s served us well over time and to try to distort that process at this point is not particularly helpful.

Just turning to the report. In the committee report of 15 March we touched upon the initial flood recovery response and particularly in the context of the Development Services response. The operation continued to operate to meet its business-as-usual requirements and the number of those requirements are legislated. So it’s important that we meet those requirements and we did.

A number of steps have been taken to support flood recovery. These include, we’ve scheduled some more Talk to a Planner events. So that allows residents who’ve got questions about rebuilding and what have you to come and talk to a planner. We’ve developed a new online flood enquiry form so that if Council—sorry, if residents can’t get to a Talk to a Planner event or can’t ring our Planning Information officers. They can lodge a form and we’ll get back to them within two days.

We’ve also scaled up the Planning Information Office. So that if people jump on the phone and want to have a chat about their restoration or renovation projects after the floods, we’ve got appropriately qualified officers there to help them. We’ve also developed a new flood fact sheet that’s been updated from the previous one. That provides some really useful information for residents as they go about the repair and rebuild process.

We’ve also instituted uncompleted works bonds. So that if we’ve got developments where they’re looking to seal the plan and move to the sale and occupation of those units. But, for example, maybe some of the landscaping has been damaged due to heavy rain. We would say okay, you can go ahead and proceed to a sell or settle on those units so people can move in. We’ll hold a bond to ensure that you complete things like landscaping and it allows the process to proceed.

We also looked at the BAU (business as usual) activity post and pre flood. Just to see the volumes of applications and investigations that were still occurring. In addition to that particular report, we had a petition requesting that Council support an application to the Queensland Government to add 21 Henry Street, Ascot to the Queensland Heritage Register. This particular petition was presented to Council on 7 December 2021. It contained 70 signatures. As the Queensland Government is specifically responsible in managing the Queensland Heritage Register, we will be sending that petition cross to them for consideration.

I’ll leave further debate to the Chamber.

Chair: Thank you.

 Any further debate? No further debate?

 Thank you, I now move to the vote on this report.

Upon being submitted to the Chamber, the motion for the adoption of the report of the City Planning and Suburban Renewal Committee was declared **carried** on the voices.

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

Councillor Adam Allan (Civic Cabinet Chair), Councillor Fiona Hammond (Deputy Chair), and Councillors Peter Matic and Charles Strunk.

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE:**

Councillors Lisa Atwood and Kara Cook.

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – DEVELOPMENT SERVICES INITIAL FLOOD RECOVERY RESPONSE

**556/2021-22**

1. The Manager, Development Services, City Planning and Sustainability, attended the meeting to provide an update on Development Services’ initial flood recovery response. She provided the information below.

2. Development Services’ (DS) initial flood recovery initiatives included:

- preparing and scaling up the Planning Information Office (PIO) and Prelodgement Services (PS) team

- additional Talk to a Planner events

- a new online flood enquiry form

- uncompleted works bonds to progress plan sealing applications

- communication to industry and ward offices

- provision of a new fact sheet and website information.

3. The PIO and PS team are both existing Council services that are able to be scaled-up as needed. The PIO consists of a network of town planners that are able to assist in times of increased demand. This has allowed for the PIO to maintain wait times of less than two minutes to speak to a Planning Information Officer, with an average call time being approximately 10 minutes. In the past week, the PIO have received 372 calls. PS has a rotational system for DS officers, which allows them to also assist in times of need. Officers assisting PS have also been prepared with frequently asked questions regarding repairing or rebuilding a flood-affected house.

4. Additional Talk to a Planner events have been scheduled in March and April 2022, at the following locations:

- Brisbane Business Hub

- Chermside Library

- Fairfield Library

- Garden City Library

- Indooroopilly Library

- Nundah Business Hub

- Toowong Library.

5. A new online flood enquiry form is available which:

- allows the public to enquire about flood-affected properties

- supplements the current PIO telephone service to contact Council

- makes it easy for customers to access and complete the form 24-hours, seven days a week

- is available for enquiries regarding town planning, engineering, construction, and plumbing

- enables Council to capture the nature and number of enquiries

- streamlines the process for Council officers to contact customers quickly with what they need.

6. A flood fact sheet has been published on Council’s website providing answers to frequently asked questions regarding Council approvals to repair or rebuild a house after a flood, including renovations and plumbing. There is also information available on flood mitigation and the Flood Resilient Homes Program, and fact sheets on building resilient homes.

7. Council is providing uncompleted work bonds to support timely plan sealing. It is recognised that some works that were complete, may have been impacted by the February 2022 weather event. Uncompleted work bonds will allow settlements to proceed while still ensuring the intended outcome.

8. An industry forum was held on 14 March 2022, to communicate that Council is currently maintaining services, but some timeframes may be delayed as some officers are impacted by the severe weather event or assisting with flood recovery.

9. The Committee was shown a comparison of the applications received and completed between 19 to 25 February 2022 (pre-flood), and between 26 February and 4 March 2022 (post flood), including development applications, prelodgement meetings, plan sealing, building and construction investigations, and plumbing inspections.

10. A webpage on ‘how to get advice’ has been created on Council’s website for planning and development in Brisbane, in particular, repairing or rebuilding a flood-affected property. An email updating ward offices on the information available will be provided.

11. Following a number of questions from the Committee, the Civic Cabinet Chair thanked the Manager for her informative presentation.

12. **RECOMMENDATION:**

 **THAT COUNCIL NOTE THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THE ABOVE REPORT.**

**ADOPTED**

#### B PETITION – REQUESTING THAT COUNCIL SUPPORT AN APPLICATION TO THE QUEENSLAND GOVERNMENT TO ADD ‘NYRAMBLA’, 21 HENRY STREET, ASCOT, TO THE QUEENSLAND HERITAGE REGISTER

 **137/220/594/47**

**557/2021-22**

13. A petition requesting that Council support an application to the Queensland Government to add ‘Nyrambla’, 21 Henry Street, Ascot, to the Queensland Heritage Register, was presented to the meeting of Council held on 7 December 2021, by Councillor David McLachlan, and received.

14. The Divisional Manager, City Planning and Sustainability, provided the following information.

15. The petition contains 70 signatures.

16. Nyramblahas been a local heritage place since 1 January 2004. The petitioners draw Council’s attention to the role played by Nyrambladuring the Allied war effort during World War II, when it was occupied by the Central Bureau, a group of service personnel who worked on breaking Japanese codes under the command of General Douglas MacArthur. The petitioners note that 2022 marks the 80th anniversary of significant USA and Australian World War II dates and that the addition of Nyrambla to the Queensland Heritage Register would be an acknowledgement of the historical bond between the two nations.

17. Applications for entry in the Queensland Heritage Register are made, assessed and determined under the *Queensland Heritage Act 1992* (Heritage Act). This process is administered by the Queensland Government’s Department of Environment and Science (DES). The Queensland Heritage Register is an inventory of places that are of significance to the State and, as such, Council has no authority or role.

18. Council has approximately 2,000 local heritage places listed on its Local Heritage Places online platform, including Nyrambla. Council’s heritage program encompasses all types of places that are significant to Brisbane’s history.

19. For a place to be entered in the Queensland Heritage Register, Council understands that an application must demonstrate that the place contributes to an understanding of the pattern and evolution of Queensland’s history and can include places that are:

* + an important example of their type
	+ the site of a significant event or activation in Queensland’s history
	+ closely associated with a person of importance in Queensland’s history.

20. The DES provides information about assessing heritage significance in their guideline *Assessing cultural heritage significance – Using the cultural heritage criteria*, which is available at www.qld.gov.au/environment/land/heritage/register, along with further information about the State Heritage process.

21. Council understands that once an application is made, the DES undertakes a process of assessment and recommendation according to statutory requirements and timeframes set out in the Heritage Act. As an independent, statutory body, the Queensland Heritage Council then makes the final decision whether to enter a place into the Queensland Heritage Register. For information about the Queensland Heritage Council’s functions and current members, refer to www.qld.gov.au/environment/land/heritage/council.

22. Although Council has no authority or role in the application, assessment and determination of places to the Queensland Heritage Register, Council will forward a copy of the petition to the Queensland Government, as the responsible authority, for its consideration.

Consultation

23. Councillor David McLachlan, Councillor for Hamilton Ward, has been consulted and supports the recommendation.

 Customer impact

24. The submission will respond to the petitioners’ concerns.

25. The Divisional Manager recommended as follows and the Committee agreed.

26. **RECOMMENDATION:**

**THAT THE PETITIONERS BE ADVISED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE DRAFT RESPONSE SET OUT IN ATTACHMENT A,** hereunder.

**Attachment A**

**Draft Response**

**Petition Reference:** 137/220/594/47

Thank you for your petition requesting that Council support an application to the Queensland Government to add ‘Nyrambla’, 21 Henry Street, Ascot, to the Queensland Heritage Register.

Council notes that Nyramblais,in part,significant as a local heritage place for the role it played in the Allied code‑breaking efforts during World War II. Council is responsible for the identification and management of local heritage places, and Nyrambla has been a local heritage place since 1 January 2004. You can access the heritage citation for Nyrambla online at www.heritage.brisbane.qld.gov.au/heritage‑places/152.

Applications for entry in the Queensland Heritage Register are made, assessed and determined under the *Queensland Heritage Act 1992* (Heritage Act). This process is administered by the Queensland Government’s Department of Environment and Science (DES). The Queensland Heritage Register is an inventory of places that are of significance to the State and, as such, Council has no authority or role in this process.

For a place to be entered in the Queensland Heritage Register, Council understands that an application must demonstrate that the place contributes to an understanding of the pattern and evolution of Queensland’s history.

The DES provides information about assessing heritage significance in its guideline *Assessing cultural heritage significance – Using the cultural heritage criteria*, which is available at www.qld.gov.au/environment/land/heritage/register, along with further information about the State Heritage process.

Council understands that once an application is made, the DES undertakes a process of assessment and recommendation according to statutory requirements and timeframes set out in the Heritage Act. As an independent, statutory body, the Queensland Heritage Council then makes the final decision whether to enter or not enter a place into the Queensland Heritage Register. For information about the Queensland Heritage Council’s functions and current members, refer to www.qld.gov.au/environment/land/heritage/council.

Although Council has no authority or role in the application, assessment and determination of places to the Queensland Heritage Register, Council will forward a copy of the petition to the Queensland Government, as the responsible authority, for its consideration.

The above information will be forwarded to the other petitioners via email.

Should you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact Mr Luke Acreman, Heritage Officer, City Architecture and Heritage Team, City Planning and Economic Development, City Planning and Sustainability, on (07) 3178 2760.

Thank you for contacting Council regarding this matter.

**ADOPTED**

Chair: Councillor DAVIS, Environment, Parks and Sustainability Committee report, please.

### ENVIRONMENT, PARKS AND SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE

Councillor Tracy DAVIS, Civic Cabinet Chair of the Environment, Parks and Sustainability Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor James MACKAY, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 15 March 2022, be adopted.

Chair: Councillor DAVIS.

Councillor DAVIS: Thank you, Mr Chair. The first item on the agenda was a presentation on Council’s Environmental Offsets program. The Schrinner Council is dedicated to making Brisbane the cleanest, greenest and most sustainable city in Australia. Our Clean, Green and Sustainable strategy highlights our city’s key sustainability achievements and outlines future targets and commitments.

 The Environment Offsets program contributes to the goals set out in this strategy of retaining natural habitat cover across 40% of mainland Brisbane and 75% of that cover being good quality habitat. Environmental offsets are just one of the tools used to restore lost habitat across the city by counterbalancing the unavoidable impacts of development and infrastructure.

 Mr Chair, since the program’s introduction in 2016, $6.5 million has been invested to restore 328 hectares of bushland across the city. The number of plants put in the ground varies on a site-by-site basis, depending on the local regional ecosystem and the amount of assisted regeneration required. There has been a strong trend in terms of increasing the number of hectares delivered per annum and on average the program plants around 38,200 stems per year,

 Council is investing $1.2 million annually to establish new projects within the program and upwards of $700,000 annually to maintain existing projects. When each project is completed, management control is transferred to Council’s Conservation Reserves Management program. Sites are maintained and funded for five years, which includes a two-year establishment period followed by a three‑year maintenance period.

 Mr Chair, I am pleased to advise that in the 2021-2022 financial year, this has seen the program’s biggest year yet. With just under 74 hectares of land acquired into the program across nine project sites. The delivery of the program is split across spring and autumn to take advantage of favourable growing conditions, assisting in the successful establishment of all new sites this year.

 Despite recent large volumes of flood and storm water passing through the majority of project sites, we have observed minimal damage. Total plant losses as a result of recent flooding stands at only 180 stems out of the 270,000 installed throughout the program. With only minor mulch loss also observed.

 During the presentation a case study of the site at 85 Ross Road, Upper Kedron was presented. This site was previously a dairy farm and was purchased in 2010 through the Bushland Acquisition program. The site had been identified for its high level of biological diversity, its ecological integrity and its significant corridor linkages. Including the adjoining D’Aguilar National Park and making up part of the upper catchment of Upper Kedron Brook.

 Through the program, invasive weed species were removed. This is increasing the extent of remnant ecosystems on site. Increasing the habitat for local wildlife populations, enhancing the health and function of Cedar Creek and enhancing park amenity for the local community. Also, by removing waste, planting 31,000 native plants and disturbing 1,770 cubic metres of forest mulch, the site is showing positive results.

 We have also received positive community feedback about the program, as well as reduction in weed species and an increase in bird life across the various sites. The program is just another example of how the Schrinner Council is delivering a biodiverse, natural environment which is an integral part of the lifestyle Brisbane residents so enjoy.

 Mr Chair, the committee also received a submission to formally name the park known as Blackwood Street Park as Fisher Family Park. I know Councillor HUANG will speak more to this and I leave further debate to the Chamber.

Chair: Any further debate?

Councillor HUANG.

Councillor HUANG: Oh thank you, Mr Chair. I rise to speak on item B of the Environment, Parks and Sustainability Committee report. On the naming of the Blackwood Street Park to Fisher Family Park. Mr Chair, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the committee for supporting the naming of the Fisher Family Park. Well Rochedale was named after the Roche family back in 1860s as the Roche family emigrated from Ireland. But they were one of the original landowner in Rochedale.

However, there were more than one landowners back in the 1860s and the Fisher family was also one of the big landowners at the time. But somehow there was competition and Rochedale became Rochedale instead of Fisherdale. So yes, so the Fisher family has been—try to sort of compete—to explain the history to local residents about how the name Rochedale came about. Naming of this park to Fisher Family Park is a good reflection and also keep a record of the local history.

*At that time, 4.50pm, the Deputy Chair, Councillor Steven TOOMEY, assumed the Chair.*

Councillor HUANG: So I would like to once again thank the committee for your support and I have met with the members of the Fisher families and discussed about the park naming. They are excited about it and I’m looking forward to see the opening of the new park, the Fisher Family Park. Thank you.

Deputy Chair: Thank you Councillor HUANG.

 Are there any further speakers?

 Councillor SRI.

Councillor SRI: Thanks, Chair. Just rise to speak briefly on the petition. I’d like to congratulate the Fisher family on having this park named after them. I did just want to make, again, the very general comment. Not specifically about this park naming. But the fact that these places do already have Aboriginal names. I think sometimes in our rush to commemorate the last 100 or 200 years of this city’s history, we overlook the previous 50,000 years of history.

 So I do want to encourage Councillor DAVIS and her team to, wherever possible, look for opportunities for dual naming an Aboriginal names of some of these public spaces. It’s often quite political in a way when we decide what names will get applied to what parks. I think we need to not lose site of the fact that we do have a responsibility to respect and acknowledge the Aboriginal history of this place as well.

So I’m aware that at the moment the Indigenous Liaison Unit team in Council is quite stretched. They don’t always have the time and capacity to provide detailed advice on appropriate Aboriginal names for some of these parks. We’ve been navigating that in my ward as well. But it does strike me that in our rush to get names and acknowledge local history for some of these spaces, we are overlooking and marginalising those thousands of years of Aboriginal history.

I would just encourage all Councillors to reflect on that and if you are advocating for names for public parks and spaces in your wards. To at least please consider a dual Aboriginal name and to work with local Aboriginal Elders to see if there is some way to commemorate both the recent European history but also that much longer Aboriginal history which is too often ignored in this city. Thanks.

Deputy Chair: Thank you, Councillor SRI.

 Are there any further speakers? I see none standing.

 Councillor DAVIS, right of reply.

Councillor DAVIS: Thank you very much, Deputy Chair. I’d just like to respond to Councillor SRI. The EPS (Environment, Parks and Sustainability) Committee is always happy to consider petitions that have Aboriginal park names. So if you have some to put forward through a petition, we would be happy to consider them. Thank you.

Deputy Chair: I will now put the report of the Environment, Parks and Sustainability Committee.

Upon being submitted to the Chamber, the motion for the adoption of the report of the Environment, Parks and Sustainability Committee was declared **carried** on the voices.

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

Councillor Tracy Davis (Civic Cabinet Chair), Councillor James Mackay (Deputy Chair), and Councillors Jared Cassidy, Steve Griffiths, Sandy Landers and David McLachlan.

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – ENVIRONMENTAL OFFSETS PROGRAM

**558/2021-22**

1. The Parks and Natural Resources Manager, Natural Environment, Water and Sustainability, City Planning and Sustainability, attended the meeting to provide an update on the Environmental Offsets program. He provided the information below.

2. Environmental offsets are a tool used to restore lost habitat across the city by counterbalancing the unavoidable impacts of development and infrastructure. Through Council’s Environmental Offsets program (the program), developers can seek to either undertake their own on-site offset or provide a fiscal payment to Council to undertake the works. The program contributes to the *Brisbane. Clean, Green, Sustainable 2017-2031* goals of 40% of mainland Brisbane retaining natural habitat cover and 75% of that cover being good quality habitat.

3. Council uses a procurement panel arrangement to secure contractor services to facilitate this program. Since the program’s induction in 2016, Council has awarded 75 long-term delivery contracts, investing $6.5 million to restore 328 hectares of bushland across the city.

4. Each environmental offset project is maintained for a five year period, with Council investing $1.2 million annually to establish new projects within the program, and upwards of $700,000 annually to maintain existing projects. When each project is completed, management control is transferred to Council’s Conservation Reserves Management program.

5. Since the program commenced, there has been a strong trend in terms of increasing the number of hectares delivered per annum. This is noteworthy as sites are maintained and funded for five years, with existing sites still requiring funding from the same budget.

6. On average, the program plants around 38,200 stems per annum, with the number of plants put in the ground varying on a site-by-site basis depending on the regional ecosystem and the amount of assisted regeneration occurring; which is when no planting occurs, but weeds are removed to allow for the re‑emergence of native species.

7. A map of project sites was shown to the Committee, noting that the restoration of upper catchment sites helps in controlling weed dispersal downstream.

8. The 2021-22 financial year has been the program’s biggest year, with 73.9 hectares of land acquired into the program across nine project sites. The delivery of the program is split across spring and autumn to take advantage of favourable growing conditions, assisting in the successful establishment of all new sites this year, facilitated by the above average recent rainfall.

9. Council maintains its project sites for a period of five years. Contractually, this is comprised of a two‑year establishment period, followed by a three-year maintenance period. Each financial year, the program audits sites and reviews contract delivery, with additional weed maintenance undertaken at the two-year mark for established project sites.

10. Despite recent large volumes of flood and stormwater passing through a vast majority of project sites, Council has observed minimal damage through surveys conducted within the last week. Total plant losses as a result of flooding stands at approximately 180 plant stems out of the cumulative 270,000 installed throughout the program, with minor mulch loss observed.

11. A case study site at 85 Ross Road, Upper Kedron (the site), was presented to the Committee. Previously a dairy farm, the site was purchased in 2010 through the Bushland Acquisition Program for its high level of biological diversity, its ecological integrity and its significant corridor linkages, including the adjoining D’Aguilar National Park and making up part of the upper catchment of Upper Kedron Brook.

12. The site objectives include removing invasive weed species, increasing the extent of remnant regional ecosystems on-site, increasing habitat for local wildlife populations, enhancing the health and function of Cedar Creek and enhancing park amenity for the local community.

13. Through the removal of waste, the planting of 31,000 native plants, the distribution of 1,770 cubic metres of forest mulch and undertaking a mosaic-style approach to reduce disturbances, the site is exhibiting positive results, including significant reduction in weed species cover, increased birdlife presence, positive community feedback and native plant growth, that is meeting expectations.

14. Following a question from the Committee, the Civic Cabinet Chair thanked the Parks and Natural Resources Manager for his informative presentation.

15. **RECOMMENDATION:**

 **THAT COUNCIL NOTE THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THE ABOVE REPORT.**

**ADOPTED**

#### B PARK NAMING – FORMAL NAMING OF THE PARK KNOWN AS BLACKWOOD STREET PARK, 12 BLACKWOOD STREET, ROCHEDALE, AS ‘FISCHER FAMILY PARK’

 **161/540/567/223**

**559/2021-22**

16. The Manager, Program Planning and Integration, City Standards, Brisbane Infrastructure, provided the following information.

17. Blackwood Street Park (D2233, B-RE-2828), 12 Blackwood Street, Rochedale, is an existing general recreation park that is due to be completed in June 2022. The park upgrade project is currently being undertaken to ensure the park caters to the growing needs of the community and suits the character of the local area. The project involves the installation of a new signature playground that includes a 100‑metre walking and scooter circuit, seating, a large central open space for play and informal sporting activities, new shade trees, picnic tables and a new picnic shelter.

18. In November 2020, as part of the community consultation undertaken for the park upgrade project, respondents were asked if they supported the formal naming of the park as ‘Fischer Family Park’, in recognition of the significance of the Fischer family to the area, with the majority of the respondents supporting the name.

19. The Fischer family were very prominent in the Rochedale area coming to the region around the turn of the 20th century, purchasing 640 acres of land, and commenced farming the land located close to the intersection of Miles Platting and Gardner Roads. Some family members were also involved in timber cutting.

20. When considering names for the suburb of ‘Rochedale’, one of the names put forward was ‘Fischerdale’, however, the name of another early settler to the area was chosen instead.

21. South Region, Program Planning and Integration, City Standards, Brisbane Infrastructure, has considered the park naming request and, given the majority support for the name ‘Fischer Family Park’, has recommended that approval be granted to formally name the park.

 Funding

22. Funding for the name sign is available in the South Region, Program Planning and Integration, City Standards, Brisbane Infrastructure, recurrent budget allocation for 2021-22.

 Consultation

23. Councillor Steven Huang, Councillor for MacGregor Ward, has been consulted and supports the recommendation.

 Customer Impact

24. Formally naming the park will acknowledge the Fischer family’s historical significance and give recognition to their contribution to the development of the area since the 1900s.

25. **RECOMMENDATION:**

**THAT APPROVAL BE GRANTED TO FORMALLY NAME THE PARK KNOWN AS BLACKWOOD STREET PARK, 12 BLACKWOOD STREET, ROCHEDALE, AS ‘FISCHER FAMILY PARK’, IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL’S *OS03 NAMING PARKS, FACILITIES OR TRACKS PROCEDURE*.**

**ADOPTED**

Deputy Chair: Councillor MARX, City Standards Committee please.

### CITY STANDARDS COMMITTEE

Councillor Kim MARX, Civic Cabinet Chair of the City Standards Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Sandy LANDERS, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 15 March 2022, be adopted.

Deputy Chair: Councillor MARX.

Councillor MARX: Yes, thank you, Mr Deputy Chair. Last week we had a presentation on the Compliance and Regulatory Services, their disaster response. They were very busy during this whole period of time that we’ve all sort of continued to work through over the last few weeks and will continue to work through. I was actually quite surprised at just how involved the Compliance Officers were with a huge variety of tasks that they were given to do.

 In fact when I was out with Councillor MATIC in his ward, I saw a Compliance Officer along the street in front of a car. I have to say my heart skipped a beat until we went along and he said oh, I’m just checking some infrastructure because that’s what I’m doing in this job. We turn into the good guys during the flood recovery event. So I was relieved about that because I didn’t really want to think that we were putting fines on anyone’s car that had been flooded. But we didn’t so it was all good.

 But they did have to log a whole lot of jobs of cars obviously that had been flooded and were left in the middle of the road. So they’ve dealt with that. In fact they dealt with 2,585 rapid damage reports.

 Something else that they did during that time was in supporting the local food businesses. They very quickly created a fact sheet for local food businesses to enable them to get back up and serving and working as quickly as possible. They were concerned that they would have to wait for a visit from our Compliance Officers in that space before they were able to start their business up again. So by doing up a food fact sheet, they were able to avoid that and get back on their feet really, really quickly.

 One of the members of my committee did mention that it would have been useful and helpful to have that fact sheet delivered and sent to Councillors at the same time. So I apologise, that didn’t happen. I did talk to my manager about that and she agreed. She though that would be a useful idea. So that’s certainly something we will take on board should it ever happen again. But I think in future we will try and make sure that any correspondence is also sent to Councillors as well.

 Obviously Animal Services they had a lot of animals in emergency situations, strayed and wandering. They did say quite a few were surrendered too. So I kind of want to ground truth that because it’s a bit concerning that animals were surrendered during such a terrible time. So they obviously had to organise with the evacuation centres with those residents to offer emergency kennelling. Also help support with a whole lot of other rangers to deal with the animals. We actually provided capacity support to the Ipswich City Council as well with some cats and dogs that they had a problem.

As I mentioned we dealt with some cars. They received 21 requests for assistance in relation to the hazardous flood affected vehicles. They also supported the Australian Defence Force with a number of different activities throughout the whole time. Including deliveries of goods to Wacol, to flood affected areas by helicopter.

 So I just want to really again pass on my thanks to all those officers on the ground during that difficult time. They are certainly very nimble and able to get in a hands on and do whatever is required of them during these difficult times and help our residents. So I just want to say thank you to them all again.

Deputy Chair: Thank you, Councillor MARX.

 Are there any further speakers?

 Councillor SRI.

Councillor SRI: Thanks, yes just really briefly on the CARS (Compliance and Regulatory Services) flood response. I’d like to thank Councillor MARX for her and her team’s work on this. I know it was a really busy and stressful time. Just wanted to note that the initial advice we had received was that Rapid Response and the parking inspectors wouldn’t be issuing any fines down in those flood-affected areas.

In my electorate we’ve got a precinct to the west of Montague Road where a lot of basement car parks were flooded. So it was really great that the Council was like yes, we’re not going to issue any fines. But they’ve just started issuing fines now and no one was warned about that. So we’ve got a lot of basement apartments there that are still not able to park your cars in, they’re still pumping out water, they’re still cleaning out mud. In many cases the electrical infrastructure has been damaged so people can’t park their cars in those basement car parks.

But just as of today or yesterday we’ve started receiving complaints from residents. Where they thought they were all right parking out on the street. The LORD MAYOR made that statement saying that parking times and parking meters would be turned off until end of March. Certainly my impression was that would mean there’d be no parking enforcement. I presume that perhaps some people have parked on yellow lines or parked in spots that are a little bit dangerous. That maybe then someone’s been called out.

But there’s definitely a comms issue here. Where the message residents have received from the Council Administration is don’t worry about it. There won’t be any parking enforced for now. Then the physical reality is that people are getting fined. So hopefully Councillor MARX, you can look into that and maybe pass that on to the LORD MAYOR. I would suggest it would be appropriate for the LORD MAYOR to make a statement clarifying that actually while the parking times aren’t being enforced, you do still have to park legally.

I think there’s a lot of confusion around that. So I don’t want to have to individually support residents to challenge all these fines when they thought they’d been parked where they were allowed to park. Hopefully we can talk to the Rapid Response Group officers and the parking inspectors and encourage them to maybe issue warnings for the next week or two. Rather than fines.

Because I mean that really sucks. If you’ve just had your car park flooded, you’ve lost everything in your basement car park. You parked your car up on the street because you thought you were allowed to, then you get a fine of that as well. It’s a bit of a kick in the teeth. So hopefully we can rectify that as soon as possible. Thanks.

Deputy Chair: Thank you Councillor SRI.

 Are there any further speakers?

 Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Oh yes, I just rise to speak on—this is the City Standards report, I think. We had a presentation with some interesting information last week about what had been happening with the CARS response to the flood. One of the really interesting things that we were told was that the officers had gone out and surveyed I think it was 62 suburbs within three days to determine the level of flooding.

 So Council had a lot of data pretty early on through their rapid damage reports, which informed the flood response. So that’s essentially a summary of what we were told. So within three days—essentially I think for me in Tennyson Ward, flooding started on Saturday. The last of the flooding finished on Thursday. That’s when residents pretty much in Oxley could get back into their homes. There might have been some access on the Wednesday, but we’ll say Saturday to Wednesday with everybody able to access their properties on Thursday and variously through that period.

 On the Wednesday while we still had flooded suburbs, we received an email from the DEPUTY MAYOR. The email contained a spreadsheet asking us to provide the street number, street name and then a range of details about what assistance residents wanted in their homes. Now that email was sent out to us in the middle of flooding in my area. We were asked to provide that back so that the Mud Army could be directed out to assist people.

 I did send back a fairly short and sharp email to the DEPUTY MAYOR and to the CEO and others about how inappropriate that was. But what I want to say is that it’s very clear that Council had information available in the first few days through their Rapid Response groups, through the Nearmaps that were done. Very proudly Council officers last week showed me Wednesday, the interactive mapping of where it flooded. So Council knew exactly where it flooded.

 It’s still beyond me why we were asked to fill out a spreadsheet for approximately—and again I’m still working on the number of houses. But I reckon about 3,000 houses were flooded in my area. As I said from pontoon damage to second storey. I don’t know how anybody thought that I could suddenly, without an office, fill out a spreadsheet and provide name, address and requirements for 3,000 flooded houses in my ward.

 That email that came to me was actually quite distressing as well. Because up until that point we had been sending through information to the LDCC about flooded streets, who needed help, where they needed help. We were doing—that’s what we were doing and we’re still doing that. Even 10 minutes ago when I left the room, that is the outcome of what we did.

 So I appreciate that the Rapid Response Officers were out and about and gathering this data. Where the disconnect has happened I think is how the recovery response has been connected to the management of that data. So I think this is a command issue, if that was the word I think Councillor SRI used earlier. I think this is a command issue.

I hope this is what Justice de Jersey’s going to get to in his review. As to how we had all this data about where it had flooded and what had happened. How it came in from multiple sources, including Council’s own internal officers’ satellite maps. Presumably fire, police, all the emergency responders and from Councillors and member of the public, who presumably were calling Council.

So I think we’ve had a huge amount of data. But I don’t understand how that data has not been translated into making sure that the help on the ground is what is needed and where it’s needed. So I just want to say that there is a massive job to clean up in my ward. It is really disappointing that three and a half weeks into this process that we don’t have a clear plan to do that. It’s clear that the PPI (Program Planning and Integration) officers in South Region are asking for help. They have damage assessments.

But there, for example, was supposed to be a big clean up over the weekend in my ward but resources were diverted elsewhere. I believe that was the army, I don’t know that it was Council. But then my next question is always, well what happens next? That’s where they’re unable to tell me.

I don’t think that South Region has any extra staff allocated to them at this point. I don’t think they have a budget for flood recovery allocated to them at this point. I don’t know that they have the necessary staff to do what they’ve got to do. They looked like—when I met with them last week—and I’ve not bothered them because we’re not supposed to bother our everyday officers in an emergency. That’s not our role. I did go to the initial training 11 years ago and I definitely tried to stay away from them.

But we are now in the recovery phase and I’m not seeing the resources on the ground. This is just parks. I’ve got people screaming at me about stormwater, broken drains, roads. There’s a huge clean-up effort here and it’s not just my ward, it’s every ward in this city has some kind of—well not quite every—but it’s a widespread incident in Brisbane.

What concerns me today is that this Council is focused on business operations as normal. Now I know there must be Councillors on the other side of the Chamber like Councillor GRIFFITHS and myself who are—and Councillor SRI who are concerned about what’s happening and the fact that we need to make sure that there is a clear accountability and a transparent path to making sure that recovery happens.

That is not happening at the top and by the top I mean the LORD MAYOR, the DEPUTY MAYOR and the CEO of Brisbane City Council. If he can’t get back to me within three weeks with a response to a request to set up a committee to make sure that we can direct all these enquiries into a common point where they can be answered, then that would be great. The Head of South region today told me the LDCC has been stood down. My office is telling me no, we’re still getting sitrep reports. I don’t even know if the LDCC is still going.

So, as I said earlier today, I found it fascinating to pull out the memo from Councillor de Wit. Again, now the LORD MAYOR’s back in the Chamber, Brisbane City Council flooded in January 2011. On the 30 June 2011 the All Party Ward Committee that was set up to deal with flood recovery was stood down. So it operated for a good five months after the floods. I don’t know why—and as I said, it was not perfect. But at least we had somewhere where we could go. We knew that there would be answers to our questions. We knew that we could say well what’s happening with this? What’s happening with that?

We’re dealing with Council officers who up until now probably didn’t even know that they had jobs. That restructure’s been going on through all of this. There’s been a huge amount of change within the organisation at an operational level. I respect the hard work that these officers have done. I’ve spoken to so many of them. Whether they’re at the Darra Depot or in the Parks team, the Rapid Response guys. I mean I’ve seen them on the street every day talking to them. They know—and the waste teams—they know that they have my support.

But what I want to see from this Administration is a coordinated response that is well resourced. That has clear lines of accountability and that when we say we’re going to go into five parks and we’re going to start cleaning them up, i.e. take the rubbish out of the parks and take the poo off the parks. Because they’re all covered in sewage in my area. That we see that happen.

We should have a plan underway by now and it will take months. I’m not expecting that it’s going to be cleaned up tomorrow. I’ve been through this before and I know how long it takes. Finding this memo was massively instructive because even in the memo from Councillor de Wit, she’s saying if you have flood recovery issues that still need to be addressed, contact blah, blah, blah. So this is an ongoing process and I don’t think that Council necessarily gets that.

So I’ll just finish by saying I do thank all of the operational Council officers who worked very hard during the floods. They absolutely know who they are and I feel confident that my staff and I have worked with them very cooperatively over the last three and a half weeks. But what I want to see happen from today is a clear structure for making sure that the recovery in our local areas happens. We cannot have this, the LORD MAYOR is going to announce something that we may or may not find out about. That we might have to read about on his Twitter.

*Councillor interjecting****.***

Councillor JOHNSTON: There needs to be very clear advice. Well, Councillor COOK’s saying she can’t. But we need very clear advice about what’s—

*Councillor interjecting****.***

Councillor JOHNSTON: —going to happen.

Deputy Chair: Sorry, Councillor JOHNSTON your time has ended. Thank you.

 Further speakers?

 DEPUTY MAYOR.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Thank you. Look, I just need to stand and speak to this report. Because I am continually misrepresented by Councillor JOHNSTON and I know she left early last week and didn’t hear the rest of my speech. But I will say it again.

*Councillor interjecting****.***

DEPUTY MAYOR: I sent out an email very clearly during that week, not to give you extra work, not to get anything that you hadn’t sent into LDCC. But to really make sure that the team in Council that were making sure that we got the people on the ground where we needed them, had all the latest information. That we absolutely knew—and you didn’t need to put a street number. A street would have been the same and you would have seen those columns.

It may have been clean up, it may have been pick up. It may have been hose out. It may have been—and we hear the muttering over there again. She doesn’t like the answer so she just keeps misrepresenting me. It was there to help.

*Councillor interjecting****.***

DEPUTY MAYOR: It was done as help. Every other person in this place read it like that. Didn’t need to send back a narky email, said thank you very much, here’s my information and I thank the rest of the Chamber for their understanding and their support. So we can help the people recover, rather than continue to winge about how it was done, and get on with the business.

*Councillors interjecting****.***

Deputy Chair: Thank you DEPUTY MAYOR.

 Are there any further speakers?

*Councillor interjecting****.***

Deputy Chair: I see none rising.

 Councillor MARX, right of reply.

Councillor MARX: Thank you, Mr Deputy Chair. Just to address a couple of issues there. So Councillor SRI is absolutely correct, the LORD MAYOR did make the commitment that people would not be fined of parking their cars out on the street because of their flood affected basements. One thing we make no apology for though, it’s got to be about safety. So if cars—and this is not a free for all. So cars can’t sort of—they drive their car off somewhere and then come back and go oh, she’ll be right, I’ll just park it there I’m not going to get a fine. We need to make sure safety is absolute number one priority.

I will ground truth for the Council officers about the warning versus a fine, but safety, as always, is a priority. As I said, it’s not a free for all. Which is what the actual illegal dumping is now turning into, it’s turning into a free for all. So to answer Councillor JOHNSTON’s—some of your questions, queries, issues that you’re having as far as staff out on the ground goes.

We have officers who are going out and they’re basically driving every street to confirm where there is rubbish. They are picking up that rubbish, they are taking photographic evidence that those streets are clean, they go back the next day and there is more out there. So this is seriously people taking the proverbial and just taking officers’ time away from getting into the parks and cleaning up.

Because again LORD MAYOR made the commitment no one would be left behind. So if you have flood affected items and you put them out on the footpath, they will be picked up. But people seriously now are now just taking advantage of that and they are just taking it as a chance to clean their house out whether they were flood affected or not and putting it on the footpath. That behaviour is not acceptable.

We’ve had situations where they are also illegally dumping in parks. Councillor MACKAY’s got one in an equestrian centre. Councillor OWEN very aptly was able to catch someone on a video, a truck literally unloading stuff on to the side of the road. That kind of behaviour is not acceptable and will not be accepted. We will definitely pick up flood affected waste. But anyone else, if you’re continuing to put stuff outside that is not flood affected, we will not—it will not be tolerated. I will absolutely have no problem in asking officers if they can investigate those situations of illegal dumping.

So again, we want to just make sure—we want to clean up the flood affected stuff and then we can get officers back on to the ground and fixing up the parks and stuff like that. There is a plan for park fixing, PPI have done a complete assessment of all of that. That assessment has now gone to the infrastructure owners who are working through a plan to get that sort of stuff sorted. But again, I ask any Councillor if you have any concerns of stuff that you’re not getting dealt with in what you consider is a timely manner, you have my number, you have my email. Feel free to pick up the phone. Thank you.

Deputy Chair: Thank you Councillor MARX.

 We will now put the City Standards report of Tuesday 15th.

Upon being submitted to the Chamber, the motion for the adoption of the report of the City Standards Committee was declared **carried** on the voices.

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

Councillor Kim Marx (Civic Cabinet Chair), Councillor Steven Toomey (Deputy Chair), and Councillors Greg Adermann, Peter Cumming, Sarah Hutton and Nicole Johnston.

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – COMPLIANCE AND REGULATORY SERVICES BRANCH CONTRIBUTION TO FLOOD RECOVERY

**560/2021-22**

1. The A/Manager, Compliance and Regulatory Services, Lifestyle and Community Services, attended the meeting to provide an update on Compliance and Regulatory Services’ contribution to the 2022 flood recovery. She provided the information below.

2. The City Standards Committee noted the Compliance and Regulatory Services (CARS) Community value statement: The role of CARS is to contribute to the health, safety and amenity of Brisbane through a range of licensing and regulatory services related to environmental health, land use, built environment, animal management, asset use and the natural environment. This is done by providing best practice regulatory services that contribute positively to the quality and lifestyle of the city.

3. In the event of a disaster, CARS officers provide essential and critical services. Throughout the disaster response to the 2022 flood, CARS officers have also provided support to the Local Disaster Coordination Centre (LDCC) including their requests for on-ground support and to evacuation centres.

4. The primary purpose of Council’s Rapid Response Group (RRG) during a disaster is to provide the LDCC with timely and accurate field-gathered intelligence to enable the LDCC to make informed decisions regarding flood response and resourcing requirements. Between Saturday 26 February and Monday 7 March 2022, 2,585 Rapid Damage Reports (RDR’s) were completed. RRG work with internal and external agencies and stakeholders including:

- Queensland Police Services (QPS)

- traffic controllers

- contractors

- SES

- business owners

- residents

- Councillors.

5. To support food businesses impacted by the flood event, a factsheet was prepared and translated into five key languages and emailed to more than 5,800 Brisbane businesses. Specialist officers were available during the weekend following the flood event to assist business owners with their flood recovery efforts, with a specialised food business hotline established to provide advice and assistance.

6. Council has continued to respond to reports of safety issues resulting from flood damaged structures. Council officers have responded to enquiries from residents and business regarding:

- stormwater drainage

- unsafe retaining walls and fences

- footway hazard obstructions

- unsafe structure incidents related to land subsidence

- unsafe structures

- damaged pool fencing.

7. During the disaster. there were increased reports of emergency surrendered dogs and stray and wandering dogs with capacity peaked at 92 dogs on Saturday 5 March 2022. Council’s Animal Services team is working with evacuation centre residents to offer emergency kennelling for pets while pet owners transition from an evacuation centre to alternative accommodation. During the flood response, the team has provided support to the Animal Welfare League Qld regarding reports of animal aggression, as well as the Ipswich City Council. Council provided emergency kennelling and care for two dangerous dogs and 15 cats.

8. CARS has received 21 requests to respond to hazardous flood affected vehicles and has been working with the LDCC to coordinate a process to assess such vehicles which may be deemed abandoned, and potentially require relocation.

9. During the flood response, RRG has also provided support alongside the Australian Defence Force (ADF). RRG was the first point of contact for the Regis Nursing Home, Yeronga, and identified a safe evacuation route. Further, the RRG identified that a flood affected supported living facility in Wilston Court, Wilston required urgent assistance, and immediately escalated this matter via the LDCC, which enabled support services to be provided. RRG also assisted facilitating delivery of goods by helicopter to people in flood affected areas within Wacol.

10. Following a number of questions from the Committee, the Civic Cabinet Chair thanked Manager for her informative presentation.

11. **RECOMMENDATION:**

 **THAT COUNCIL NOTE THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THE ABOVE REPORT.**

**ADOPTED**

Deputy Chair: Councillor LANDERS.

### COMMUNITY, ARTS AND NIGHTTIME ECONOMY COMMITTEE

Councillor Sandy LANDERS, Deputy Chair of the Community, Arts and Nighttime Economy Committee, moved, seconded by the DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Krista ADAMS, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 15 March 2022, be adopted.

Deputy Chair: Councillor LANDERS.

Councillor LANDERS: Thank you, Chair. I would like to express my thanks to the Inclusive Communities Manager, who gave us a great presentation on the work done by our Accessible Brisbane team across Brisbane. Within the presentation we heard about facts and statistics regarding accessibility in Brisbane and about the Inclusive Brisbane Plan. The Inclusive Brisbane Plan was developed by the Access and Inclusion team to guide Council’s provision of accessible facilities, navigation and wayfinding signage. Strategic advice and auditing community engagement and partnerships and programs.

 The committee was shown a variety of different types of accessible infrastructure including upgrades such as accessible car parking bays, safe drop off zones, improved entrances. Step free access paths, accessible and ambulant toilets and ramps and design principles that influence the movement of people through an area.

 The committee heard about a positive example of the collaboration between Council and our community facilities tenants. Such as the Wellers Hills Bowls Club who have gone from strength to strength after the implementation of accessibility upgrades at their facility.

In addition, we also heard about some of the other examples of improvements to the accessibility of Brisbane. Through work on projects like the Victoria Park *Barrambin* Vision, navigation and wayfinding upgrades across the city and other Council initiatives such as our Council Cab service. It was a very informative presentation and I’ll leave further debate to the Chamber.

Deputy Chair: Thank you Councillor LANDERS.

 Is there any further debate? I notice backbencher Billie had something to say during that report.

Upon being submitted to the Chamber, the motion for the adoption of the report of the Community, Arts and Nighttime Economy Committee was declared **carried** on the voices.

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

Councillor Vicki Howard (Civic Cabinet Chair), Councillor Sandy Landers (Deputy Chair), and Councillors Peter Cumming, Steve Griffiths, James Mackay and Steven Toomey.

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – ACCESSIBLE BRISBANE

**561/2021-22**

1. The Inclusive Communities Manager, Connected Communities, Lifestyle and Community Services, attended the meeting to provide an update on Accessible Brisbane. She provided the information below.

2. The Australian Bureau of Statistics released the following figures in 2016 regarding accessibility in Brisbane:

- one in five people have a disability

- 10% of residents are carers

- Brisbane has an ageing population

- disability increases with age

- 30% of Brisbane’s population need accessible infrastructure.

3. In 2019, Council released *A City for Everyone: Inclusive Brisbane Plan 2019-2029* (the plan), to guide the implementation of legislation, standards and strategies influencing the provision of accessibility services and infrastructure. These include the *Disability Discrimination Act 1992*, Australian Standards regarding buildings, education and transport, and the *Queensland Human Rights Act 2019*. The plan was developed by the Access and Inclusion team to guide Council’s provision of accessible facilities, navigation and wayfinding signage, strategic advice and auditing, community engagement, and partnerships and programs.

4. The Committee was shown images of ‘typical’ accessible infrastructure, which include accessible car parking bays, safe drop-off zones, improved entrances, step-free access paths, accessible and ambulant toilets and ramps, and factors influencing the movement of people through an area.

5. To date, Council has installed 14 accessible adult change facilities at 12 locations. Specialist equipment including a change bench, hoists and showers have also been installed at these facilities to ensure an equitable end-to-end user experience. Since 2012, the accessible adult change facilities Council has installed have exceeded minimum requirements.

6. Council is working to deliver accessible facilities with 51 accessibility projects and upgrades that have been delivered since 2018, totalling $23.8 million. This has enhanced the accessibility of these venues and their capacity to attract bookings and patrons. Stakeholder and community engagement has been an important factor in the success of the upgrades.

7. The Committee was provided information of accessibility improvements at Wellers Hill Bowls Club (the Club). Before its upgrade, the Club was curious about providing disability services, however, the venue was not accessibility compliant. Membership numbers were declining and, therefore, the Club was financially unsustainable. However, since the installation of infrastructure to make the Club all-ability compliant, the Club has had a 600% increase in membership and a 500% increase in revenue.

8. The Accessibility and Inclusion team has been involved in the development of the *Victoria Park Vision.* The team also contributes to accessibility upgrade projects across Council through project working groups, public space audits, design reviews, and the development of equal access solutions.

9. Navigation and wayfinding improvements have been installed, including 490 tactile street signs in the CBD and other targeted locations. After a trial period, the first official tactile street signs were rolled out in 2011 and they have been delivered in batches annually since that time.

10. Council provides approximately 651 Council Cab services per week, servicing 189 suburbs and localities to 54 destinations. The Council Cab service, which currently has 3,688 registered users, helps reduce social isolation and assists users to access essential services. Pre-pandemic, Council Cabs was operating at approximately 50,000 one-way bookings per year. Usage has fluctuated over the last two years, with vulnerable residents voluntarily self-isolating and minimising their trips to shopping centres when their perception of risk was high. For the year ending 30 June 2021, 31,000 one-way bookings were made.

11. Following a number of questions from the Committee, the Civic Cabinet Chair thanked the Inclusive Communities Manager for her informative presentation.

12. **RECOMMENDATION:**

 **THAT COUNCIL NOTE THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THE ABOVE REPORT.**

**ADOPTED**

Deputy Chair: Councillor CUNNINGHAM, Finance and City Governance Committee please.

### FINANCE AND CITY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

Councillor Fiona CUNNINGHAM, Civic Cabinet Chair of the Finance and City Governance Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Steven HUANG, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 15 March 2022, be adopted.

Deputy Chair: Councillor CUNNINGHAM you have the call.

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: Thank you, Mr Deputy Chair. Last week our committee presentation was bout the Rates Relief Package. Can I acknowledge Councillor HUANG for stepping in for me last week while I was very unwell. As a reminder to all in the Chamber, this package involves a $250 rates rebate for flood affected properties and access, of course, to a generous due date extension and payment plans. In addition, across the city, all residential rate notices have been postponed by a month. This will allow residents to receive the rebate on their next notice.

*At that time, 5.17pm, the Chair, Councillor David McLACHLAN, resumed the Chair.*

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: I would like to highlight though for all Councillors. That while residents have until 15 June to apply, they should apply by the 22 April if they want to receive the rebate on their next notice. Otherwise it will be applied to the notice after that. On a positive note I can advise the Chamber nearly 3,000 online applications have already been received for the rebate and we hope that all eligible residents across Brisbane will apply. I do encourage you to encourage your residents to apply.

 In addition to information available online, on social media and in last week’s *Living in Brisbane*. We also notify ratepayers of the ability to secure this rebate with their next rates notice when they receive that in the post or via email. I hope all Councillors will continue to promote this policy with residents and businesses who were affected, Mr Chair, we also had the regular Bank and Investment report and I’ll leave the rest to the Chamber.

Chair: No debate?

 We’ll now move the Finance Committee report.

Upon being submitted to the Chamber, the motion for the adoption of the Finance and City Governance Committee was declared **carried** on the voices.

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

Councillor Steven Huang (A/Civic Cabinet Chair), and Councillors Angela Owen, Jonathan Sri and Charles Strunk.

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE:**

Councillors Fiona Cunningham (Civic Cabinet Chair) and Lisa Atwood.

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – FLOOD RATES RELIEF

**562/2021-22**

1. The Revenue Manager, Support Services Centre, Organisational Services, attended the meeting to provide an update on flood rates relief. She provided the information below.

2. A range of rates relief initiatives are available to support Brisbane ratepayers affected by the recent severe weather. These include:

 - a flood recovery package providing a $250 rebate on the next rates bill

 - postponement of the April quarter 2021-22 rates notice

 - rates payment extensions and payment plans.

3. To be eligible for the rates relief initiatives, applicants must be property owners as at 26 February 2022. Council records must show the property is located within a flood-affected area, or ratepayers can provide other evidence of significant inundation or rainfall damage, such as photos showing property inundation or damage, or an insurance report. For Community Title Scheme (CTS) properties, all owners within a flood-affected CTS property will be eligible for the rebate. Vacant land or land owned by any government will not be eligible.

4. Applications submitted by 22 April 2022, will receive the rebate in the rates account in late April or early May 2022. Applications submitted between 22 April and 15 June 2022, will receive the rebate in the first rates account for the 2022‑23 financial year. Eligible ratepayers can apply by phoning Council’s 24-hour Contact Centre on (07) 3403 8888 or online at www.brisbane.qld.gov.au. Applications for the rebate are open until 15 June 2022. The Committee was shown images of the online application form for the flood relief rebate and advised of the requirements to submit an application.

5. In addition to these measures, the last rates account for the 2021-22 financial year will be postponed by four weeks, with rates notices being issued in late April to early May 2022, instead of late March to early April 2022. This does not apply to commercial rates notices as these have already been issued. Ratepayers impacted by severe weather and facing financial difficulties can also access payment plans or apply for payment extensions.

6. Following a number of questions from the Committee, the A/Civic Cabinet Chair thanked the Revenue Manager for her informative presentation.

7. **RECOMMENDATION:**

 **THAT COUNCIL NOTE THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THE ABOVE REPORT.**

**ADOPTED**

#### B COMMITTEE REPORT – BANK AND INVESTMENT REPORT – JANUARY 2022

 **134/695/317/1228**

**563/2021-22**

8. The Chief Financial Officer, Organisational Services, provided an overview of Council’s petty cash, bank account and cash investment position as at January 2022.

9. Page 1 of the report (submitted on file) outlines Council’s cash and investments with financial counter parties as recorded in Council’s financial systems.

10. The increase of cash and investments of $44.8 million in January was based on Council’s business activities during the period and largely due to:

- Receipts:

- receipts of commercial rates consistent with the usual quarterly rates billing cycle

- monthly receipts from TransLink

- increase in Swiss Francs (CHF) bank account balance due to receipts from Brisbane Metro hedge settlements for upcoming CHF invoice payments.

- Partially offset by:

- quarterly Emergency Management Levy

- decrease in the QIC (Queensland Investment Corporation) investment due to adverse markets movements in the value of the investment.

11. Explanation of the significant items include:

- Cash at Bank in Australian Dollars:

- transactional banking account with CBA – this is Council’s operational bank account for receipts and payments for day-to-day transactions in Australian Dollars

- the variance between the balance as per the General Ledger and the balance as per bank statements relates to timing differences in recognition.

- Swiss Francs Bank Account – AUD Equivalent:

- AUD equivalent of CHF held in a CBA account which is solely used for Brisbane Metro project hedge settlements and invoice payments in Swiss Francs.

- Cash investments:

- surplus cash is invested with QTC (Queensland Treasury Corporation) for higher rates of interest

- the variance between the balance as per the General Ledger and the balance as per the investment statements relates to the accrued interests and fees which have not yet been processed to the bank statement.

- QIC Investment:

- the QIC investment account is set up to provide asset backing for Council’s self‑managed insurance Fund (SMIF).

12. Page 2 of the report (submitted on file) outlines the cash investments as recorded in the financial counter parties’ statements and provides a high-level explanation of variance between Council financial systems records and the financial counter party statements.

13. The variance for the period is due to accruals of interest and fees not yet recorded in the bank statements and timing of transactions processed. These are normal variances due to the timing of transactions and information received.

14. Page 3 of the report (submitted on file) includes amounts held by Council in trust as well as petty cash balances. The trust amounts are largely associated with monies held for infrastructure development commitments.

15. Trust balances decreased $2.2 million to $25.2 million due to lower receipts than payments in the month. These are normal fluctuations of the funds from month to month.

16. Page 4 of the report (submitted on file) includes a reconciliation of the CBA bank account between Council’s financial records and the CBA statement. The majority of unreconciled bank transactions at the end of the period have since been reconciled.

17. In addition, the Swiss bank account movements during the period are disclosed.

18. Page 5 of the report (submitted on file) details the movement in trust balances and the reconciliation with trust ledger and statements.

19. The variance between the trust ledger and the investment balance is due to the timing of transfers processed to ensure the required funds are held outside of Council’s transactional bank account. These are normal variances and fluctuate from month to month.

20. Page 6 of the report (submitted on file) details the petty cash balances and movement during the month.

21. All relevant general ledger accounts were reconciled and analysed.

22. **RECOMMENDATION:**

 **THAT THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THE REPORT**, as submitted on file, **BE NOTED.**

**ADOPTED**

Chair: Councillors I draw your attention to a notice of motion of item 6A.

## CONSIDERATION OF NOTIFIED MOTION – BACKFLOW VALVES:

*(Notified motions are printed as supplied and are not edited)*

**564/2021-22**

The Chair, Councillor David McLACHLAN, then drew the Councillors’ attention to the notified motion listed on the agenda, and called on Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON to move the motion. Accordingly, Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON moved, seconded by Councillor Kara COOK, that—

*This Council urgently builds all backflow valves identified in the 2012 AECOM report commissioned by Brisbane City Council following the January 2011 floods.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: Thank you. You’re not going to read it out? Okay, just start, righto.

 Thank you. I’ve put this motion on the agenda again today because it’s 11 years since the 2011 floods. Following those floods, Council undertook an independent review of what happened and there were a number of recommendations that came out of that review. The recommendation that came out of the review—and I’ve brought some of those original documents with me, they actually sit—and have always sat—directly behind my desk and I reach for them quite often.

 So, the recommendation was that Council investigate the feasibility of the installation of devices to prevent backflow from the river flooding in locations such as parts of the CBD and in high rise buildings which would not have been flooded otherwise, where all those potentially affected by backflow flooding have responsibility for oversight and maintenance of the device in working order.

 There’s a number of then responses to that by Council and that was to undertake a range of technical studies, gather data, undertake a review. Now, out of that, came the AECOM review; now this is just the summary of the AECOM review. For many years, it was on the Brisbane City Council website—and I don’t know if you can still find it on the Brisbane City Council website—and Council also used to publish information about what it had done with respect to the backflow valves.

 These documents are something that I refer to on a regular basis, and—as all Councillors in this place know—every year since the floods, I’ve moved a motion at budget time—and other times—asking for backflow valves to be funded. It was pretty sad—I think Councillor DAVIS’ comments earlier today and the LORD MAYOR’S last week—that they think that the amount of funding being put into drainage in this city is adequate. $24 million is a drop in the bucket, that’s less than Council spends on marketing in Brisbane; it is just appalling that we’re not seeing more money spent on essential drainage.

 Now, part of that, is how we respond to flooding in the city and this flood absolutely was different to last time; it included river flooding, creek flooding, backflow flooding and flash flooding. The stormwater that charges up—the water that charges up the stormwater drains causes untold misery to people, it comes in advance of any river or creek flooding, so it cuts people off and it’s unexpected. People are looking for what is happening with the river, they’re listening to messages about the river and all the while—because they’re in a low point—the water is silently creeping up, where you can’t see it, until it’s too late and it spreads out and cuts them off.

 It isolates communities; I’ve got quite a few areas in my ward where this is a problem, along with other aspects of flooding. Now, the very detailed response to the Council report that AECOM undertook—Max Winders was the hydrologist—is quite extensive; it identified 51 different locations around the city where backflow valves would be useful. Now, in some of those locations, multiple devices would be required. Now, I remember all of the debate about all of this, at the time Council substantially underestimated how much these devices would cost and some of them ended up—they thought they would be maybe $100,000, $200,000; the ones down at Paddington—in Paddington Ward, in New Farm and those areas—cost millions.

So, Council probably had a set budget in mind for this and they spent it, they blew it up front on some of the big ticket ones. Now, of the 51 locations that were identified, I think there’s about 20 that have actually been done and that does include some in my ward. So, for example, backflow valves have been installed in parts of Chelmer and parts of Tennyson but there are numerous parts of my ward that have not received the backflow valves. Now, that includes further locations in Chelmer, further locations in Graceville, further locations in Tennyson—the suburb—multiple locations in Yeronga and Fairfield.

So, I still have numerous suburbs where these backflow valves were recommended 11 or 10 years ago now—10 years ago—by expert hydrologists, where Council has simply not done them. Now, it gets worse than that because—again, everybody in this Chamber has heard me bang on about this—every time we do infrastructure lists for this city—in the PIP (Priority Infrastructure Plan), in the LGIP, in all of these documents—all the drainage priorities for the city are listed.

 Every single backflow device location in my ward—and I think it’s all of them in this report—were delisted from Council’s Priority Infrastructure Plan and then the Local Government Infrastructure Plan, so they’re not actually listed anywhere for Council to deliver. It’s a few years ago now where when I asked questions in information sessions about this, we were told, they’re on the same list with all the other ordinary stormwater drainage that needs to be done across the city. We know that there is a significant underinvestment in stormwater drainage in this city and if Councillor DAVIS thinks that this Council is funding stormwater drainage appropriately then she has rocks in her head.

 I’ve just sent a letter to the CEO today, a man went to Council 18 months ago complaining about a broken stormwater drain in Yeerongpilly, it’s still not been fixed. Now, he didn’t come to me initially, he went to the call centre, after 18 months of trying to get Council to fix a drain with tree roots growing through it, he’s come to me. Now, I don’t know, this has just happened this morning. So, I know that there are other locations in my ward that have been sitting on the infrastructure list for years and years to get proper stormwater improvements and upgrades, including in Yeronga.

 But what is the problem here? It is that experts undertook a review into flood mitigation that would assist this city and part of that was backflow valves. Further technical reports were done, there were public consultation sessions, the hydrologists went out into the community and attended community meetings that I went to, it was really great. The hydrologists talked to residents about what to do and I know the residents who contact Council frequently—and me frequently—were at these meetings. They were out in the suburbs, there were some in Jamboree, there were some in my area, they were all over the city.

Council actually did a good body of work here with professional hydrologists, but it’s just never finished the job. To my estimate, there are about 30 of these locations around the city that have not been completed. There is no plan to fund and complete them. There must be one. We cannot ignore the lessons of 2011, we cannot ignore the recommendations of the independent review of 2011 and we cannot ignore the expert advice of the hydrologists that say that these backflow valves can offer protection to residents in certain parts of the city.

Now, I don’t want to leave—as I say every time—residents with the idea that backflow valves will stop flooding; they don’t, they only stop a type of flooding. In parts of Graceville—in Giraween Park where it flooded again very badly just three weeks ago—there is no backflow device that has been installed. I am certain that a backflow device in this area—which is quite isolated—would have prevented significant flooding from occurring at that location. There may have been some river flooding right at the end, but it would have been lower than the backflow flooding that occurred out of the major drain in Giraween Park that flooded the surrounding streets in Graceville.

Right through this document, there are maps and lists of where homes could be protected. Brisbane City Council has now—for 11 years—not followed through and delivered on the report that was issued and that were recommended by independent engineers. I don’t think that we can continue to ignore it. I appreciate that Councillor COOK has taken up this issue as part of the response to the floods in her area. Her area has had some but—like mine—there are still many others that would be useful, but what I will say is that this Council has given itself a pat on the back, written completed next to this recommendation but not delivered on the outcomes in the report.

That is not good behaviour by this Council. It is something, obviously, that will form part of my recommendations to Justice de Jersey, the failure of Council to do it should not be overlooked and it is essential now that we agree that installing all the recommended backflow valves forms part of the response in 2011. This should never be ignored.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, your time has expired.

 Thank you.

 Councillor COOK, are you speaking as a seconder? No, you’re not speaking. No?

Councillor COOK: Okay. Thank you, Mr Chair. I speak in support of this motion before us today. Mr Chair, this motion is about basic Council infrastructure—backflow devices—infrastructure that should have been built over a decade ago, as we have heard from Councillor JOHNSTON today. This LNP Administration has been in power, as we know, for a very long time—too long in my view—and their track record when it comes to the installation of backflow devices in our city is abysmal.

 Mr Chair, we know the locations, we know they are feasible—we have had experts tell us so over 10 years ago—yet the lack of care and consideration for the flood impacted residents in this city is appalling, by the LORD MAYOR Adrian SCHRINNER, and his entire LNP team. Mr Chair, when this LNP Council have been criticised about their lack of action on backflow devices—particularly in my area—their response has been—and we heard from Councillor DAVIS—oh well, it was only 10 people who those devices would have benefitted. Ten people.

I’m not sure if anyone on the other side of the Chamber—perhaps with the exception of Councillor WINES who has resided in my area—has actually visited Lindsay Street in Hawthorne, but I can assure this Chamber that that location alone, that number 10 is absolutely farcical. There are around 30 properties—not people, 30 properties—with impact from backflow flooding in that one location alone in Hawthorne. Mr Chair, the question, I think, for this Council is, why have those residents and their properties not been prioritised by this LNP Administration?

Why did these residents—who have seen mud and water and the loss of property not once, not twice, three times over the flood event, in the days leading up to the major event and also in the following days—get left behind by this Council? They pay their rates, they have a reasonable expectation for basic services but, yet again, they’ve been ignored. Mr Chair, in my local area back in 2013 many residents pleaded with the then Lord Mayor Graham Quirk—and I’ve seen the letters and the emails—to prioritise the installation of these devices.

They also petitioned Council at the time; empty promises were made—they have letters that they’ve shown me from Council promising these devices were going to be installed—but zero delivery. In the last week, once again, we’ve seen over 150 residents—so far—sign my petition calling on this Council to not only review the use of backflow devices in my local area and install the devices that were feasible back in 2012, which is what this motion again calls for today. Today is this Council’s opportunity to finish the job. That’s what Councillor JOHNSTON wants. Do the right thing and finish the job for the people of the city.

Mr Chair, residents are right to question what went wrong in this flooding event and why this LNP Council failed—yet again—to deliver basic infrastructure for our city and they failed to learn the lessons of 2011. The Morningside Ward has one of the highest number of development applications in the city, yet we are not seeing the flow of those infrastructure charges into basic services like backflow devices. Instead, this LNP Administration would prefer to spend rate payer funds on their shameless self-promotion, telling residents what they already knew in the week following the flood event.

They sent out *Living in Brisbane* at a cost of over $100,000, money that could have been spent on backflow devices. I have no doubt that the LNP want to crow about the devices that they have installed in a handful of locations, and they have installed some but not all. If we have a really close look at where those devices were installed—particularly in the last couple of years—those facts are absolutely shocking. In the last financial year, does anyone have any idea how many backflow devices were installed in our entire city?

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor COOK: A hundred? Fifty?

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor COOK: Twenty?

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor COOK: Ten?

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor COOK: One. One backflow device in Victoria Street, Windsor. How about the current financial year, the 2021-22 financial year? Any other guesses?

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor COOK: One. One again. Walton Street in Dutton Park. So, from a $3.6 billion budget we’ve had one device in 2020-21 and one device in the current financial year. That’s just appalling, there’s no excuse for that level of neglect and there is absolutely no one else to blame, the LNP have been in power the entire time; there has been zero political will to install this basic infrastructure of the people in the city. So, today—or tonight—Labor will be supporting this motion and we thank the Councillor for Tennyson—Councillor JOHNSTON—for bringing this motion and also for being such a strong advocate in this place for her local community, not just today but over the last 10 years.

 Throughout this flood event she has worked tirelessly to stick up for her local community and not once has this LNP controlled Council acknowledged her efforts. Instead, they call the police on her; they call the police on her and now there’s laughter from that side of the Chamber.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor COOK: That’s a funny thing, that someone comes into this place with good intentions—to advocate for their community—and they call the police. So, Councillor JOHNSTON, thank you for your advocacy when it comes to backflow devices, not just today but consistently over the last 10 years. Labor actually values your contribution in this place—and I know your residents do as well—so I encourage all Councillors in this place to support this motion today.

Councillor interjects.

Chair: Thank you.

 Further speakers?

 DEPUTY MAYOR.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair, and I stand to speak on this motion, and I was going to give Councillor COOK the benefit of the doubt of being—the wool pulled over her eyes by Councillor JOHNSTON but after those blatant falsehoods we just heard, I’m not quite so sure, but you know, don’t let the truth get in the way of a good story for anyone on that side of the Chamber.

 I wanted to start on speaking to this motion about putting some facts on the table. The 2012 AECOM report listed, yes, all the sites that backflow devices were feasible to be installed in Brisbane, that is could physically, feasibly be installed in Brisbane. The comprehensive list did not clarify between whether they protected residential properties or not but where they could be feasibly, physically installed, and here is the difference. This is an argument that Councillor JOHNSTON has been pushing up the hill for the last 10 years, but it is also poor and reckless financial management to think that we would build every one of these backflow devices.

 In today’s dollars, Commercial Road, Teneriffe, roughly about $6 million. How many residential properties would that protect? Let’s use one of their terms, donuts. $10 million roughly in Montague Road and Mollison Street, West End. How many residential properties?

*Councillors interjecting.*

DEPUTY MAYOR: Donuts. Even $1 million in Brougham Street, Fairfield. No residential properties would be protected from the overland flow like what we saw last week or from backflow devices. That is not value for money.

*Councillor interjecting.*

DEPUTY MAYOR: But I need to say that every one of those listed in the AECOM report in 2012 were very carefully reviewed and considered by hydrological engineers—Mr Winders and those with the expertise beyond Mr Winders—before we went through the list of those we completed, in the highest priorities for the largest number of properties, to get the value of money for the ratepayers of Brisbane, and we make no apologies for not considering that.

 However, we do recognise that there are backflow devices listed on this report where flooding still happened last weekend—well two weeks ago, sorry, a couple of weeks ago now, it’s all a blur, it feels like it was last weekend, but it was actually three weeks ago. In particular, the one in Councillor COOK’s—oh, she’s not even here to hear, surprise surprise.

*Councillors interjecting.*

DEPUTY MAYOR: Oh, sorry, Councillor COOK, I didn’t see you down there. In particular, Lindsay Street—oh for goodness sakes Councillor CASSIDY, I’ll take your interjection. Screams at me, but if I say one thing about Councillor COOK, look out. Pot, kettle, black.

*Councillor interjecting.*

DEPUTY MAYOR: But, in particular, Lindsay Street at Hawthorne was the one that was bought in the paper on Saturday and was mentioned. We need to remember just because a street is right beside the river and you live close to the river, not every event is the same and not every flooding—even if you’re near a river—is from the river. There’s also streets that are in very low points of residential areas in the terrain—I have a ward that is nowhere near a river and got a lot of flooding and just because you were beside the river didn’t mean you got a river flooding.

 I listened very carefully to Councillor COOK and she did say the flooding happened on the Saturday and the flooding happened on the Sunday; the river hadn’t risen yet. I’m not a hydrological engineer but it sounds like overland flow to me. So, Councillor COOK, I believe that you may have seconded the motion without truly considering the financial ramifications and I don’t think any of us in this room are hydrological engineers but moving to install every backflow device that is in that list is just not feasible. It’s a sloppy motion—to say the very least—not carefully considered but backs up the barrow that we hear Councillor JOHNSTON’s been pushing for 10 years.

 I did hear Councillor COOK, again, say, we want a review, and for that reason I’m happy to give her exactly as she mentioned in her speech with an amendment.

|  |
| --- |
| **565/2021-22**It was moved by the DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Krista ADAMS, seconded by Councillor Sandy LANDERS that the notified motion be **amended** by the removal and insertion of such words so that the motion would read as follows.That:*This Council urgently reassesses all backflow valves identified in the 2012 AECOM report commissioned by Brisbane City Council following the January 2011 floods. Further, recommits to not installing backflow valves where the installation would not provide any benefit to homeowners.* |

Chair: Thank you.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, Mr Chairman. The motion before us today is very simple, it states that we should build the backflow valves recommended in the AECOM 2012 report. The amendment that Councillor ADAMS is seeking to move, substantially changes the nature of that motion by saying they should not be built, that is the opposite of what is in the motion that I have moved. So, Mr Chairman, I would ask that you rule it out of order because it changes the nature of the motion before us today.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Have you given me a copy of the amended motion?

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Thank you, Councillor JOHNSTON. The debate is about the backflow valves identified in the 2012 AECOM report, the proposed amendment continues to have that as the primary purpose of the motion, that is to look at the consequences of that AECOM report and subsequent potential for them to be installed. I don’t believe this alters the substantive motion.

Councillor SRI: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Councillor SRI, point of order.

Councillor SRI: I really do feel this amendment does significantly change the motion. Are you sure you wouldn’t like a five-minute recess to seek legal advice on this, because this is a very substantial change to the notified motion.

Chair: No, I’m confident—

Councillor SRI: It fundamentally changes the—

Chair: I’m confident in that ruling, thank you Councillor SRI.

|  |
| --- |
| **566/2021-22**Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON moved, seconded by Councillor Kara COOK, that the Chair’s ruling be dissented from. Upon being submitted to the Chamber, the motion of dissent was declared **lost** on the voices. |

Thereupon, Councillors Nicole JOHNSTON and Jonathan SRI immediately rose and called for a division, which resulted in the motion being declared **lost.**

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 7 - The Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Jared CASSIDY, and Councillors Kara COOK, Peter CUMMING, Steve GRIFFITHS, Charles STRUNK, Jonathan SRI and Nicole JOHNSTON.

NOES: 18 - The DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Krista ADAMS, and Councillors Greg ADERMANN, Adam ALLAN, Lisa ATWOOD, Fiona CUNNINGHAM, Tracy DAVIS, Fiona HAMMOND, Steven HUANG, Sarah HUTTON, Sandy LANDERS, James MACKAY, Kim MARX, Peter MATIC, David McLACHLAN, Ryan MURPHY, Angela OWEN, Steven TOOMEY and Andrew WINES.

Chair: DEPUTY MAYOR, to the amended motion.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Thank you. I’ll be very brief and it’s really clear it’s not about changing the intent; I think the intent here of the motion is very clear. We need to see if, again on this event—which is very different to 2011—that backflow devices would have made a difference. As I said, none of us in this room are hydrological engineers, there was two very different types of flooding during this event as well, and that needs to be reconsidered and reassessed.

 But we do want to make it clear that our focus and our priority is always about protecting residential properties and that’s what this amended is about.

Chair: Thank you.

 Speakers to the amended motion?

 Councillor MATIC?

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: This is the amendment.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON : This is the amendment.

Chair: We’re speaking to the amended motion, aren’t we? So, speaking to the amendment motion, yes.

 Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: All right. Yes, I’m speaking to the amendment proposed by Councillor ADAMS, and I do not support the amendment that she has put through. When a motion is put forward to install all of the backflow valves recommended in 2012—and the amendment says that they should not be installed—that is the opposite of what the motion says. Now, normally that should be ruled out of order, but that’s not the decision here—that’ll be a decision for others—but let me be clear about these things that Councillor ADAMS has said.

 She claims that somehow, I’m engaged in some sort of poor and reckless financial management by suggesting that the ratepayers—

DEPUTY MAYOR: Point of order, Mr Chair.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Claim to be misrepresented.

Chair: Thank you, noted.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: I’ll write it down. So, Councillor ADAMS says that I’ve been engaged by pushing these back—by pushing—

DEPUTY MAYOR: Point of order, Mr Chair.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Pushing up the hill.

Chair: Point of order, DEPUTY MAYOR.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Claim to be misrepresented.

Chair: Noted.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: I know. I wrote them all down. So, let’s be clear, that Councillor ADAMS has stated today that putting in these backflow valves would be poor and reckless financial management—

DEPUTY MAYOR: That’s what I said.

Councillor JOHNSTON: —and that I’ve been pushing them up a hill for a decade. Let’s be clear, that Councillor ADAMS and the LNP Councillors here today don’t believe that the residents of my ward and Councillor COOK’s wards and others in Brisbane are worth it.

Chair: Point of order, DEPUTY MAYOR.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Claim to be misrepresented.

Chair: Thank you.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Councillor ADAMS and the LNP don’t believe that money should be spent on the recommended—

DEPUTY MAYOR: Point of order, Mr Chair.

Chair: Point of order DEPUTY—

DEPUTY MAYOR: Claim to be misrepresented.

Chair: Okay, thank you.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Councillor ADAMS and the LNP have made it very clear today that they don’t believe money should be spent on installing the backflow valves that were recommended by the independent AECOM report in 2012. She has—

DEPUTY MAYOR: Point of order, Mr Chair.

Chair: Point of order, DEPUTY MAYOR.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Claim to be misrepresented.

Councillor JOHNSTON: She has made it very, very clear today that she does not believe that they should be installed and in fact she’s moving an amendment motion saying they should not be installed.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Point of order, Mr Chair.

Chair: Point of order, DEPUTY—

DEPUTY MAYOR: Claim to be misrepresented.

Chair: Thank you, DEPUTY MAYOR, I think we get the point.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, you have the floor.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: The ignorance of Councillor ADAMS’ debate on the substantive motion today about the impact of flooding and how backflow flooding happens was quite astonishing. The river does not need to break its banks for backflow flooding to occur. When the creek is high in my ward it charges up the stormwater drains and causes flooding, when the tributaries are high it causes flooding, when the river is high but not broken the banks, the actual outlets for the stormwater—which are much lower than the top of the bank—fill up with water and the water goes up. It ends up in Seng Street, in White Street, in Vivian Street, in Lancelot Street, in Brougham Street, in Fairfield Street.

It ends up all over my ward. It happens before the river floods. Before. What happens is that roads are cut, people cannot evacuate because they are flooded, they cannot get their cars out, they cannot get themselves out and they cannot get their household items out because they are trapped in by backflow flooding. That is what happened in 2011 in many parts of my ward and that is what happened again in 2022. Now, in this independent report—that Councillor ADAMS doesn’t think needs to be done—are maps of every single one of these locations, they demonstrate how houses can be saved from backflow flooding and I’m holding up the one for Giraween Park in Graceville.

Now, I’ve read some media reports from Councillor COOK’s area with residents saying they are considering a class action. I say, good on them, I hope they do it. I hope every single resident in this city thinks about what they can do to hold this Council to account for its neglect and mismanagement—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: —of a recommended outcome for flood mitigation in this city. Now, Councillor ADAMS claims, oh we’re not hydrologists; no, you’re not. The people who are the hydrologists recommended the outcomes that we are talking about today, not me—not me—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: —not Councillor COOK, not Councillor ADAMS; independent engineers recommended these devices.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: I don’t think we should ignore them. I’ve never thought we should ignore them and for a decade I’ve been doing it—or as Councillor ADAMS likes to call it, trying to push it up hill—well, I have been, that’s without question. Now Councillor ADAMS also says that the rest of these valves that they’re not doing can’t be feasibly and physically installed.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Point of order, Mr Chair.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor ADAMS.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Claim to be misrepresented.

Chair: Noted.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Let me be clear that all the valves that have been feasibly and physically installed have been done, the others can’t be done.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Point of order, Mr Chair.

Councillor JOHNSTON: That’s what she said.

Chair: Point of order.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Claim to be misrepresented.

Chair: Noted.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor MACKAY, please, no interjecting.

 Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Just keeping a tally of how many, just in case if I say have made one point of order—and the police came in and removed me—whether or not the eight or 10 that the DEPUTY MAYOR has made would contemplate ejection, but you know. Councillor MCLACHLAN do you have a view on that?

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, please, to the amended motion before you, to the amendment.

Councillor JOHNSTON: You’re digging yourself a very big hole when you treat me differently to you treat her.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: You’re just eroding your time for the debate.

Councillor JOHNSTON: I am holding up the map for Graceville. Let me be clear, these houses that flooded catastrophically in 1974, in 2011 and in 2020 expected Council to take action. The reports were done, the recommendations were made, the technical studies were done. When it came to delivering on the recommendations, the LNP Administration has failed to do so, and Councillor ADAMS has made it very clear today that she doesn’t think that the residents of this city are worth it.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Point of order, Mr Chair.

Councillor JOHNSTON: It’s too expensive.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Could you please ask her to refrain from that. I am being polite in my point of orders but that is false, claim to be misrepresented.

Chair: Again, noted.

Councillor JOHNSTON: I think every single one of these locations should be installed, engineers spent a lot of time and effort doing them. It will help protect our road network so that emergency responders can get to people who need to be evacuated, it will ensure that our road network is open for people to evacuate themselves and their household possessions and their loved ones, it will ensure that we have safe routes out of my ward. We do not have them now and backflow flooding is a big contributor to them in my area and in many other parts of the city.

 Again, this is not just my ward, this is across the city that these should be delivered.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: So, the amendment being put forward by Councillor ADAMS today is trying to stop the installation of backflow valves and—very clearly—Councillor ADAMS has outlined her reasons today for doing that. She doesn’t think they’re needed, she doesn’t believe they can be feasibly or physically installed, and she doesn’t believe that they are financially responsible; she’s made it very, very clear. Councillor ADAMS knows better than the independent engineers. Well, I’ll just say this. Week after week I’m criticised in this place for having an opinion and the most common criticism of that opinion is, I think I know better than the Council officers.

 Well in this case, the Council officers have agreed to the recommendations of the flood report, this Council agreed to the recommendations of the flood report, the independent engineers conducted a review and made recommendations that elaborated and detailed a response to the recommendation to install these backflow valves, and the hydrologists went out and spoke with our community and added community feedback into the process for backflow valves. Let me be clear, every single one of them was the same; we should do this because it will protect property, it will protect people, it will provide access for emergency purposes.

 These backflow valves have a critical role to play in flood mitigation and they are not the only solution, but they are a critical component of it.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: For a decade, the LNP Administration has ignored these recommendations. They did a few at the beginning—and certainly I appreciate the ones that I’ve had done, and certainly I look forward to the review that Justice de Jersey is doing, and it includes the backflow valves—but the fact that this Administration has not completed the job is not good enough and now they don’t want to do it at all.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor JOHNSTON.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Your misrepresentation, DEPUTY MAYOR, there were several.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Yes. I got five. Councillor JOHNSTON said that I said, you are engaged in poor and reckless financial management, I did not, I said building them all would be. You said that I said your residents were not worth spending money on. I did not say that, I said I understood exactly the pain that people were going through and that’s why we want to reassess them all. Believes they should not be built, no, I did not say that, I said, only if there is no benefit for them.

 She said that I said the others couldn’t be done, I did not say that, I said, only if they’re financially feasible. She said that I said, residents were not worth it, I did not say that, I said we do need to review this, every event is different and that’s why we’ll be reassessing every one of these.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

Chair: Thank you. Point of order, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Claim to be misrepresented.

Chair: Okay, do you want to deal with that now, Councillor JOHNSTON?

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes. Councillor ADAMS has stated that I said she stated that residents weren’t worth it. I didn’t say that’s what Councillor ADAMS said, that’s what I say about what she has done—

Councillor MURPHY: Point of order, Chair, this is ludicrous.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor MURPHY: By the way, Chair, this is not what misrepresentation is for, it’s after a substantial speech, it’s not after a misrepresentation—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor MURPHY: —and I ask for your ruling on that, Chair, as a point of order.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: I think, Councillor JOHNSTON, you concluded your claim of misrepresentation.

 Councillor SRI, to the amendment.

Councillor SRI: Thanks, Chair.

Councillor LANDERS: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor LANDERS.

|  |
| --- |
| **567/2021-22**At that point, 6pm, it was resolved on the motion of Councillor Sandy LANDERS, seconded by Councillor Sarah HUTTON, that the meeting adjourn for a period of one hour, to commence only when all Councillors had vacated the Chamber and the doors had been locked. |

Thereupon, Councillors Jonathan SRI and Nicole JOHNSTON immediately rose and called for a division, which resulted in the motion being declared **carried**.

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 18 - The DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Krista ADAMS, and Councillors Greg ADERMANN, Adam ALLAN, Lisa ATWOOD, Fiona CUNNINGHAM, Tracy DAVIS, Fiona HAMMOND, Steven HUANG, Sarah HUTTON, Sandy LANDERS, James MACKAY, Kim MARX, Peter MATIC, David McLACHLAN, Ryan MURPHY, Angela OWEN, Steven TOOMEY and Andrew WINES.

NOES: 6 - Councillors Kara COOK, Peter CUMMING, Steve GRIFFITHS, Charles STRUNK, Jonathan SRI and Nicole JOHNSTON.

Council stood adjourned at 6.07pm.

**UPON RESUMPTION**:

Chair: Thank you, Councillors, further speakers to the amendment?

 Councillor SRI.

Councillor SRI: Thanks, Chair. I rise to speak on the amendment to the motion. I must say I was much more supportive of the original motion. I think the amendment that has been proposed really does fundamentally change the meaning and intention and spirit of what the Councillors have brought to the table.

I might speak at greater length about the backflow devices when we’re actually speaking on the amended motion, but just to this amendment itself I think Councillor ADAMS has done us all a bit of a disservice by using and introducing wording which I think is quite ambiguous. The lack of clarity actually causes more confusion.

She’s used the term, would not provide any benefit to homeowners. That terminology I think is vague and troubling because—and I don’t want to put words in Councillor ADAMS’ mouth—I think what was intended here was to say, would not install backflow valves where there they would not reduce the risk of flooding to a residential home.

But it’s actually the case that even if backflow devices are installed that don’t prevent flooding to homes, they can still benefit homeowners by keeping open road access, by reducing impacts on other infrastructure, by preventing flooding to other services and facilities. So, I think that particular piece of this amendment—I don’t think it reflects well on Councillor ADAMS and I think it undermines the good intentions of the original motion.

I’m on board with the idea of reassessing backflow valves rather than full on committing to installing every single one of them. I see the logic of that, and in fact if that was the only part of the motion that had been amended, I would probably have still supported it. But this amendment of saying, we will not install backflow valves where they don’t provide any benefit to homeowners, leaves us in a little bit of a grey area.

It would be good for Councillor ADAMS to clarify whether she actually means that she doesn’t want to install backflow valves that don’t prevent flooding to homes—is that her intention here? Or is the intention of this amendment that she’s brought simply to say, we don’t want to install backflow valves that don’t provide any benefits at all?

I think even the backflow valves that don’t prevent flooding to specific homes do still provide a benefit to homeowners, and so the thrust of her motion seems to defeat her own intentions in that we would still be able to install backflow valves that don’t prevent flooding to homes under this construction of the words before us.

I think it’s a little disappointing that she’s muddied the waters with a hastily drafted and poorly thought through amendment. For that reason, I would prefer if we didn’t debate this amendment. I’ll flag down the track I’ll move an amendment to the amended motion when it comes to that point.

I did want to for the time-being pick up on that point that Councillor JOHNSTON ably made, which was that the backflow valves that are proposed to be installed across the city aren’t just about preventing flooding to homes. I hope this is something that the relevant Councillors will reflect on more deeply and engage with in future. Perhaps Councillors who are still here in a few years and are dealing with the longer-term ramifications of poor planning and inadequate infrastructure will be more amenable to thinking deeply about this issue than some of the Councillors who are checked out and aren’t going to have to deal with these long‑term problems.

But the simple fact is that a lot of this flooding that comes up through stormwater drains, whether or not it floods homes and whether or not it severely impacts residential properties, it still has quite significant impacts on road surfaces and on footpaths in terms of introducing a lot of muddy water to low-lying areas. I think this is something that in particular through you, Chair, Councillor ADAMS has completely missed the point on.

I think she probably just hasn’t had time to think about it deeply because she’s so busy, but when you think about the fact that these mid‑level floods that the backflow devices are designed to stop are going to become more and more frequent in the future—which means that we could end up in a situation where every other summer all these low‑lying areas are flooding via the stormwater drains dumping mud, and often it’s contaminated mud that contains faecal matter, on to low-lying streets that results in those streets being closed off, that results in disruptions to the road network that costs Council a lot of money in terms of clean‑up, *et cetera*.

So, it really becomes a question of, how often do we think these floods are likely to happen? How many times do we want to have our officers out there cleaning up the mess and dealing with the infrastructure damage of repeated stormwater drain based flooding? That I think is something that the Councillors from the Administration in their attempts to have this—maybe they’ve got good intentions of doing this rigorous cost-benefit analysis, but they’ve missed the point here that flooding, whether or not it impacts homes, still impacts our roads.

 I’ve seen, particularly in my electorate, a lot of damage to roads in terms of cracks to the bitumen and potholes and all that sort of stuff where maybe homes on that street weren’t particularly heavily affected but certainly the street itself is. The costs of resurfacing roads now are really climbing. It costs tens of thousands of dollars to resurface even those smaller residential streets.

 I want to draw Councillor MARX’s attention to this, because I know her officers have to deal with this a lot. If you’re thinking about the cost-benefit analysis of installing some of these backflow valves, you shouldn’t just be saying, the backflow valve costs a million dollars and there are four properties that it would prevent flooding to, therefore it’s not worth the million dollars.

You also need to be thinking about the value of the public infrastructure that’s detrimentally affected by this and think about, if flooding is going to cause more frequent and faster damage to these road surface, whether or not homes are affected, you still want to reduce that frequency of flooding.

 I don’t think the Council Administration has given enough detailed thought to this. I don’t think the cost-benefit analysis has been rigorous enough in simply concluding, some of these sites aren’t worth doing. I’ll speak at greater length about this when we get to the motion itself, but I really do feel like the Council—I don’t know what the thinking was here—but maybe in trying to get one over Councillor JOHNSTON has actually snookered itself, because this line of recommitting to not installing backflow valves where the installation would not provide any benefit to homeowners misses the point that we can benefit homeowners even if all we’re doing is stopping flooding of their streets and footpaths.

 I don’t want to live in a city where pooey water is washed on to the footpath every other summer. That is to me what the value of these backflow valves is, even if they’re not seen as preventing flooding to a whole bunch of residential homes. They still have value.

 In terms of this amendment, I’m happy with the change to re‑assess. I don’t think it’s ideal but I could live with that. I certainly don’t support that second sentence that’s been tagged on there, and I would encourage the Administration to consider rewording it to something that offers a little more clarity.

 I also personally object to the use of the term homeowners. I think we should be using resident because whether they’re renters or they own the home I think is largely irrelevant. In my ward, almost everyone who was made homeless and displaced was a renter, and I would hate for a situation where the use of the term homeowner is seen as implying that we don’t worry at all about the rental properties, we only worry about the owner/occupier properties.

 There are a lot of investors who when their homes get flooded to be honest are a little bit chuffed, because they get an insurance payout; they get an excuse to kick out some low-income tenants; they renovate; they put the rent up. They’re barely negatively affected by flooding.

 I don’t want to generalise. I’m not saying this is all investor/owners. But there have been quite a few who, to be honest, were almost pleased because the insurance payout came at a time that will allow them to renovate. I’d rather see a framing in this motion that also recognises that renters themselves are going to be quite severely and detrimentally impacted by this flooding in the future. I’ll speak on that at greater length when we get to the motion itself.

Chair: Thanks, Councillor SRI.

 Further speakers on the amendment?

 Councillor ADAMS.

Councillor ADAMS: Thank you, Mr Chair. I will take Councillor SRI’s comments on board and make it very clear that we are talking about residential homes, homeowners, whether it’s the home you live in or the home that you have as an investment. We are talking about properties and where water enters people’s properties, not necessarily just yard flooding, definitely not street flooding.

 People before roads. People before parks. That’s what we are talking about, and that will be the priority. But we would like to re‑assess all of these in light of the very different event that we’ve had in the last month.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor ADAMS.

 I now move the amendment.

The Chair put the motion for the amendment to the notified motion to the Chamber resulting in it being declared **carried** on the voices.

Thereupon, Councillors Peter CUMMING and Jonathan SRI immediately rose and called for a division, which resulted in the motion being declared **carried**.

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 17 - The DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Krista ADAMS, and Councillors Greg ADERMANN, Adam ALLAN, Lisa ATWOOD, Fiona CUNNINGHAM, Tracy DAVIS, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Sarah HUTTON, Sandy LANDERS, James MACKAY, Kim MARX, Peter MATIC, David McLACHLAN, Angela OWEN, Steven TOOMEY and Andrew WINES.

NOES: 7 - The Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Jared CASSIDY, and Councillors Kara COOK, Peter CUMMING, Steve GRIFFITHS, Charles STRUNK, Jonathan SRI and Nicole JOHNSTON.

Chair: Councillors, the debate now is on the amended motion.

 Councillor MATIC.

Councillor MATIC: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I rise to speak in support of the amended motion on a topic that is very important to all the residents of our city and the Councillors in this Chamber. It’s interesting listening to the debate today. It reminds me very much of the discussion we had in this Chamber in 2011 when we first had the debate about backflow devices, the subsequent report that was undertaken by then Lord Mayor Graham Quirk, and then back to the Chamber with the recommendations and the debate that existed in the Chamber at that particular time.

 There are many elements of the debate at those times that are reflected here today. We’ve had a catastrophic event through our city that has affected many people, and so backflow devices understandably have come to this Chamber again for discussion. We’ve listened to Councillor JOHNSTON speak on this matter, and there are many issues that she’s raised here that she’s raised previously in regards to those backflow devices. But it is important to understand the background to all of that and the recommendations that came from it.

 At the time that we had the 2011 flood, there was significant talk within the media, the public and in the government, not only at local but state level, about the effectiveness of backflow devices. There was much debate at the time as to what their effect would be, whether it would be beneficial or whether it would be in certain storm events even more detrimental, because as all Councillors in this Chamber know, Mr Chairman, every storm event, every flood event is different. 1974 was different to 2011, was different in my ward to 2012, 2015, 2016 and 2022. In other parts of the city, the effect that it had in The Gap, for example, in 2007, was completely different to the subsequent event in 2008.

So, the debate in the Chamber was: what would these backflow devices do for our city? We had the Emeritus Professor undertake the review, and recommendations were made from that, and as Councillor JOHNSTON rightly said, there are a number of feasible sites. Councillor ADAMS clearly stated what was in the report. The locations that were suggested were potentially feasible. Obviously, there had been no detailed design done at the time. There couldn’t be. But they were opportunities open to Council to consider.

Even when we brought the debate into the Chamber, there was still the discussion of whether these backflow devices would be effective in every event, and the answer was, unequivocally, no. That was made very clear by the LORD MAYOR, by the report, and importantly to the community.

Mr Chairman, you were there at the time. The LORD MAYOR was there at the time. What was important and clarified to all the people of Brisbane was that the backflow devices were not the ultimate solution, that every storm event was different, that every flooding event that occurred would be different. So, to have one device to answer all problems would not be possible.

What was important in that conversation was the reiteration of that fact that we are a flood-prone city. We have flooded and we will flood in the future. As such, the things that we do to assist our residents and protect our city are not about flood immunity but they are about mitigation.

That was what the backflow devices at the time were about, the potential for mitigation under certain circumstances. We made sure as an Administration that message was told quite clearly to the community, to the Insurance Council, to other levels of government, to anyone that was—to the REIQ (Real Estate Institute of Queensland), to all the stakeholders out there that this was not the magic bullet but under certain circumstances it could provide assistance.

What happened from that point onwards, Mr Chairman, as you know, is that the officers undertook that undertaking within that report of looking at the priorities across the city, looking for the best value for all residents in being able to find those locations, and that was what was done.

There was no one that was ignored in that report. The officers undertook that investigation to get the best outcome for as many people as possible. The reality of that is that it actually occurred. Councillors opposite have called this, the LNP Administration made these choices; the LNP Administration chose to ignore. The fact of the matter is that is clearly not the case.

There were backflow devices installed in a number of wards on both sides of this Chamber, and that investigation was undertaken by officers for the best outcome, and the priority was at that time for residential dwellings. Whether you were an owner or whether you were a renter, it didn’t matter. The priority was for residential dwellings. The secondary benefit was for businesses and other property owners within that precinct.

That was the position that was taken and was consistently taken throughout that whole period. As such, we’ve seen the benefit of those in varying effects in the 2022 flood. My ward, like some other wards, was significantly affected, Mr Chair. The backflow device at Milton Drain was closed at those key points within those events on Saturday and Sunday, and I stood there in those local streets and I watched the water rise.

We had 1100mm in six days. It’s more rain that we have in a year. It’s more rain that we had in the 1974 flood. It’s definitely more rain that we had in 2011. In 2011, while we were helping all our residents out in our local streets, the sky was blue and the sun was out, and we were all getting sunburnt. But that event was about the river, and backflow devices, Mr Chairman, are about overland flow and storms, storms that overwhelm so that when that water comes down and the tide rises, the backflow device is there to stop the river flowing back in. But it does nothing to mitigate the rainfall capacity.

I saw streets within my own ward fill, and all kinds of brown, pooey water and other stuff came up, and it had nothing to do with the river. The backflow device did nothing to stop that from occurring. I had more areas in the ward flooded in this flood than in 2011. The spread was wider, the impact more significant, and yet the backflow devices worked.

From a local community perspective those residents understood that, but it didn’t take away from their loss. It didn’t take away from their pain. The debate that we have here tonight is not just about installing every device that’s in that report. As Councillor ADAMS clearly said, there are locations in that report with no residents, no businesses, no one. Should we have to build a device in a location that has no benefit for a person as opposed to sacrificing it for someone else?

That’s why this amendment is so important. We do need to have a re‑evaluation of that report. We need to assess against the results of what happened in 2022. We need to continue to prioritise our homeowners and renters, because that was always the priority and we would expect that to be the case.

Mr Chairman, it’s important moving forwards that when we have this debate we make it clear not only here, but whatever comes out of this debate and to the general public, that a backflow device in and of itself is not the magic bullet solution to all of your flooding problems.

You will still flood in an excessive rain event. Your local areas will still flood. Your low-lying areas will still flood. The pipes will back up. Stuff will come out of the drain. People’s homes will be impacted. Businesses will be impacted. None of that is going to change. What we’re talking about is mitigation. We’re not talking about flood immunity.

It’s important when we look at this and when we debate this that we continue to consider the importance of the evaluation by officers for the benefit of the city as a whole. These are not political decisions that are made here. These are decisions made by qualified engineers and professional people to get the best value we can.

But irrespective of that, the conversation has to be and always will be about those backflow devices and what they truly prove to be at the end of the day. I think it’s important for all of us in this place—and when we speak to all of our residents—that we clearly explain to them the significant rain event that we had, the fact that it was so large that no matter of drainage could support the capacity of it, and ultimately that with a backflow device there you would still have got localised flooding, there is no escape from that reality.

When we look at these things we need to look at them from that perspective, not the general perspective of, somehow this would not happen. It will happen. It would have happened. Every situation will be different. As we assess these backflow devices moving forwards and the decisions that come from that, we need to be in a place where we continue to be honest and open with our residents about what backflow devices actually achieve so that they don’t live under some delusion that they are now flood‑immune, because that would be the wrong thing moving forwards.

When Councillors opposite speak about this, then speak about it in those terms, because that is the reality, Mr Chairman. We need to move forwards to help our society as much as we can.

Chair: Councillor MATIC, your time has expired.

 Further speakers?

 Councillor SRI.

Councillor SRI: Thanks, Chair. I welcome the debate on this motion. For anyone who is following along at home and struggling to understand, basically backflow valves stop water rising back up through stormwater drains during flood events. I don’t want to oversimplify it but it is important, as Councillor MATIC identified, for residents to understand that if there is heavy rain falling within a catchment a backflow valve can’t necessarily be closed, because that will stop water draining away from that local area. In fact, sometimes closing the valves in those contexts can worsen localised flooding because the stormwater has nowhere to go.

 Similarly, if the river is particularly high and it bursts its bank, then it doesn’t really matter whether the stormwater drain is closed to backflowing water because the water is coming over the top of the riverbank anyway. What we’ve seen in the most recent flood in 2022, there were quite a few sites around the city where backflow valves would have done pretty much nothing to prevent flooding. As I’ve already explained to a few residents in my ward, there are a few areas where backflow devices had to be left open in order to allow stormwater to flow out.

 I think Councillor MATIC is right that we need to be very cautious about not overstating the value of these devices or creating the false impression that they will magically stop flooding. I’ve obviously been very cynical of this high modernist engineering philosophy that says we can control nature through building dams and good drainage.

 At the end of the day, we built a city on a flood plain and the way to stop these sorts of natural disasters is to stop building in those areas. But there were a few parts of my ward in this most recent flood where the water did come up the stormwater drains and where the river did not burst its banks. So in those particular areas it does seem to be the case that had a backflow valve been installed, the water would not have come up the stormwater drain and homes would have been preserved from quite damaging flooding.

 We’re still mapping things at a more precise detail, but at the moment it looks like in some of those streets around the low side of West End where backflow valves were recommended but never installed, there were about 30 people—and I don’t want to exaggerate it, we think it’s about 30 people—who are now homeless due to flooding in their homes. It seems plausible that those homes would not have flooded to the same extent, or if at all, had there been a backflow valve on that drain.

 I am not an expert, I don’t want to make really strong claims about that, but I’ve looked at the mapping, I looked at where the water flowed, it definitely came up the drain and it was coming up the drain after the heavy rains had passed. So in that context, I think there is a strong case for arguing that they could have been preserved from flooding if the Council had made that decision. I would note that all of those people were renters as well, they were the lowest income residents of my electorate, who don’t have the luxury of being able to afford renovations and certainly don’t have the luxury of having another dwelling that they can move to once they’re made homeless by flooding.

 But to put the LNP Administration’s case as strongly as I can, it basically sounds like what the Administration has said is look, some of these devices may stop flooding of homes in some areas, in some contexts and some kinds of floods, but we’ve made a calculation that says the risk of flooding, the likely amount of damage does not justify the significant cost of installing those devices. In general terms I do see the logic of that, I accept the principle that if a device that mitigates flooding is so incredibly expensive and the likely damage and likely frequency of flooding is not particularly high, I am persuaded that there would be cases where it wouldn’t be economical or justified in terms of installing backflow devices.

 But the problem that the Administration is running up here against is that it has completely underestimated the frequency of these kinds of floods. I’m not necessarily talking about the very big floods where the river bursts its banks and these neighbourhoods would be flooded by that event anyway. I’m talking about what might be called those minor or moderate level floods where the water is coming up the stormwater drains and it would be prevented if backflow devices were in place. I want to highlight that in some of the areas around that low side of West End where Council elected not to install backflow devices, what it did was it counted the number of properties—and LORD MAYOR, I really hope you’re listening to this.

 Council counted the number of properties that were zoned for residential development and said okay, five properties zoned for residential development would be preserved from flooding, it’s not enough to justify the installation of a potentially $1 million device. But those properties zoned for residential development have been developed as medium density and high density residential towers now, or residential apartment blocks. So even though on a desktop analysis it looks like it might be one or two or three residential properties, each of those properties have dozens of residents now.

 It’s important to highlight that even in cases where the apartments themselves weren’t necessarily getting flooded, there was a lot of significant damage and hassle caused by the flooding of basement car parks. People lost their vehicles, they lost stuff that they had stored in those basements. I could go on about that side of things because I think the developers really stuffed up in terms of design. But the point is that just because living areas aren’t being flooded, just because bedrooms aren’t being flooded doesn’t mean that flood damage to these areas isn’t really significant.

 I am concerned that the LNP is focusing very closely on living areas and they’re saying we’re not as concerned about flooding to yards and we’re not as concerned about flooding that doesn’t make it up to the house. But I want to highlight that on some of these sites if floodwater is coming up the stormwater drain and flowing straight into a basement car park, that’s costing those property owners, those homeowners, thousands and thousands of dollars in clean-up costs, not to mention the significant property damage.

 So as I said earlier, in addition to those issues we’ve got the fact that flooding up stormwater drains also causes a lot of issues in terms of the safety of streets, the impact to that public infrastructure like roadways and footpaths and in particular, the introduction of contaminated water to some of these low-lying areas. So Councillor MATIC’s right, there are going to be times where these backflow devices don’t stop flooding and it’s a different kind of flood, or it’s too severe and they’re not going to work. But there are some flood events and in fact they’re probably the more frequent kinds of flood events, where these devices will indeed stop pooey water washing over our roads.

 LORD MAYOR, this is a calculation you have to make, because if you accept the old, outdated thinking that these kinds of floods only happen at a rate of one per cent or two per cent risk per year and you think the risk of these floods happening is only one per cent or two per cent per year, then you might conclude it’s not worth the money. But if you accept the argument—and I think it’s self-evident now that these floods are going to happen at a greater frequency than that and that the true risk of what was previously called a one in 100 years flood is probably getting up to more like three or four per cent per year as a result of global warming, then you have to recognise that these lower level floods, which are also going to become more frequent, could be happening every couple of years.

 I’m not trying to exaggerate this, I’m not saying that they’re going to happen every single summer, but the data and the science tells us that these kinds of floods are going to become much more common. Which means you’re going to have to be sending out officers to clean up these streets and clean up the mud and patch potholes every couple of years. Once you factor in that extra level of cost and disruption, it’s not just the trade-off of, do we spend $1 million on a backflow device to prevent a couple of thousand dollars of damage to a couple of thousand properties once every 20 years. It’s do we spend $1 million on a device that will stop a road getting inundated every other year and will stop and significantly reduce the clean-up bill that our officers are having to engage in.

 I think as well as that it’s important to consider the timelines that we’re evaluating here. Because if you’re only looking ahead over the next 10 or 20 years, then you’re underestimating the risk and you’re underestimating the total cost of damage that these backflow valve devices would prevent. But if you start looking out 50, 60, 70 years and adding up the total cost of damage that these devices would prevent over a 60 or 70 year hot timeline, then the quantum of damage is significantly higher. The cost of installing the device more or less stays the same, you only have to pay for it once to be installed.

 But if you’re casting your minds out to that 60 or 70-year timeframe and recognising that flooding is also going to become more frequent, then actually a rigorous cost benefit analysis would suggest that yes, they are going to be worth installing. That’s the thing I’d like the Mayor to answer, if he does speak on this, or another LNP Councillor, is when you undertook that assessment back in 2012 and said look, these aren’t worth installing, floods won’t happen that often, there’s only going to be this many floods over this many years and they’re only going to cause this much damage, therefore, it’s not worth the cost, how many years ahead were you looking?

 Were you looking ahead 50 or 60 years, as you should be as an elected representative and leader of this city? Or were you only looking ahead 10 or 20 years? Or were you in fact only looking ahead to the next couple of election cycles? That is a crucial distinction, because if we look ahead to the coming decades and over the coming century, the case for investing in this infrastructure now to prevent future damage is very strong and very clear.

Chair: Councillor SRI, your time has expired.

 Further speakers?

 LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Yes, thank you, Mr Chair. I’ve been listening very carefully to the debate on this item, both inside the Chamber and outside the Chamber remotely. I want to thank Councillors for their contribution. I particularly wanted to, I guess, draw or put some focus on things that were raised by both Councillor MATIC and also Councillor SRI. Because what we’re doing with this new amended motion is we’re making the decision to reassess the work that has previously been done. I think the best reason why we should be doing that is exactly what Councillor SRI just said. To go blindly and implement recommendations from a report in 2012 would be a very poor decision, an incredibly poor decision.

 We’ve already heard that a number of the backflow valves in that report did not protect any homes, did not protect any homes and some of them had an extraordinary expense. But there’s a number of things that have changed since 2012, nonetheless or not in the least, the cost. The cost in 2012, can I have a show of hands, anyone think that the cost in 2012 would still be the cost today? It’s likely to be either double or triple the cost in 2012 and that’s just the nature of escalating construction costs, particularly at the moment. So at the very least, that cost assessment needs to be updated, but other things have changed too. Councillor SRI made some good points in relation to the things that have changed.

 So what we’re simply saying is yes, we should go and we should reassess where backflow valves are suitable for. But we shouldn’t blindly go and implement a report from 2012, which is out of date and which hasn’t considered current events and certainly hasn’t considered current costs. So I think it is perfectly reasonable, this amendment that has been made and now accepted, because it is the sensible and right thing to do. It’s been interesting, Councillor MATIC referred to some examples in his ward and I also joined you at a couple of those areas.

 There’s been a number of, I guess, examples where people have said this is an example of a success story of a backflow valve in the 2022 flood. One of those was in Rosalie Village, the backflow valves were engaged, but guess what, Rosalie Village still flooded. It did not prevent Rosalie Village flooding. What happened here is a technical assessment was done by our flood engineers and they asked a very simple question, will the flood level in that area be higher with the backflow valve open or the backflow valve closed? That’s the assessment they did. If the answer was that the flood level would be lower with the backflow valve closed, then they closed the backflow valve. They’re not promising anyone that this will stop flooding.

 Councillor MATIC made a really clear argument on that point. This does not stop flooding. This is something that helps manage flooding, helps to mitigate flooding, but it does not cause flood immunity. So it was actually devastating to read some residents in Councillor COOK’s ward who had the mistaken belief that if a backflow valve had been installed and engaged, their property would not have flooded. That is not the case, that is simply not the case. It would be irresponsible of anyone in this Chamber to give them the false hope that their property would not have flooded if a backflow valve was built and engaged.

 This really is a management issue, it’s a mitigation issue, but it’s not something that can stop flooding. There are many different causes of flooding but we, when we engage the backflow valves—and that is something that’s based on very technical advice and modelling, it’s like which ones to switch on, when. It’s literally timed to a particular time to switch them on and switch them off based on that modelling. As I’ve said, really to simplify it, the question that is asked is will the flood level in that area be higher with the backflow valves closed or the backflow valves open? It’s not will we stop flooding altogether?

 Now it would be wonderful if they did that, if they could stop flooding altogether, that would be fantastic, that would be rolled out to every street of Brisbane. But that is a false hope and we should not be giving residents false hope in this situation. So as the leader of this city, I can say I am absolutely, absolutely willing to fund and build more backflow valves across Brisbane, but it must be built based on updated analysis and an updated assessment. Not on an old 2012 report which is well out of date and which had a list of projects, many of which did not provide any real benefits to residents or business.

Councillor SRI: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Point of order.

Councillor SRI: I’ve really appreciated this context from there, I wonder if the Mayor will take a quick question.

Chair: Will you take a question, LORD MAYOR?

LORD MAYOR: I appreciated your comments before, Councillor SRI, so I will take a question.

Councillor SRI: Thanks, through you, Chair, to the Mayor, the amended motion that’s now on the table says that we wouldn’t install backflow valves where they would not provide any benefit to homeowners. Are you concerned about the fact that there might be some areas where backflow valves would provide a benefit to businesses, but wouldn’t provide a benefit to residential properties? Don’t you think the motion could be broadened so that it doesn’t exclude backflow valves that provide a benefit to businesses but don’t provide a benefit to homes?

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: In any reassessment of where backflow valves are suitable for, that’s something that we’ll have a look at, businesses. As the most small business-friendly Council in Australia, that is something that we will take into consideration. But that amendment simply points out that a significant number of the backflow valves that weren’t built weren’t built because they provided no real benefit. That’s the position that led to the current 60-plus backflow valves being installed.

 But Councillor SRI, as I’m saying and as I’ve already said, my commitment is that we will reassess this and we will have a look now, based on what we know now, based on the new information that we will gather through this process, based on a new assessment, where are the suitable locations to install backflow valves. So we will do that, we will do that work, we will make that assessment and then we will make sure that funding is provided for a program for backflow valves. That’s what we’re saying today. We’re not saying no, we’re saying let’s do a new assessment. But we are certainly not doing the silliest thing that’s been proposed tonight, which is to build all the 2012 backflow valves.

 That is just silly, it is giving false hope and it is sometimes trying to solve a problem that doesn’t exist when it comes to no homes or businesses are being flooded in those areas. We’re going to invest significant money, we want there to be significant benefit and good to come out of it. That is what we should do as responsible custodians of ratepayers’ money. So I just again repeat, we will reassess the need for backflow valves in all parts of Brisbane where they might be used, we will update the costings and the modelling. We will take the advice of the experts and then we will implement a new program that continues to fund and support backflow valves. That’s what this motion is doing and that’s what we are committed to.

Chair: Thank you, LORD MAYOR.

 Further speakers?

 Councillor COOK.

Councillor COOK: Thank you, Mr Chair. I rise to speak on the amended motion. Where to start? In this place sometimes you listen to the debate that goes back and forwards and particularly the events over the last week, where this issue has been raised repeatedly in the media. I feel like in part the LNP Administration has been listening, because the reassessment of the AECOM locations has been raised certainly by myself, I’m sure Councillor JOHNSTON has raised it as well. That’s been raised multiple times over the past week, that we need to look at the impact that we saw in 2011, we need to look at the impact that we’ve seen in 2022 and do a comparative and have that analysis done by the experts.

 So finally, that’s exactly what the petition that my residents have been signing over the last seven days calls for, 150 people want this reassessment done in my local area. But what they also wanted was what was promised to them, so those two things go hand in hand. We’ve got this extraordinary position now where the LNP comes into this place and wants to—I guess they’ve been shown up for what they are, which is not listening to the experts. We have Councillor MATIC saying listen to the experts, but just not these ones.

 Then we have the LORD MAYOR saying people are providing false hope. I don’t know who is providing false hope when consistently every single Councillor on this side of the Chamber has been saying we know they don’t prevent flooding. We know that, but we know that they can mitigate the impacts of that flooding. So to say tonight that no one over on this side of the Chamber has discussed mitigation is just not true. That is all we’ve talked about, is asking for the mitigation that was promised to be done.

 Now we’re in a position where we do have this proposed amendment and I agree with the points that have been made by Councillor SRI and Councillor JOHNSTON around I do also have concerns about the second part of this motion, which is problematic. We only talk about homeowners, we don’t talk about the impact of roads being cut, the fact that there were residents in the city who couldn’t make it to the evacuation centres because the roads were cut. So there are going to be circumstances where backflow devices will benefit people who are not homeowners.

 But here we are tonight in the position where we need to vote on this proposed amendment and I wholeheartedly support the first part of the amendment and I know my fellow Labor Councillors do as well. But the second part of the amendment is problematic. So in the interests of looking at the best possible outcome, we will support the amendment because it is addressing the issues in part that we have been raising, particularly over the last week, on this issue.

 But I just think it’s a bit disingenuous, particularly from Councillor MATIC, some of his comments about that we’re delusional over this side, they’re just unnecessary. I think the LNP consistently over the last couple of weeks has called for there to be a bipartisan approach on some of these issues, but yet can’t help themselves. They come into this place and have a jab every single time. They can’t just admit that they did the wrong thing, that they made a mistake.

Councillor MATIC: Point of order, Mr Chair.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor MATIC.

Councillor MATIC: Claim to be misrepresented.

Chair: Noted.

Councillor COOK: Well, Councillor MATIC, I wrote it down. You used those words and I think the only person who has been delusional has been in making those comments about things that just haven’t been said by this side. Consistently we’ve been trying to assert the interests of our residents in protecting their properties and mitigating the risk, not extinguishing flooding altogether. So that’s disappointing.

 The other disappointing thing that we’ve heard from the LNP during this debate is consistent talk of best value. What is best value? Who is valued in this city? The comments from Councillor DAVIS previously on this issue around certain devices only benefiting 10 people, I mean they’re just plain wrong. They were the arguments that were used to discredit residents, particularly in my local area, who had genuine concerns.

 So we’ll be supporting the amended motion this evening, but I think it’s incredibly disappointing that week after week we have to come into this place and there is a real sense that at the end of the day, this LNP Administration knows that they have failed to deliver these devices. They know that residents have been impacted by flooding, that had they done their job wouldn’t have been impacted to the degree that they were. Here we are having to debate for hours something that simply should have been done. So, Mr Chair, we will be supporting the amended motion tonight, thank you.

Chair: Thanks, Councillor COOK.

 Point of misrepresentation for Councillor MATIC.

Councillor MATIC: Only a minor one, Mr Chairman, and that was that allegation that I called the ALP delusional. Well I did not, I was quite careful with my words.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor MATIC.

 Further speakers?

 Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, I rise to speak on the amended motion and I just want to put on the record what I actually moved and what it’s become. Firstly, the motion put forward today was that Council urgently builds all backflow valves identified in the 2012 AECOM report commissioned by Brisbane City Council following the January 2011 floods. Let’s be clear, the January 2011 floods actually happened. It’s not like they didn’t happen and that flooding never happened in 2011. A major flood happened in this city.

 There were recommendations and an outcome that was made and for the last decade this Administration has failed to implement the changes that were recommended. It’s not like this is the first time in a decade that this has been raised; it has been every single year, sometimes multiple times a year that I have brought motions to this place asking for Council to respond to the independent recommendations of the Council review and the independent report of the engineers saying what we should do to respond to the 2011 floods. Now it seems like the LNP want to wipe the slate clean, 2011 never happened, that’s old news, who cares about 2011? We’ve had 2020, fine, of course we’ve had 2020.

 I know that it is a term of reference in the current Council report that there will be a review of the backflow valves’ functionality and their operation as part of Justice de Jersey’s review. I write this motion with that in mind. I know that there will be a review going on. The LORD MAYOR has already done that, not that he sent it to us, I had to ask Justice de Jersey to send it to us. But that is what is going on behind the scenes already. What the LNP are trying to do here today is pretend that 2011 never happened, pretend that their failure to deliver on the recommendations of the independent report and the engineering reports done by AECOM were actually done. They were never done.

 Now let me be clear, what Councillor ADAMS is saying, we should urgently reassess all backflow valves identified in the 2012 AECOM report commissioned by Brisbane City Council following the January 2011 floods. 2022 was a different flood. It’s not that we reassess what happened in 2011 that needs to happen, it’s that we need to look at what happened in 2022 and build on what happened in 2011. The flood in 2022 doesn’t erase what happened in 2011, it was a different flood.

 When it floods again in 2028 or 2032, God help you all if that happens, it will flood again and it will be different. Every single time that there is a major natural disaster in this city, we should investigate, we should respond and we should follow through on the recommendations that come from that. Now what happened in 2011 is the LNP Administration did not do that and now they are pretending that 2011 did not happen. Councillor ADAMS just thinks oh, we should let that go. We’ve heard the LORD MAYOR here today and Councillor ADAMS talking about going blindly—

DEPUTY MAYOR: Point of order, Mr Chair.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor ADAMS.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Claim to be misrepresented.

Chair: Noted.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Oh, God. Going blindly, making poor decisions, all these kind of words from the LORD MAYOR. Let me be clear about this, 2011 happened. This Council did not do what it said it was going to do. We need to address the backflow valves that happened for all of the reasons that have been outlined here today. Residents in my area, their homes were flooded and this Administration did not put the backflow valves in that were promised in Graceville, in Chelmer, in Tennyson, in Yeronga and in Fairfield. That is disgraceful and they would have protected homes in these suburbs.

 Renters and homeowners and that’s the other appalling part of the motion that the DEPUTY MAYOR has put forward here before us today and the LORD MAYOR in his comments as well. It’s like oh, yes, we’ll just reassess all this, we don’t mean to exclude renters. That’s not what you’ve said in your motion, your motion is very specific. Unless the LORD MAYOR or the DEPUTY MAYOR drafted it on the back of an envelope, they’re very clear that they recommit not—let me be clear, it’s not grey language or a little bit we’ll hedge our bets and see what happens. But it says, recommits to not installing backflow valves where their installation would not provide any benefit to homeowners.

 Now Councillor SRI has outlined why the backflow valves are valuable in all parts of the city, so have I and so has Councillor COOK and I think them for their contributions to the debate today. But let me be very, very, very clear, the Justice de Jersey review is already looking at the impact of this flood and the operation of the backflow valves and whether more backflow valves are needed. That is critically important work that is already underway. No one is trying to stop that, I think that is a very good thing and I’ll be making a contribution to that review.

 But what the LORD MAYOR and the DEPUTY MAYOR are doing today is trying to erase 2011 from the consciousness of this city and talk about making blind decisions that somehow it didn’t happen and we don’t need to worry about what happened in 2011. Yes, we do, we need to worry about 2011, we need to worry about 1974. Every single time there’s a natural disaster it adds to our knowledge as a city. It should add to our response, it should add to the way in which we mitigate and address natural disasters as a city. The fact that the DEPUTY MAYOR and the LORD MAYOR want to erase our corporate knowledge and the actions that came out of 2011 is disgusting, in my view.

 Now let me be clear, the other thing here about what’s going on is that somehow I think that they’re trying to pretend that they’re doing something positive for backflow valves going forward. The LORD MAYOR said we’re going to have a look at that and we’ll act on the recommendations and we’ll fund the reports. Well let me be clear, 2011 they didn’t do it. There was a report, they did a little bit of it and then they stopped. They didn’t act on all the recommendations, they didn’t deliver on the report, they didn’t follow the experts’ advice.

 I have zero confidence that they’re going to do it again in 2022, because their track record as an LNP demonstrates very clearly that they failed to do it in 2011 and did not use the 2012 report to fund the backflow valves. So I am appalled at the LNP’s behaviour here today. Councillor MATIC, I wasn’t here last week when he went on a rant, but today’s was really odd as well. No one here today has stood up and said that somehow backflow valves stop flooding, no one, no one suggested that. I’ve never suggested that, no one I know has ever suggested that. They form part of a suite of measures that can help mitigate flooding in certain circumstances.

 They can be extremely useful and as I’ve outlined here today, they mean that there are clear evacuation paths for residents. They mean that emergency services can get in. They mean that residents might be able to get their cars and their possessions out prior to a flood, because the LORD MAYOR didn’t warn anybody there was a flood coming. On Saturday, when residents’ houses were flooding because of backflow and creek flooding in my area, there was no warning. The LORD MAYOR was down at Downey Park, watching the netball, that’s what he was doing. The rest of us were desperately telling the LDCC that there were houses being flooded around the city.

 So as far as I am concerned, if the LORD MAYOR is not going to issue warnings in a timely way, he’s go to invest in the infrastructure that’s needed to support mitigation of flooding in communities that I represent and around the city. I don’t just want it for me; I want it for every resident in this city. So I feel that the LORD MAYOR here is trying to erase 2011 inappropriately. If there is another flood that is similar to 2011, what, are we going to come back in 20 years or 40 years, someone will read my speech and go oh, geez, she knew what she was talking about.

 They’re not going to come back and say well, the LORD MAYOR said we should just forget 2011, because that’s what he’s pretty much talking about here today. I don’t think that the Administration has thought this amendment through. They’ve let the politics override their common sense. We need to address 2011 flood and we also need to address 2020 and the two are not mutually exclusive.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, your time has expired.

 Your point of misrepresentation, DEPUTY MAYOR.

DEPUTY MAYOR: I don’t think Councillor JOHNSTON listened to me, but I’m not surprised. We’re in furious agreement, 2011 is different to 2022 and it needs to be revised for exactly that reason. Not forgetting what happened in 2011.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor ADAMS.

 Further speakers?

 Councillor CUNNINGHAM.

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: Yes, thank you, Mr Chair. I rise to speak briefly on the motion. Now in last year’s Council budget debate, Councillor JOHNSTON said there’s no money for drainage in my ward and that is a quote from the minutes. Now as any Councillor who has read the budget would know, there are Tennyson Ward drainage projects listed in the Suburban Works program in black and white for all to see.

 But perhaps Councillor JOHNSTON was reflecting on what would happen if her and Councillor COOK got their wish. Because if we supported the original motion tonight, Councillors and funded every project in the AECOM report, there would be funding left for stormwater drainage projects. So under this approach, supported by Labor today, which is presumably now Labor policy that perhaps they’ll take to the election, we would have to spend every cent from the drainage budget and then some on backflow devices for riverside suburbs. We have clarified this matter several times before—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: —but once again, let me be clear, let me be clear, no, no, let me be clear about what the AECOM report was. It was not the Royal Commission into the floods, it was not a damning report into projects that needed to be urgently delivered. It was an engineering report that looked at every feasible project right across Brisbane. Not every urgent project, not every critical project; it was for literally any feasible opportunity for a backflow device. Councillor COOK, it was never a promise, but she seems to think it was.

 Now through the LORD MAYOR’s budget we invest millions every year in drainage projects and you know what, we need to be agnostic about the types of flooding that they prevent. Whether it’s river flooding and backflow flooding, creek flooding or overland flow, we need to assess the impact and prioritise the funding accordingly, based on flooding frequency, severity, the number of properties benefited and the cost to ratepayers. Councillor JOHNSTON and now Councillor COOK’s obsession with backflow device to the exclusion of all other drainage works is fundamentally flawed.

 We must be agnostic on drainage work type, we must look at the overall cost benefit. Of course Council will consider backflow prevention projects for future budgets and the LORD MAYOR has said that. It will certainly be considered as part of our independent review and as part of our recovery. We are built on a flood plain and we need to continue to improve our city’s resilience. We will need to calmly review, take on board the expert advice and prioritise the appropriate drainage works and prioritise the funding accordingly.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor CUNNINGHAM.

 Further speakers?

 Councillor DAVIS.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Just to raise an issue that I feel personally quite upset about. Councillor CUNNINGHAM’s mocking of my turn of phrase today, I think, is childish.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, this isn’t a point of order.

Councillor JOHNSTON: It is, it’s unsuitable meeting conduct to—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Go on.

Councillor JOHNSTON: It’s unsuitable meeting conduct to mock somebody like that and I don’t think it is appropriate that she does so. I could certainly do that to others and I am happy to have a robust debate about the issues, but to mock ‘let me be clear’ as a turn of phrase, like she did repeatedly there, is offensive to me and I would ask that it’s not done.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, this has been a very vigorous debate on all sides and including from yourself. I didn’t see any offence that you should take from those comments made by Councillor CUNNINGHAM.

 Further speakers?

 Councillor DAVIS.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order, Mr Chairman.

Chair: Point of order.

Councillor JOHNSTON: I am telling you that I took offence from her behaviour there earlier today.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor MACKAY, please.

Councillor JOHNSTON: It’s not a matter of whether you feel that you’re offended by it; I am offended by it and mocking somebody in this Chamber for their speech, I think, is inappropriate and I would ask that you make a ruling on it. It was very deliberate and repeated.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, I made my ruling previously, thank you.

 Councillor DAVIS.

Councillor DAVIS: Thank you very much, Mr Chair, and I rise in support of the amended motion. I too have listened very carefully to the contributions here tonight and I will respond to some of the commentary a little later. But I would like to say from the outset that it is amazing to me that those opposite want to accuse the only people in this Chamber who have done anything about installing backflow devices in Brisbane. It is this side of the Chamber that did take and commission a report into backflow devices after the 2011 floods. It is this side of the Chamber that continues to look at ways that we can implement flood mitigation strategies right across the city, whether it be backflow valves or improving our drainage systems.

 Like Councillor CUNNINGHAM before me, one of the things that I noticed very early in my time when I became a Councillor, particularly with regards to Councillor JOHNSTON, was that this AECOM report, this half-inch page report was considered almost akin to the Floods Commission of Inquiry. It’s not the same, it was an engineering report that provided some insights and some options and feasibilities as to what areas across the city may benefit from installing a backflow device. If we look at the numbers—and there seems to be a lot of talk about numbers this evening—85% of residents benefitted from the devices installed. The remaining devices account for very little impact or benefit to local residents.

 I know that part of the contribution tonight, those opposite have talked about cost benefit and how we shouldn’t be considering that, well we do have to consider that. We have a budget and we have a responsibility to the ratepayers of this city to make sure that when considerations of important infrastructure projects are undertaken, that we get the best benefit for the money that we invest in the projects.

 The reality is, Mr Chair, that many of the projects, the 38 remaining locations that were identified as feasible options in the AECOM report, did not benefit a wide number of residents. As has been discussed during the evening, even in some flooding circumstances, the backflow devices may not have worked anyway. But of those 51 locations, we did identify very early and the experts told us so, that there were 12 priority areas. What did we do? We invested in backflow valves in those 12 priority areas, but we didn’t do it in 12 priority areas; we did it in 13, because that was important and we knew that there would be a great benefit for the residents that lived in those particular areas.

 One of the other things that was mentioned this evening I think it’s important to note, was that the AECOM report was seen as a guiding document, something that we could look forward to and consider over time. Many of those particular areas that were mentioned in the AECOM report have been reviewed a number of times since 2012, that’s what the officers are telling me and I have no reason to not believe what the experts are providing me in that particular circumstance. But the LORD MAYOR articulated it very well, that this particular amended motion is about we think it is time maybe to have another look. But we need to be pragmatic about that, we have to look at it in a contemporary way.

 Although Councillor JOHNSTON tonight indicated that somehow we had forgotten that 2011 actually happened, there’s nothing further from the truth. But we will have learnings from 2011 and where the backflow valves have gone in and we’ll have learnings from 2022. It is appropriate that if we move forward, we look at it in a contemporary light and look at issues that other Councillors have raised—and I refer to a few of those things that Councillor SRI spoke about tonight—and they could be considered as part of any review.

 The other thing I’d just like to say is that in addition to outlining the fact that this is the only side of the Chamber that has gone ahead and implemented backflow devices, I don’t recall, LORD MAYOR, at the last election the Labor Party coming forward with a policy about installing backflow devices from the AECOM report. I don’t recall any such policy and to come in here now and start to talk about—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor DAVIS: —well I take the interjection. We have been working with officers to deliver in appropriate locations, drainage management programs across the city. That was our commitment and we continue to do it. As I mentioned this morning, we have increased this year $2.4 million in drainage maintenance and solutions across the city. This term, over $65 million investing in drainage solutions and maintenance. So it is ridiculous and just simply untrue that we are not investing in this space.

 Mr Chair, this is a pretty straightforward amendment, it simply talks to the fact that we will revisit those areas that are currently still listed in that AECOM report that have not had devices installed. But it will be viewed through a contemporary lens and we are saying that it is only appropriate that we do not commit to installing backflow devices in areas where there is no benefit to residents. I support the motion.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor DAVIS.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Point of order, Mr Chair.

Chair: Point of order, DEPUTY MAYOR.

DEPUTY MAYOR: I’m sorry, I can’t let it go by and I didn’t want to interrupt Councillor DAVIS, but I am quite upset on behalf of Councillor CUNNINGHAM that a Councillor in this Chamber just walked up, stood in front of her and in a menacing and threatening statement said don’t you ever mock me again. This is the second time in two weeks that this Councillor has gotten up and charged across the Chambers in a threatening manner, which is—I am shaking, I am so shocked at this disgraceful behaviour. I ask if you could warn that Councillor that it is beyond inappropriate. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you, DEPUTY MAYOR.

 My attention was on Councillor DAVIS during that exchange, I didn’t see it, but Councillor CUNNINGHAM and the DEPUTY MAYOR, I take it that that event did occur.

 Councillor JOHNSTON, I warn you that that behaviour is unacceptable in this place to stand and walk across to other Councillors in that manner.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Excuse me, excuse me, that is an absolute lie from the DEPUTY MAYOR. That is a lie, a lie from the DEPUTY MAYOR. That is not what was said, that is not how it was said and it was not. Let me be clear, let me be clear, Councillor CUNNINGHAM, that did not occur and you cannot warn me for something that did not happen. I’m not going to stand here and be defamed by the DEPUTY MAYOR in this place, which is now telling everyone to sit down and calm down, this is very deliberate, very deliberate. I walked over in a quiet manner, a quiet—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Councillors, please. Councillor JOHNSTON, I think there are ways that Councillors can—

Councillor JOHNSTON: No, no.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, I’m asking—

Councillor JOHNSTON: No, no, no. Let me be clear, let me be clear about this, I am not going to be threatened in my workplace by this. I politely asked her not to do it.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: I did not and no one standing in this place heard it. Did Councillor CASSIDY hear me threaten anyone? No. No one did, no.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, please sit down.

Councillor JOHNSTON: No, the DEPUTY MAYOR has defamed me. That is unsuitable meeting conduct—

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, if you believe—

Councillor JOHNSTON: —and I am not going to have it. Let me be clear, the DEPUTY MAYOR stood up and has made a deliberate falsehood about me in this Chamber. It is untrue, untrue and it needs to be withdrawn. You have acted on her behaviour here today without even—you’ve just accepted what she’s said. It’s not acceptable.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON. Last week you behaved in a similar fashion, moving in an aggressive way across—

Councillor JOHNSTON: You need to stop saying this about me. It has got to stop.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, please, please. Your behaviour in this place has been unacceptable.

Councillor JOHNSTON: No, Councillor ADAMS’ behaviour tonight has been unacceptable.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: She has lied about me in the place tonight.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, in this place on the record—

Councillor JOHNSTON: She has lied, she has lied again in this place about me tonight. She lied last week. It’s very clear she lied last week. No, you call the police right now. Call them now. I will not be leaving.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Councillor ADAMS has lied on the record and I am not going to put up with it. I am not going to put up with it.

Chair: Councillor—

 DEPUTY MAYOR, can I have a motion for the suspension of the meeting while we resolve this issue and ask Councillor JOHNSTON to calm herself.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

|  |
| --- |
| **568/2021-22**At that time, 8.17pm, it was resolved on the motion of the DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Krista ADAMS, seconded by Councillor Sandy LANDERS, that the meeting adjourn until the bells are rung at the Chair’s direction so Councillor JOHNSTON will have time to calm down.Council stood adjourned at 8.17pm. |

**UPON RESUMPTION:**

Chair: Thank you Councillors.

 We are up to voting on this motion.

 All in favour—

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Tonight unfounded, inappropriate and false allegations have been made against me in the Chamber by the DEPUTY MAYOR who I notice is not present. You accepted those allegations without question. They are false and I would like them withdrawn.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON you have made allegations that can be taken into a different forum and if you wish to do so then I suggest that’s what you do.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Mr Chairman, under the Meetings Local Law there are rules against unsuitable meeting conduct. Spreading false and malicious lies about another person in this place is unsuitable meeting conduct. You personally simply accepted the false statements made by the DEPUTY MAYOR and I would like them withdrawn from the record. I am seeking a ruling to this effect.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON that have been a lot of things said tonight which people may regret. I would like to conclude this meeting please.

Councillor JOHNSTON: I would like a ruling on my point of order, Mr Chairman, as I am entitled to under the rules.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, I have provided advice to you previously on this. If there are issues that you believe are defamatory as you’ve claimed, then you’ve got other forums in which to take that.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON this is enough.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Mr Chair, I am asking for a ruling on my point of order as I am entitled to under the Meetings Local Law. I need you to tell me that you do not uphold it or you do so that I can move dissent and we can move on. But arguing with me is not helpful. I would appreciate it if you could make a ruling as you are required to do under the Meetings Local Law.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON I do not uphold your point of order.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Thank you. Point of order, Mr Chairman.

Chair: Point of order Councillor JOHNSTON.

|  |
| --- |
| **569/2021-22**Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON moved, seconded by Councillor Steve GRIFFITHS, that the Chair’s ruling be dissented from. Upon being submitted to the Chamber, the motion of dissent was declared **lost** on the voices. |

Chair: Thank you. We now move to the vote on this motion.

As there was no further debate, the Chair submitted the motion to the Chamber and it was declared **carried** on the voices.

Thereupon, Councillors Nicole JOHNSTON and Jonathan SRI immediately rose and called for a division, which resulted in the motion being declared **carried**.

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 21 - Councillors Greg ADERMANN, Adam ALLAN, Fiona CUNNINGHAM, Tracy DAVIS, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Sarah HUTTON, Sandy LANDERS, James MACKAY, Kim MARX, Peter MATIC, David McLACHLAN, Ryan MURPHY, Angela OWEN, Steven TOOMEY, Andrew WINES, and the Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Jared CASSIDY, and Councillors Kara COOK, Peter CUMMING, Steve GRIFFITHS and Charles STRUNK.

NOES: 1 Councillor Jonathan SRI.

ABSTENTIONS: 1 - Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON.

Chair: Thank you.

## CONSIDERATION OF NOTIFIED MOTION – REJECT DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION FOR 23 CASTLEBAR STREET, KANGAROO POINT (A005933994):

*(Notified motions are printed as supplied and are not edited)*

Chair: Councillors I draw to your attention the notice of motion at item 6B on the agenda. Unfortunately the motion, as a result of Part 4 is not a valid motion as it is subject to an existing legal impediment pursuant to section 37(1)(e) of the Meetings Local Law. The development application is a code assessable development application subject to the development assessment rules prepared under section 68 of the *Planning Act 2016*. Currently, the proposed development application is within Part 3 information request of the development assessment process.

The motion moves that Council rejects the development application. The intent of the motion is to refuse the development application which falls within Part 5 Decision of the development assessment rules. Relevantly, section 21(1) states that the assessment manager cannot decide the application until Parts 1, 2, 3 and 4 as relevant to the application have ended.

So I rule this notice of motion out of order.

## PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS:

Chair: Councillors petitions, are there any petitions?

Councillor MARX.

Councillor MARX: Yes thank you, Mr Chair. I have a petition from residents in Sunnybank Hills.

Chair: Thank you.

Councillor ADERMANN: Chair.

Chair: Councillor ADERMANN.

Councillor ADERMANN: I have a petition requesting Council rename Gap Creek Circuit trail at Gap Creek Reserve, to ‘Gillian Circuit’ to honour mountain-biking advocate, Gillian Duncan.

Chair: Thank you.

 Further petitions?

 Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, I have a petition from Annerley residents calling on Brisbane City Council to upgrade community facilities in Annerley.

Chair: Thank you.

 Councillor SRI.

Councillor SRI: Thanks, Chair. I’ve got a petition calling on Council to buy the site at 281 to 297 Montague Road, to expand Davies Park.

Chair: Thank you.

 Any further petitions? May I have a motion for receipt of the petitions please?

**570/2021-22**

It was resolved on the motion of Councillor Sandy LANDERS, seconded by Councillor Charles STRUNK, that the petitions as presented be received and referred to the Committee concerned for consideration and report.

The petitions were summarised as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **File No.** | **Councillor** | **Topic** |
| 137/220/594/77 | Kim Marx | Requesting Council relocate or remove the gazebo at The Avenue Park, Eaton Place, Sunnybank Hills, for the security of local residents. |
| 137/220/594/74 | Greg Adermann | Requesting Council rename Gap Creek Circuit mountain bike trail at Gap Creek Reserve, Mt Coot-tha, to ‘Gillian’s Circuit’, to honour Gillian Duncan. |
| 137/220/594/78 | Nicole Johnston and Steve Griffiths | Requesting Council invest funding into community facilities in Annerley, including upgrading Annerley Library, undertaking a Village Precinct Project to revitalise Annerley Junction shopping precinct, and revitalising Annerley Hall.  |
| 137/220/594/76 | Jonathan Sri | Requesting Council reject the development application at 281‑297 Montague Road, West End (A005608649), and purchase this property for public parkland. |

## GENERAL BUSINESS:

Chair: Councillors, General Business. Are there any statements required as a result of an Office of the Independent Assessor or Councillor Ethics Committee order? No one rising to their feet.

 General Business?

 Councillor MACKAY.

Councillor MACKAY: Just a point of order, Chair. Are we doing General Business now or the motion now?

Chair: We are doing General Business—the conclusion of the agenda.

Councillor MACKAY: Thanks, Chair. I rise to speak about our recent natural disaster. Tonight, recounting this experience I might shed a tear because the flood affected me emotionally and mentally, but fortunately it did not affect my home. Tonight, I will tell you stories of woe and stories of warmth. This flood has touched many, in many different ways. Now, weeks later, we’ve seen people go through trauma and come out the other side. We’ve seen days of sadness marked with acts of selflessness and generosity that would make Queenslanders proud. Across St Lucia, Taringa, Toowong, Fig Tree Pocket and Indooroopilly, homes faced river inundation.

Homes in Chapel Hill suffered the indignity of overflowing toilets from an overflowing sewerage system. On Friday afternoon of 25 February, I did my weekly five-minute Friday news update video from UQ. It was raining, but there was no indication of flooding. I even joked that I might go and do some mail dropping on the weekend. By that night, I found myself doorknocking homes in St Lucia’s Munro Street, urging residents to move their cars. That street floods regularly because it’s actually below the king tide level. Late that night, I towed my first car from Heroes Avenue, outside Toowong Bowls Club where the new school is proposed.

Saturday morning on 26 February, we towed two more cars from Toowong Bowls Club and I gave my first video update with Kim from the Indooroopilly police. Floodwaters were rising fast in Witton Road and we did our best to divert traffic with cones. At 3.28pm, the Wivenhoe drinking water level was at 100% and the flood storage compartment was less than 10% full. 27 February was a Sunday and the rain had not stopped. Homes in St Lucia, Indooroopilly and Taringa had been inundated by intensive rain. Power was cut, people were cut off and homes were inundated.

Fortunately, because it was a Sunday, the Christchurch at St Lucia was high and dry and open. My heart goes out to Helen Clark and her helpers who opened a day respite centre at the church and kept it open all week. In the afternoon, I was back in Fig Tree Pocket where Jesmond Road had been cut and the Mandalay area wasn’t far off. The locals there had a backflow valve installed and they were anticipating how it might work. As it turned out it did spare scores of homes from flooding. Sunday afternoon saw volunteers bake cakes and muffins which I delivered to the police, the SES (State Emergency Services) and the QFES (Queensland Fire and Emergency Services).

At that point, I heard that only one of the firies on the evening shift had made it to work and the rest had been cut off. An hour before high tide on Monday, 28 February, the morning skies were clear. The raincoat was gone, but the water kept rising. Overnight, Brisbane suddenly had new riverfront homes. We knew by now that thousands of people had lost power, that meant that fridges were off, elevators were out and people with mobility issues were trapped. I thank Michelle, Alexi and Cathy at Meals on Wheels for delivering meals by kayak. I named their service the Kan-Uber Eats and they started providing hundreds of free meals to those in need.

At that point, we set up a GoFundMe campaign for them and we raised about $5,000. People had no food, so we held our first community barbeque that day where we met Dorothy, who was celebrating her 90th birthday and her third St Lucia flood. I thank John, Glenda and Yee from the St Lucia convenience store who supplied sausages and bread for the barbeque. I love the initiative of Australians, at the barbeque a local named Andrew brought down a generator and charged phones. Ryan from TMT (Taringa Milton Toowong) Scouts brought down gear and hit the tongs on the barbeque.

We were concerned that the next day’s peak might be higher so we organised a sandbag dump at St Lucia Playground Park. The sandbags were gone soon after we put them there. We heard at this time that the site for the proposed new school was inundated and that Perrin Park was well underwater that was full of sewerage. Pro tip, find another location for the school. Tuesdays are bin days for my neck of the woods and while most homes had their bins emptied, 1 March saw closed roads which created a collection problem for others. Fridges and freezers were turning and there was nowhere for the waste to go.

We knew at this time, that waste removal—food waste removal, was about to be our next big issue. It was about this time, that Councillor MARX made her way onto my speed dial. I kept calling her for advice on what we could do about food waste removal. Thanks Councillor MARX. Of course, feeding people was our priority, including the 60 Malaysian students who had nowhere to turn, but instead of simply whinging about it we fixed the problem, the meals were found and delivered to those who needed it.

At this point, I need to tell you about Council officer, James Acoola, from Public Space Operations—I warned you it was going to happen. He looks after Fig Tree Pocket’s Biami Yumba Park. On Tuesday morning, it was well underwater and it was the cut‑off point for about 200 homes. James is a legend, he spoke calmly to distraught seniors who couldn’t get their medicine. He comforted children who were cut off from their parents. It was then that James and I solved a problem with the advice of some Council officers, Peter and Shane.

We made a road. Well, Council made the road, but we created access and opened up hundreds of people’s homes. Some Councillors get things done and some whinge. I say you should step up and be better. Tuesday was the first day that I cried. I pay tribute to Ben from Fig Tree Pocket, he rocked up to our second free community barbeque with a massive generator and a DJ set. He charged phones and put on a concert for about 200 people who had no power, no food and no home. At the time, I thought it was great community spirit.

That night, I found out that Ben’s house was inundated and destroyed, but instead of being in his own home, Ben came to St Lucia to help others get through their distress. Wednesday, 2 March, saw waters start to recede and access open up. It was fair to say the devastation was overwhelming. The food waste was gathering, basements were pumped, mud was gurneyed and lives were put on the footpath. It’s distressing to see photo albums, framed diplomas and trophies tossed out onto the curb. These are lives that have been irrevocably changed, memories as trash.

We based ourselves at 92 Macquarie Street which was the St Lucia epicentre. I borrowed a bike that day and used it for the rest of the week making my way around the suburb assessing, offering help and spotting problems and finding solutions. Hundreds, if not thousands, of volunteers were working in Macquarie Street alone hosing, sweeping and dragging out flood-affected waste. Michael, Gabe, Joss, Sinead brought gurneys and got stuck in. The Broncos brought cheeseburgers. Dominoes brought pizzas and the Dare guys brought ice‑cold drinks.

My old mate, Councillor ATWOOD organised London Spuds food truck to come down and hand out meals. I also thank Councillor DAVIS, HUTTON, MATIC and ADERMANN for their frequent calls and welfare checks. United Waste donated skips to help us move food waste. Another Ben dutifully emptied about 50 red-topped bins with maggots all afternoon. The street hummed with true community spirit, but the devastation was everywhere. Hundreds and hundreds of metres of waste lined up along the footpaths above my shoulders.

Sometimes we forget the little people, but I never will on this event. The kids from Ironside cut out and painted little cardboard hands and wrote messages for the volunteers. We strung them up for everyone to see. I can’t even count how many people I saw stop and cry when they saw them and read them and took on board their significance. I cried when heard about 30 kids who went to school without food. I cried when we managed to drop over enough food to get them through the day. Then I cried in the afternoon when the call for donations of school uniforms just flooded in.

I’ll tell you what, I also cried when I visited Neil and Anna in Indooroopilly who had every single possession on the kerb because their house was filled up to the guts with sewerage-infested water. With passionate volunteers and the support of Bravo Company, the 6th Battalion, Royal Australian Regiment; St Lucia, Indooroopilly, Taringa and Toowong cleaned up pretty quickly. We also had help from 9RQR (9th Battalion, Royal Queensland Regiment) and my old battalion, 2549. I’ll never forget when the officer commanding turned to me and said, don’t worry Councillor, we will not leave St Lucia until the job is done—and they didn’t.

The work of recovery is largely finished. The work of rebuilding is moving forward. To every person who has served and suffered this flood my heart goes out to you. Special mentions to Julian Simmonds MP, Wayne, Phoebe, Gab, Chris, Ben and Georgia, but the biggest thank you goes to Philippa who works 12-hour days, 24 days in a row without a break. From the bottom of my heart, thank you, we are lucky to have you.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor MACKAY.

 Further speakers? Further speakers in General Business?

 Councillor HUTTON.

Councillor HUTTON: Mr Chair, sorry I was a little bit emotional after that one. Jimmy got me. Mr Chair, I rise to speak about my community—sorry, you’re going to get me again—sorry—they’re phenomenal efforts during the floods. Give me one second, thanks Billy. Sorry. Yes, I’ve got this. The last month has been a pretty wild ride. We have seen the extreme devastation across our city. Despite the pain and damage, the silver lining has been witnessing the strength and compassion and resilience of our locals. Sorry, Mr Chair. While the kerbsides might be clear we are—we have a long journey ahead.

I want to put on the record my gratitude to some of the most exceptional humans who have gone above and beyond and who have really done so much for our community. I want to take you back to 26 February, when we began to realise that the rain was continuing to fall at a drastic rate—sorry—I will breathe—at a drastic rate and our homes and community facilities were at risk of being impacted by the flooding waters. We rushed down to the Centenary Rowing Club and the Springfield Dragon Boat Club, who were working on lifting their boats and valuables to higher ground using an army of volunteers. Thank you to their respective committees for their swift response.

While the flooding hit the second level of the rowing club, I want to shout-out to the Centenary Tavern who securely held their ergos and bikes which will ensure the rowers can continue their critical training, despite not having a pontoon any longer. We then visited the Jindalee Bowls Club, which is the home of the Centenary Meals on Wheels and the Centenary RSL sub-branch. The nearby creek was sneaking closer and closer. We made the decision to move the RSL and the Meals on Wheels, which was located underneath the bowls club, to the second level.

I want to thank all of the volunteers who assisted and responded to the calls for help on Facebook. Like Bob, who came to help for hours alongside Matt Bourke and Nat Hutton trying to keep the ground floor dry with pumps and sandbags. After an enormous effort, collectively, we agreed to return at 4am before the proposed peak at 7am. Sadly, when we arrived back at 4am the water was lapping at the second level and we had lost everything. It was the first loss of many to come. Sorry. Particularly tough for our RSL, who lost precious souvenirs and collectibles, many irreplaceable.

I want to thank George, the President of the RSL; Paul, President of the bowls club and Ruth from the Centenary Meals on Wheels, for their tireless leadership during this time. Again on Sunday, we continued to have rainfall. Sorry, I will get there. We became very nervous that this may impact residents in a similar way to 2011. We made the decision to doorknock the streets impacted previously. I want to acknowledge the efforts of senior constable Ben Harm, constable Brendan Croxford, Matthew Bourke, Yianni Pallourios and Marty Gilles, who in the pouring rain walked the streets to ensure locals were aware of the rapidly changing situation.

On the same day, John Robertson, from Riverlife Baptist Church, reached out to ask how they may be able to assist. I wasn’t quite ready—sorry—I’m sure he wasn’t quite ready for me to ask, but I did ask him to open an evacuation centre. Within a few hours, John, who was trapped in Moggill, worked with his team, Scotty Wilson and Aimee Cowan to bring this request to fruition. I want to thank the entire team for being open‑minded to my request and establishing a temporary home for 70 people and their array of pets over the proceeding five days.

I say ‘home’ quite intentionally as they made that facility as comfortable and accommodating as possible for humans and pets alike. At one point, we had a small menagerie of animals, not just dogs and cats, but we were nursing a wallaby and a turtle all at the same time. At such an emotional time for many locals, the warm and welcoming vibe of Riverlife staff and volunteers was exactly what they needed to get some respite and also plan the way forward. To Riverlife, your community’s generosity has been inspiring. I thank you so much for responding to my call. I want to particularly acknowledge Aimee Cowan and Scotty Wilson, two exceptional humans who went above and beyond at this time. Your support will never be forgotten.

This support flowed throughout our community with 297 locals registering to support their neighbours either on a broom or volunteering at our two recharge stations, at either Jindalee or Oxley. Our Jindalee recharge station was set up with the support of Helen Saba from the NGU Real Estate. I want to say thank you to Helen for opening her office and enabling locals to come in, charge their phones and really take a moment.

I also want to thank the numerous businesses who came and supported us there. Total Tools at Richland, who donated a gurney; Middle Park Bakery, who donated numerous bakery goods, but also hot pies with hearts on top. So they really wanted locals to know that they were thinking of them. Too many businesses to mention here, but we certainly have the heart of our community in 4074. I want to acknowledge Jo from 4 Voices who visited our various recharge stations on a number of occasions and helped locals apply for grants and receive support. Your support was incredible.

I know so many locals appreciated the connection they made with yourself and your volunteers. Our other recharge station was at the Uniting Church at Oxley. Reverend Dave was kind enough to open his facility to allow locals to charge their phones and grab a bite to eat. It soon became a hive of activity, like Indooroopilly Shopping Centre on Christmas Eve, bustling with people, food and support. To Reverend Dave and your entire community, thank you for not only opening your doors to our community, but supporting our locals in such a practical way. I am so appreciative of your tireless support and the many hours you have devoted. Thank you so much.

I want to acknowledge a particular volunteer, who was there every step of the way and simply responded to one of my Facebook shoutouts. Amy from a neighbouring suburb would spend her days volunteering at the church and then go home and scroll through local Facebook pages to help anyone who expressed a need. Thank you Amy for having such a big and generous heart. Some of the other exceptional locals who shone during these floods were Shelby and Kylie Robinson. Sadly flood clean-ups were far too familiar for this pair, and during 2011 they spent six months helping local families rebuild.

Shelby owns a landscaping business and he was quick to work with our team to figure out a plan of attack to get these streets cleaned up. Thank you Shelby and Kylie, I want to put on the record today my sincere thanks for your effort, hashtag Legends of Oxley. Whilst there are many of those, I would like to pay particular tribute to Lou Bromley, Maryanne, Zach and Claire. Thank you so much for everything that you have done and the number of volunteers who transited through our locations, but we weren’t able to capture the names of, we truly appreciate your support.

One of our other fabulous volunteers, Tamara Foong, managed to connect me with Fazil Deen, who is a member of the Archerfield Rotary Club, and keen to provide four gurneys for the clean-up efforts. He casually mentioned that his family would be very interested in helping Oxley, their local community. Well, the Deens certainly know how to help, the following morning they arrived with six trucks, an excavator and a bobcat, and we began the clean-up on Oxley Station Road. I was beyond excited—too excited—to see so many trucks arrive.

With hundreds of volunteers working alongside each other and along with the Mud Army, we were making progress. After an enormous day, the Deen family then proceeded to supply the most incredible curry for dinner, an amazing effort that was replicated again the second day. To the entire Deen family and, in particular, George, Happy, Fazil, Jock, Yasmeen, thank you for going above and beyond, your efforts were exceptional. In the midst of all the clean-up we also had some incredible police manage the road network, many of whom volunteered and worked enormous hours during this time.

To Senior Constable, Ben Harm; Acting Sergeant, Andrew Percell; Senior Constable, Matthew Scott; Senior Constable, Aaron Bobberman, you are champions of the community. I am so lucky that you turned up when you did. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. I would also like to thank Gina, Faye and Simon from the LDCC. Thank you for your tireless efforts in navigating my many requests, including a fuel truck. Who would have thought we could have been so happy about seeing a fuel truck arrive, but you truly made dreams come true.

Finally I want to acknowledge my team and my friends who have been on this journey with me. To Nat Hutton, Marty Gilles, Ben Kozij, Belinda Messer, Matthew Bourke, Yianni Pallourios, Lisa Baillie, Grant Baillie, Poppy Eugeniou, Marc Breen, I could not have supported our community in this way without you, you are legends of our community. The last month has been intense and emotional with the loss and devastation of so much. Together, we have solved problems, gathered resources and navigated a way forward.

Amidst the pain, we have laughed, danced with joy and had moments of elation. We have connected people with support for the long road ahead and seen the heart and generosity of our community. Every cloud has a silver lining. Recovery is a marathon and not a sprint. Our community has a long way to go, but together we’ve got this.

Chair: Councillor HUTTON thank you. Your time has expired. Great speech. Thank you.

 Further speakers on General Business?

 Councillor TOOMEY.

Councillor TOOMEY: Thank you, Chair. I rise briefly to speak on the events of the 2022 flood in The Gap Ward. Like many of our wards that have creeks they went from being creeks—or suburbs surrounded by creeks—into archipelagos. Much of the infrastructure that connected our communities, particularly, in my ward, was heavily damaged. We’ve heard Councillor WINES many, many times speak to Mt Nebo Road, Gresham Bridge and others like that. I am going to take a different tact this evening, Chair. I spent a lot of time during the flood events with Council officers.

It started off on the Saturday at the bagging station at Newmarket. We had three bagging machines going that day. Some of the lads that I was shoulder to shoulder with were on their second shift. They were doing 12-hour shifts filling bags. We filled—I imagine I lost count after about 300, but we did 300 that day. By the end of the day, all the Council officers, along with the rapid relief team, we were ankle deep in water at Newmarket. The water was running through and there was nothing we could do, but still they persisted. They kept filling bags.

We were fighting wet sand, dry sand, machines that weren’t operating all that well given the conditions that we were in. We were soaked to the bone, but they soldiered on. One of the fellows there lives in my ward and he did have to go early otherwise he wasn’t getting home. So I said to Tim, mate, you go and I’ll fill your spot. But to those guys that were there at Newmarket it was probably—I wouldn’t say the most unpleasant conditions I’ve been in, but it was getting close, but those guys were just absolutely phenomenal.

I also want to give a shout-out to the rapid relief team that were also operating backhoes. They were doing the food there for everybody as well, they had large trucks in full of supplies. They were absolutely outstanding, I am 100% sure that the team at Newmarket would not have been able to do the work that they did in the conditions that they had to do it in, without the help of the rapid relief team. I also want to pay tribute to some of the Council officers in the aftermath of the event. We had Gresham Street Bridge go under quite significantly. Settlement Road basically collapsed for about 120 metres. Mt Nebo Road had 24 landslips.

Gresham Street Bridge, the temporary bridge, basically was undermined. The traffic was reduced there for 24 hours, which have basically turned St John’s Wood into an island. You couldn’t get in through Bennetts Road because the road over Cowan’s Crossing had disappeared. It fell into a hole, but the officers, to their credit, actually shored up the abutment of the temporary bridge and got those services running, which meant that the trucks could get in, residents could get out and those services could, somewhat, return to normal. In fact, the guys that did Cowan’s Crossing, basically with the hole in the ground they cut it out, they filled it in, they patched it up and they got it going.

So the community on Bennetts Road, which is very, very small—there’s about 12 houses in that little pocket—they were stuck, they weren’t going anywhere. There was nowhere they could go. Some of those residents are in their 90s. So it was important for us to get that section connected through there. When it comes to Settlement Road, I don’t think I’ve seen anything like Settlement Road. It’s a bit hard to communicate to the community how bad Settlement Road was as a landslip. To paint a picture, there was roughly 120 metres or so of decomposed granite and boulders roughly the size of half of VW (Volkswagen) Beetles that had come down.

On that decomposed granite, you could go up to the spoil that was on the road and slap it, and there would be a wave in that granite. It was weird—the weirdest thing I’ve ever seen, but to the officers’ credit, especially Darryl, Trevor, Troy, Jason on the excavator—I think Jason deserves a medal, I don’t think I’ve ever seen anybody operate an excavator like that before—was amazing. These guys just cleaned it all up; they shaped it, they reinstated it and they got it open, well within the time that they said they would. They went through one rock-breaker—rock‑breaker completely broke on the first day.

Aussie Excavators, to their credit, got a brand new one in. This was its first job, they broke up the rock. The machines—the excavators could not lift the rock into the back of the truck. It was that big, they had to break it into six pieces. So they broke gear opening that road, which is unbelievable. Mt Nebo Road, a different kettle of fish, different problems there. No decomposed granite, but it was all silt. Anybody who knows the north-west corner, it’s a shale and loose soil-type—same up on Mt Nebo Road, very, very large landslips.

Again, Jason came to the foray. His excavator—his long-reach excavator only had a limit of about 18 metres. Jason built a ramp to go up the side of Mt Nebo Road so he could get his excavator up to the top. Real ingenuity, real innovative thinking from these guys to get Mt Nebo Road open. Again, it was very hard to communicate to the Mt Nebo community how bad it was. Subsequently, we did have a car go through and have an accident on that road. It was closed, they went through three road-closed signs and then had an accident. So I don’t know how you tell people when the road is closed, the road is closed.

To some of the towies—some of the towies that came out to get—to pick up some of the cars. There was one towie who was chasing a 4-series Audi around Woodland Street, it was just floating down the street. The guys just got in and just towed it out before it did any damage to anybody’s home during that time. It was just absolutely amazing, but I do want to thank the Council officers, the engineers, the excavators, the truck drivers, the guys who were with me filling sandbags—I shouldn’t say that—I was with them filling sandbags, it was just outstanding. It was a community effort.

We’ve heard from Councillor MACKAY and Councillor HUTTON how their community pulled together, but our Council officers in their communities, pulled together. Our guys from PPI being put into jobs that is not their normal day job, were going out and doing things that they normally don’t do and doing it really, really well. Today they are still doing that. I really want to commend our officers and as Deputy Chair of City Standards, I really want to thank them for the work that they did and work that they are doing. They’re still doing that. That’s one thing we do have to remember, our officers are still doing flood recovery work.

I dare say that this will be going on for quite some time. So on behalf of a very, very grateful Councillor for The Gap Ward and the Deputy Chairman of City Standards, I want to thank all the officers for all the work they did during the floods, after the floods and, particularly, the preparation that they did before. Thank you, Chair.

Chair: Further speakers in General Business? No further speakers in General Business?

 Thank you Councillors.

## CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADJOURNED MOTION:

**Continuation of debate on the motion that** **Brisbane City Council reinstates round two of the Lord Mayor’s Better Suburbs Grants for the Community Facility Category.**

Chair: We now move on to the adjourned motion that was moved by Councillor CASSIDY and I believe seconded by Councillor COOK, although I may be wrong on that—thank you. The adjourned motion that was moved by Councillor CASSIDY and seconded by Councillor COOK; that Brisbane City Council reinstate round two of the Lord Mayor’s Better Suburbs grants for the Community Facility category.

 Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair. When the pandemic first hit this LNP Mayor cut kerbside collection. Now when the floods have hit he’s cut grants for community clubs and organisations. Community clubs and organisations need this funding to pay for much needed improvements. Why is it that under this LNP leadership the first things to get cut in time of need are funding and services for the community? Now even before COVID, this LNP Mayor cut funding for community grants. In the 2019-20 financial year, we saw grants across all programs cut by about $2 million.

Groups were struggling to keep the lights on back then and now following a pandemic and flood, the situation is even more dire, Chair. In the middle of all that, the LNP refuse to fund vital repairs to facilities like the Moorooka Bowls Club, instead forcing tenants to pick up that bill. They’re also threatening to bulldoze and demolish community facilities that are currently being used daily, despite hundreds of organisations being on the waitlist for a permanent home. They are doing everything—everything, but helping these communities in need.

So it’s a real slap in the face for residents when, on one hand, they see these cuts to community organisations and community clubs, but on the other hand, see the LNP Mayor fatten up the advertising budget. In fact, this month, we saw him once again plaster the *Living in Brisbane* newsletter, only this time using the floods to promote himself. We also have intel now that an entire *Living in Brisbane* newsletter that was produced was very quietly pulped at all of the Australia Post locations and a new one was produced at great expense to the ratepayers which featured the LORD MAYOR in his khaki cosplay.

He throws hundreds of millions of dollars at projects that we see cost blowouts on to cover up for this mismanagement. When the chips are down for the people of Brisbane, their services are always the first on the LNP’s chopping block. These cuts always come with mistruths from the LNP. They say things like, we were forced to cut these services because of the floods or because of COVID or because of something else. Well the truth is, at the moment, that the Federal and State Governments will be paying for emergency works and services the Council will have to undertake throughout the flood clean-up.

So the emergency kerbside collection, the emergency mosquito spraying, they will all be reimbursed from higher levels of government through disaster recovery fund. Now this LNP Mayor hardly touches the Council budget in the flood recovery, but uses these disasters as excuses to cut services. This LNP Mayor should be ashamed of the way that he is governing this city, Chair. It’s all about him and his LNP Administration, instead of the people of Brisbane, they always come second. That’s why we need this community funding to be reinstated immediately.

We’ve heard earlier—we heard earlier that the LORD MAYOR and other LNP Councillors have said the $5,000—they called it a grant, but it’s not really—a one-off $5,000 donation, as it’s termed, would cover the costs that these grants otherwise would have, apparently. Now these grants, again, were for between $10,000 and $200,000. These community organisations were told by Council officers to apply for the first round, to do that planning work and then apply for the second round to do the capital work.

These community organisations which are run by volunteers who are dedicated to their communities were led to believe that this funding would be in place to help make our communities a better place. They were encouraged to apply for this and they have been told very quietly that this funding has now been pulled and some clubs that were affected will get $5,000. We’ve already heard one example from Councillor JOHNSTON earlier, that the electricity work that’s required is $18,000 from memory. The works required down at the Sandgate Hawks, for instance, to get that back up and running will be in the tens, if not hundreds, of thousands of dollars.

So the $5,000—that’s on top of vital works that needed to be done and funded through the Better Suburbs program that has now been cut. So community organisations are being starved of funding over the last few years, allegedly because of COVID. Now they’re being starved of funding under the guise of flood recovery, which will be reimbursed anyway like it was in 2011 by other levels of government. So again we see this emerging pattern from this LNP Administration. They’re totally out of touch with the needs of our communities. Our suburbs are missing out.

They’re missing out on vital infrastructure on the basics like drainage, like footpaths, like park upgrades. People are noticing that. Now our community clubs are missing out on vital funding while having the screws put on them to—in some cases like in Councillor GRIFFITHS’ ward, to spend up to $1 million to upgrade a Council facility. The priorities of this LNP Administration are all wrong.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor CASSIDY.

 Further speakers?

 Councillor CUNNINGHAM.

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: Yes, thanks, Mr Chair. In response to the floods the Schrinner Council took swift action to provide financial support to our community and to our community clubs. One of the first things that we did was to announce a fast-tracked $5,000 payment to affected community groups to support their immediate clean-up efforts. This was done using the Better Suburbs grant funding. It was actually the fastest mechanism by which Council could get the money out the door and into the pockets of those volunteers who give up hours upon hours in these community facilities.

I wouldn’t expect the Opposition to appreciate some of these financial machinations of Council in the way that we operate in getting out the money as quickly as we can. Across the city, Corporate Finance is continuing to work through the financial implications of this unprecedented flood event. The residents of Brisbane know that the Schrinner Council can be trusted to manage the budget of Australia’s largest local government, but make no mistake, there is a really big job ahead of us. We are up for the task. We need to go through a formal process. I’m not going to pre-empt this, but you can be sure that we’re working very hard to support our city’s recovery and to get the budget right is key to that. In light of all this, Mr Chair, I wish to move an amendment to the motion before us.

**MOTION FOR AMENDMENT TO NOTIFIED MOTION:**

|  |
| --- |
| **571/2021-22**It was moved by Councillor Fiona CUNNINGHAM, seconded by Councillor Sandy LANDERS that the notified motion be **amended** by the removal and insertion of such words so that the motion would read as follows:*That Brisbane City Council reinstates the Lord Mayor’s Better Suburbs Grants for the Community Facility Category as soon as feasible.* |

Chair: To the amendment.

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: Thanks, Mr Chair. To the amendment, just very briefly it’s quite self-explanatory. We want our community clubs to be supported. We will reintroduce this program just as soon as possible. We know the invaluable work that these groups do in our community and in our wards. We will continue to support them in the future.

Chair: Thank you.

 Further speakers to the amendment?

Councillor CASSIDY: On the amendment, yes. We won’t be supporting the amendment because the Brisbane City Council budget—I understand there are processes in which quarterly budget reviews are done and decisions are made by E&C and endorsed by this Council, and E&C as a delegate while we are in recess, these things can be done. This funding can be reinstated. The Council budget is $3.6 billion. We’re not talking about spending billions like the LORD MAYOR is on his flashy busway extension or up to $1 billion now on green bridges.

We’re talking about funding of community organisations. Councillor CUNNINGHAM said that this Administration put money into the pockets of volunteers. I’m pretty sure that $5,000 didn’t go into the pockets of volunteers. Sure, we support that emergency funding going to community organisations that are run by volunteers. They don’t profit from these organisations. They put their blood sweat and tears, their time into these groups whether they’re sporting clubs or community centres. They don’t do it for money, they do it for the love of their community.

But when they see a Council Administration take away that funding stream that was promised to them—not in just some general way—they were led down a path to put all of their efforts and all of their energies into applying very specifically for these grant programs, because they were told if they were successful in the first round and did this work that they were told to do, very specifically, they would get funding in the second round to do the capital works. They have been left high and dry now by this Administration. This is kerbside collection all over again, all over again.

You have now cut this program and now said, at some point in the future when you can find a few bucks here and there, as if it’s hard to find this kind of funding in a budget of $3.6 billion, is a slap in the face to those community organisations. Then they’ll try and gaslight those people—community organisations, and say, oh no we never cut it in the first place, we just sort of moved around and did this.

Councillor MURPHY: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor MURPHY.

Councillor MURPHY: I just ask that Councillor CASSIDY withdraw the use of the word gaslight there. I don’t think it’s appropriate.

Chair: Are you personally taking offence at that Councillor MURPHY?

Councillor MURPHY: Chair, I just think we all know what the word means. I think it is offensive. I ask that he withdraw it.

Chair: I think we’ll let—in the context of political debate I’ll let it stand.

Councillor CASSIDY: At your direction, Chair. That’s fine. This is just an extraordinary situation where this money was budgeted. The flood recovery of course is going to cost money as it did in 2011. All of those works, all of those works were reimbursed. We still have the situation where suburban works today in 2022, have not been funded. The excuse at the time was that money had to be redirected to the flood recovery. Well, all that was reimbursed. So we know the track record of this Administration. A project like the Brighton Foreshore was never completed, that was blamed on flood recovery works.

Now we’re having a situation where vital community group funding is being eaten up by flood recovery works and at some point in the future, when all of that is reimbursed, this Administration is leading these community organisations to believe that it will be reinstated. Well, I just think once bitten, twice shy when it comes to this. The community groups out there that have been badly let down—we will be talking to them all in all parts of the city about this over the coming weeks—they have been badly let down by this LNP Administration and their local LNP Councillors. They will know all about it.

Chair: Thank you.

 Further speakers to the amendment?

 Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, I will speak to the amendment. I just want to be clear, the piece of paper that we’ve been given looks like the amended motion. So can I just confirm what it is that’s being deleted from the existing motion?

Chair: Yes, the words—so they have been deleted, were as read out with the amendment being moved were, round two of, and the words added at the end were, as soon as feasible.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Okay. Just for future, I appreciate this is the amended motion, but the amendment should be pretty clear about what’s being deleted and what’s being added, if that’s okay.

 All right, I rise to speak on the proposed amendment before us today. I guess this amendment pretty much indicates that the LNP don’t want anybody talking about what they’re actually doing which is cutting funding for community sporting clubs. Now there are a lot of clubs that are flooded in my ward, without question.

But unfortunately the LNP have a track record here that I’ve heard Councillor ADAMS and Councillor HAMMOND use many times in this place, about—that I shouldn’t be complaining about things in my ward because we got all that flood money back in 2011. Now I’ve heard that. Flood money pretty much just fixes things, it doesn’t actually replace them. We still haven’t got infrastructure that was lost in 2011 replaced in my ward. The pontoon—the missing pontoon at the Taylor Bridge Reserve at Chelmer, is a great example of that. That was a public pontoon facility that Council just decided they weren’t going to replace.

It wouldn’t have cost Council a cent, they would have got all the money back from the feds, but they decided not to do that. What we’re talking about here is the need for our budget as a city to be flexible and to make sure that we have the scope within it to adapt to the changing circumstances that require some emergency relief funding for community groups in our ward. Have we had a debate about that in the Chamber? No. Has there been any discussion about what the options might be with Councillors so that we could make an informed decision that is in the best interests of the city? No.

Has there been a motion brought to this place to talk about how many clubs will be missing out, how many of them—they did a huge amount of work in my area on the basis that they were going to be getting funding in round two—we don’t know what this Council will announce in the budget in a few months’ time. So there are some real problems with what the Administration here are doing. They’re not being transparent or open about what the needs for flood recovery are and what the financial costs for flood recovery are. So from memory, in 2011 the flood reimbursement was about $440 million. Council ended up paying about $60 million out of its own budget, which it did.

Projects were cancelled including some in my ward that are still on the infrastructure list 11 years later. The road safety upgrade at Kadumba Street and Kingsley Parade. That was—I volunteered to cut it because we had to put projects into—money into projects for flood recovery, because we were promised that they would all be reinstated and they were not. We are still waiting for those projects to be reinstated 11 years on from 2011. So you cannot trust what the Administration say.

If they’re not prepared to be upfront about the actual costs—we haven’t even heard today how many clubs have been flood-affected. We haven’t heard how many have got the $5,000. We haven’t heard how many of them are still waiting for their $5,000. We don’t know whether the—presumably it’s about $1 million in the Better Suburbs grant, we don’t even know how much that is that’s actually been cut. We don’t know if that covers all the $5,000 for all the clubs. We don’t know if more will be needed. There’s literally been no factual information provided to us.

As a result of the LNP’s—their decision, their just off-hand decision to cancel a whole program, we don’t know whether it’s actually in the best interests of the city or not. Now the Finance Chairperson claims that we wouldn’t possibly understand. Well I do. I know that you have not been upfront and you have not been transparent about how this city is funding budget repair. I know that you have not given us a single dollar figure—a single dollar figure outlining what it is that we’re going to be doing, how much it’s going to cost. What I do know is that the clubs in my ward, $5,000 isn’t coming close to fixing it.

I did mention this earlier because I actually have it literally here today to respond to. This is Souths Cricket, their electrical bill is $17,589. Their clubhouse was totally destroyed again; that’s the electrical bill. The cost of rebuilding the club is going to be hundreds of thousands of dollars. I don’t know where that money is coming from and they are asking me here, is there any money to help us get our electricity back on? I’ve had to write to them and say, no the LORD MAYOR stood up today and all he says is there’s $5,000 that’s available. I don’t know if there will be any more money. I don’t know where it’s coming from.

Think about this. They’re asking to do this now. Like many of my other flooded clubs, they are trying to progress their flood recovery now. What I’m watching happen is the Mud Army 2.0. When the budget comes out and the LORD MAYOR has got his budget announceables in June, there might be some more money to rebuild these clubs, but the big problem is going to be they will have already progressed as far as they can. That leaves clubs in the position of partially having started the work, making them potentially ineligible for any further money that Council offers unless it’s a direct amount allocation in the budget. Because Council doesn’t retrospectively fund grants.

It leaves these clubs in limbo for three months until the LORD MAYOR decides he wants a press opportunity about flood recovery and goes out and announces some money. Council has now had these surveys back for a couple of weeks about what’s happening with these clubs and they are in a position now to know which clubs need help and which ones don’t. Are we hearing a peep from these people about what the clubs need? No, we are not. The only thing we’ve heard is you can have $5,000 if you fill out a survey and we’re going to cut the grant funding for the—I don’t know, what there’s 600-odd clubs in Brisbane—what, maybe 100 are flooded? I don’t know. I’d like to know. How many clubs are flooded?

So 500 clubs get nothing, the other 100 clubs get $5,000 which doesn’t meet their needs. So the big question we’ve got here is, the funny money exercise going on in the Liberal Party over there is not achieving any good for anybody at this point. The flooded clubs need more. The existing clubs have gone about their governance and their arrangements to upgrade Council’s facilities. This is not their facilities, this is Council’s facilities. We’re mainly talking about—in my ward these organisations are run by people of a certain age who put a huge amount of effort into this, and they’ve just been told no, too late, too bad, you’re not getting it.

Now they won’t complain because they actually think that their money is going to be helping flooded clubs. $5,000 probably isn’t going to pay for the skips that the clubs needed to get to put their stuff into when the demolition occurred. So there is a real gap here between what the LNP are doing and what they are saying that they are doing. I think the biggest problem that we’ve got with the LORD MAYOR’s actions so far on community clubs, is that there has been this $5,000, but no follow-up, no follow‑up.

So instead of doing the right thing and outlining a course of action—even tonight he could still stand up and do it as part of this debate and say, yes, we are going to undertake the repairs for the clubs. We’ll pay for them. He could stand up and say that tonight, or he could stand up and say, right we’re going to be offering grants of $100,000 and we’re going to ask the clubs to go and get money from the State Government as well. I don’t know if he’s going to do it that way. There should be some pretty clear indications about what is going to happen now, because I think it’s going to be a very expensive rebuild process.

But what is not good form is to take money away that people have relied on when the outcome of that means that the clubs that need the money are still not getting it for their flood recovery works. If the LORD MAYOR really wants some suggestions about what to cut—if the LORD MAYOR wants some suggestions about what to cut, he could start with the marketing budget, that would be a really good start. He could have started by meeting with the Prime Minister yesterday and asking for money, he didn’t do that either. There are plenty of other options in this budget for things that could be better utilised to support our clubs instead of cutting their grants.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON your time has expired.

 Further speakers on the amendment? Any further speakers on the amendment?

 Councillor CUNNINGHAM do you want to sum up?

 Okay so the amendment motion is to delete the words, ‘after reinstates round two of’, and to add the words at the end, ‘as soon as feasible’. So the amendment change will be that Brisbane City Council reinstates the Lord Mayor’s Better Suburbs grants for the Community Facility category as soon as feasible.

The Chair put the motion for the amendment to the notified motion to the Chamber resulting in it being declared **carried** on the voices.

Chair: Debate on the amended motion.

Councillor HOWARD: On the new motion?

Chair: On the substantive motion, yes.

Councillor HOWARD: On the substantive motion. Thank you, Mr Chair. I realise it is quite late at night, but I rise to speak on briefly on the motion and to just maybe set a few things more accurately in the record. So through you, Mr Chair, organisations and Councillors were made aware on 11 March that the Better Suburbs grants were suspended. The funds from this program needed to be redirected to emergency payments for flood relief. We knew that community clubs were going to need immediately financial help, and we acted quickly to make this happen. This decision was made over three weeks ago and the Labor Party are just catching up tonight.

In fact, through you, Mr Chair, $5,000 payments were being sent to community organisations within the space of two weeks of this scheme being announced. What a fantastic outcome. That didn’t happen in 2011. It happened because of the hard working officers that put their shoulder to the wheel and made sure that we got $5,000 to those community organisations as quickly as we possibly could. It will be up to the clubs how they spend that money. It’s to help remove large bulky items, to get them back up and running. The critical thing is that the clubs know that they could count on this money as quickly as possible. That’s exactly what we did.

We know that we will have to work with all levels of government to help those worse‑hit clubs undertake that structural work necessary to rebuild clubhouses. Some of the clubs are going to need significant help, we understand that. We are working so closely with those clubs. In fact, I can report here tonight that 440 organisations have completed that survey. Now that survey helps us to understand what the clubs need. The $5,000 gets them up and running as quickly as we possibly can. As of this afternoon, 129 organisations have been paid their disaster relief payments totalling $645,000.

If we didn’t create an emergency fund the Opposition would have criticised us. When we actually did create one, they still criticised us. So the Schrinner Council is committed to supporting our community groups. That is what we do. That’s why we will be supporting the amended motion which recommends Council reinstate the Better Suburbs grants as soon as feasible.

Chair: Thank you.

 Further speakers?

 Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair. What a strange speech. Councillor HOWARD just said that they created some new special fund that funded these $5,000 payments. They didn’t. They cancelled a round of grants worth millions of dollars to hand out $645,000.

Councillor HOWARD: Mr Chair, claim to be misrepresented.

Chair: Noted.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: That’s a cut to club’s funding by more than 50%. There’s a strange alternate reality going on. We’ve got the LNP Councillors all night and now Councillor HOWARD getting up and saying the big bad Council in 2011 didn’t do all these things, the Council that they were all part of, the LNP Administration, criticising the LNP for doing nothing in 2011, then coming in and riding on these great white stallions saving all these clubs with a $5,000 payment, these clubs that have hundreds of thousands of dollars’ worth of damage and then saying, but some other level of government will fix it. You know, the State and Federal Government, they will give the money to fix these clubs.

Councillor HOWARD: Claim to be misrepresented.

Chair: Excuse me, point of order first, Councillor HOWARD.

Councillor HOWARD: Point of order. Claim to be misrepresented again.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor HOWARD.

Councillor CASSIDY: It’s just so strange what’s going on. I just—this just reinforces again that the LNP Councillors and the leadership of the LNP, whether it’s the LORD MAYOR, the DEPUTY MAYOR or these Committee Chairs, just don’t know what is going on out in the suburbs, they don’t know the challenges that these clubs are facing. Where they can come in here and say that they are the good guys for eating up a grant fund that was there to provide basic upgrades to Council-owned facilities because they wouldn’t fund them under a capital program. But in piecemeal funding, will give some funding to community organisations to maintain Council facilities.

 So they cut that. They’ve cut that and said that that’s a great thing. The LNP are coming in and saying they have done great work in cutting community grants to give one-off $5,000 donations to clubs. Sure they are appreciative right now to get the $5,000 to help them right now. But again, they were led to believe—in the email that was sent out, the Council officers have identified that those clubs did an awful lot of work at their behest—at Council’s behest—on these applications, on doing all this planning, on spending all this time putting together these applications, doing their applications for works, paying for reports, doing all this out of club funds to make sure that they’re in a good position to get this piecemeal funding that they were promised.

That’s been taken away from them and according to Councillor HOWARD, that’s all right. Well it just really isn’t.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: Yes, that’s right, patting themselves on the back. What we have here again is this is kerbside collection all over again. We have this amended motion before us which says that the Better Suburbs grants will be reinstated when it’s feasible. Well it’s feasible today to do it. This Council can make the decision to do it right now and actually support community clubs. Community clubs that have been flood affected and community clubs that have been forgotten about for decades under this LNP Administration. Ones that have been left to rot and then they’ll fall apart and those communities are expected to spend $1 million of their own volunteer-raised money to fix them up.

All those community facilities that are at risk of being bulldozed now by this LNP Administration, they have been forgotten for decades. That trend is increasing now here today with this decision by this LNP Administration to cut this grant funding. What this does—what this amended motion does, really, is enable and confirm that this current round of funding that’s in the budget right now, will never be paid out to community groups. So when feasible means probably, for the LNP—minimum next financial year, so this financial year, but maybe two, maybe three.

They’ll say, oh well we had to wait on other levels of government to give us some money. We couldn’t possibly help out the community organisations that were leasing Council-owned facilities because it’s always someone else’s fault when it comes to this LNP Administration. It’s just lazy. It’s weak, but it is really true to form for this Administration. They really don’t know what’s going on out in the community and they really don’t want to know because they don’t care.

Chair: Councillor HOWARD, your claims of misrepresentation.

Councillor HOWARD: Yes, Mr Chair. At no time did I use the word cut, and at no time did I say that we were relying on some other level of government. I said that we would be working with levels of government.

Chair: Thank you.

 Further speakers?

 Councillor CUMMING.

Councillor CUMMING: Thank you. I just want to speak briefly on this matter. I’m really concerned about these clubs relying on grants from anyone and getting any permission from the Brisbane City Council to spend the money. Because I’ve had cases in my area where they’ve—clubs were given money before the last Federal election. Now hold on, that’s three years ago now, and they haven’t turned one shovel so far because they’ve been stuffed around by the LNP Administration. So I’d hate to see what’s going to happen with a large number of clubs wanting permission from Council to get anything done on their grounds any time soon.

I just put out a challenge there to the Administration that you’ve got to change your attitude towards that have got grant money to be spent. You’ve got to assist them. You co-operate with them and work with them to get the money spent and not stuff them around for years, which is what is happening at present.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor CUMMING.

 Further speakers?

 LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Yes, thank you. I just imagine being a fly on the wall in the Labor caucus room about what they’re going to talk about each Council meeting. Councillor CUMMING would be snoozing in the corner. He’d occasionally wake up and go LNP cuts, that’s what we’ll talk about, LNP cuts. Councillor CASSIDY would be like, yes, that’s a great idea, let’s talk about LNP cuts. So we’ve seen the most unimaginative rubbish—dribble from the Labor Party yet again with this ridiculous motion. They’ve compared it to kerbside collection. Well okay, if you want to draw that comparison, what happened with kerbside collection? We had to pause it—

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —and then we brought it back. We brought it back. In fact, we’ve just undertaken the biggest kerbside collection in the city’s history. So you want to compare it to kerbside collection? My goodness. I can tell you, there will be a significant number of things we are going to have to reassess as a result of the cost of this flood, a significant number of things. That is exactly what had to happen after 2011 as well. So what I can tell you is this, in 2011 the cost to repair Council‑related infrastructure and assets was over $440 million. But unfortunately what Councillor CASSIDY—he wasn’t around at the time—what Councillor CASSIDY said that was completely inaccurate was that the Federal and State Governments paid for it all. Council was out of pocket over $100 million from the 2011 flood. That’s costs that couldn’t be reimbursed or weren’t reimbursed—

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Now, okay let’s take $100 million in 2011 dollars and what would maybe the value of that be today? What would be the value? As I said earlier, we’re talking several hundred million dollars. It’s in the hundreds of millions of dollars that this budget will be out of pocket based on the current estimates. Now there’s still a lot that has to be firmed up in terms of the costs going forward and we’re going through that process. The Council officers and the Finance sections are working very diligently on tallying up all of these costs. They’re working diligently to make sure that as much as possible can be claimed through disaster funding arrangements, but they are already well aware that there will be a gap. It will be a significant gap.

 So the idea that somehow everything can just continue on as normal is just—it’s really a bizarre way of looking at what is a significant hit to the finances of this Council on top of what has already been a significant hit with COVID already. So what has happened here is that we had in the budget, funded two rounds of the Lord\Mayor’s Better Suburbs grants. I can tell you, those grants have been promised to nobody. The idea that they’ve—oh yes we’ve been asked to apply and we’ve been promised a grant—no. There’s actually a process to go through where grants are assessed and then approved.

 If anyone is promising grants to anyone before this process has been undertaken I would be very concerned about that because that should not be happening. So here we get another mistruth from the Labor Party. That is not surprising, but once again disappointing. So what is happening is the funding that’s available right now for the second round, every cent that is available—it’s not being cut Councillor CASSIDY, it’s being injected straight into the flood-affected clubs and community groups who need it the most.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: I wonder what you would say—I wonder what you would say if we actually—

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY.

LORD MAYOR: —gave the money to clubs who hadn’t been flood affected. I know what they would say. They would come into this place—

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY, please.

LORD MAYOR: —and they would say your priorities are all wrong. What about these poor flooded clubs? You’re not doing anything for them yet you’re giving money to other clubs. Anyone predict that they would have done that?

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: This is a farse, this is a joke and this is a waste of everyone’s time. There is not a single dollar that has been cut. This money is all, every single cent of it, going to community groups in need.

Chair: Thank you, LORD MAYOR.

 Any further speakers?

 We now move then to the vote on the amended motion that Brisbane City Council reinstates the Lord Mayor’s Better Suburbs grants for the Community Facility category as soon as possible.

The Chair submitted the motion to the Chamber and it was declared **carried** on the voices.

Thereupon, the DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Krista ADAMS, and Councillor Sandy LANDERS immediately rose and called for a division, which resulted in the motion being declared **carried**.

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 24 - The Right Honourable, the LORD MAYOR, Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER, DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Krista ADAMS, and Councillors Greg ADERMANN, Adam ALLAN, Fiona CUNNINGHAM, Tracy DAVIS, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Sarah HUTTON, Sandy LANDERS, James MACKAY, Kim MARX, Peter MATIC, David McLACHLAN, Ryan MURPHY, Angela OWEN, Steven TOOMEY, Andrew WINES, and the Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Jared CASSIDY, and Councillors Kara COOK, Peter CUMMING, Steve GRIFFITHS, Charles STRUNK and Nicole JOHNSTON.

Chair: That concludes today’s meeting.

 I’ll see you here on 3 May.

## QUESTIONS OF WHICH DUE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

*(Questions of which due notice has been given are printed as supplied and are not edited)*

**Submitted by Councillor Steve Griffiths (received on 17 March 2022)**

**Q1.** In relation to Brisbane City Council’s $50,000 sponsorship of White Box Enterprises, can you please advise if this is for a specific program or project?

**Q2.** If the sponsorship funding from Brisbane City Council to White Box Enterprises is for a specific project, where is the project run and what suburbs does it cover?

**Q3.** If the sponsorship of White Box Enterprises is not for a specific purpose, what areas of Brisbane does this organisation cover?

**Q4.** Was a traffic count done before the installation of the new traffic lights at Rickertt and Chelsea Roads, Chandler were installed?

**Q5.** Did residents have to pay for their newly upgraded concrete driveways on Rickertt Road, Wakerley?

**Q6.** Why is the open drain system still open after all the Chelsea and Rickertt Road works were completed? Why were they not covered?

**Q7.** What works are now being done on Rickertt Road, after the recent rain event and why?

**Q8.** Provide the total number of buses presently in Brisbane City Council’s fleet, broken down by the year of service commencement:-

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **YEAR COMMENCED SERVICE** | **NUMBER OF BUSES** |
|   |   |

**Q9.** Provide a full breakdown of all costs incurred by Council to date relating to the 5-year project to completely repaint the Story Bridge announced by the Lord Mayor in February 2019.

**Q10.** Provide a full breakdown of all anticipated future costs for Council relating to the 5-year project to completely repaint the Story Bridge announced by the Lord Mayor in February 2019.

**Q11.** What is the current number of Council officers for the following job roles (excluding contractors)\*:

| **JOB ROLE** | **FTEs** | **Full Time** | **Part Time** | **Casual** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Gardener |   |   |   |   |
| ICT Role |   |   |   |   |
| Labourer |   |   |   |   |
| Asphalter |   |   |   |   |
| Project Manager |   |   |   |   |
| General Trades |   |   |   |   |
| Engineering |   |   |   |   |
| Cleaner |   |   |   |   |
| Analyst |   |   |   |   |
| Technician |   |   |   |   |
| Bridge Maintenance |   |   |   |   |
| Trades Assistant |   |   |   |   |
| Administration |   |   |   |   |
| Transport Worker |   |   |   |   |
| Change Manager |   |   |   |   |
| Truck Driver |   |   |   |   |
| Quarry Worker |   |   |   |   |
| Engineering Trade |   |   |   |   |
| Architect |   |   |   |   |
| Contract Management |   |   |   |   |
| Customer Services |   |   |   |   |
| SAP support |   |   |   |   |
| Surveyor |   |   |   |   |
| ICT Architect |   |   |   |   |
| Sandbagger |   |   |   |   |
| Logistics |   |   |   |   |
| Landscape Architect |   |   |   |   |
| Letterbox dropper |   |   |   |   |
| Environmental Officer |   |   |   |   |
| Urban Planner |   |   |   |   |
| Accountant |   |   |   |   |
| Marketing |   |   |   |   |
| Mechanic |   |   |   |   |
| HR |   |   |   |   |
| WHS |   |   |   |   |
| Traffic Controller |   |   |   |   |
| Plant Operator |   |   |   |   |
| CAD |   |   |   |   |
| Inspector |   |   |   |   |
| Carpenter |   |   |   |   |
| Groundsman |   |   |   |   |
| Burial Officer |   |   |   |   |
| Document Controller |   |   |   |   |
| Project Designer |   |   |   |   |
| Signwriter |   |   |   |   |
| Planning |   |   |   |   |
| Plant Operators |   |   |   |   |
| Weighbridge Operator |   |   |   |   |
| Integration Advisor |   |   |   |   |
| Interior Design |   |   |   |   |
| Plumber |   |   |   |   |
| Business Improvement |   |   |   |   |
| Recruitment |   |   |   |   |
| Business Development |   |   |   |   |
| Senior Methodology Officer |   |   |   |   |
| Habitat Officer |   |   |   |   |
| Quality Manager |   |   |   |   |
| Procurement |   |   |   |   |
| Yardsmen |   |   |   |   |
| Boilermaker |   |   |   |   |
| Contaminated Sites Officer |   |   |   |   |

\* This question was asked previously, however it was not answered at the meeting of 1 March 2022 as *Council officers have advised they do not have the resources available to answer this question within the timeframe required by the Meetings Local Law 2001*. Given there is more than a month until the next scheduled meeting, this question has been re-submitted for response.

## ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS OF WHICH DUE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

*(Answers to questions of which due notice has been given are printed as supplied and are not edited)*

**Correction to answer provided for Question 3 on 15 March 2022, submitted by Councillor Steve Griffiths (from meeting on 8 March 2022)**

*The answer to question 3 in last week’s response mentioned that Council had installed 183 backflow devices since 2011. While Council has installed 183 backflow devices across the city, some installation occurred prior to 2011.*

**Submitted by Councillor Steve Griffiths (from meeting on 15 March 2022)**

**Q1.** List all locations where backflow devices were installed by Council in the following financial years, including the number installed per location:-

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FINANCIAL YEAR** | **LOCATION** | **NUMBER OF BACKFLOW DEVICES INSTALLED PER LOCATION** |
| 2012-2013 |  |  |
| 2013-2014 |  |  |
| 2014-2015 |  |  |
| 2015-2016 |  |  |

***A1.***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***FINANCIAL YEAR*** | ***LOCATION*** | ***NUMBER OF BACKFLOW DEVICES INSTALLED PER LOCATION*** |
| *2012-2013* | *Castlemaine St, Milton**James St, New Farm**Harrison St, Bulimba**Alice/ Margaret/ Charlotte St, Brisbane City* *Vivian/ Lancelot St, Tennyson**Roseberry Tce, Chelmer**Leybourne St, Chelmer* | *8**4**2**3**2**1**2* |
| *2013-2014* | *Kenny St, Fig Tree Pocket**Lang Pde, Milton**Land St, Auchenflower**Gailey Rd, Toowong* *Nadine St, Chelmer* *Queenscroft St, Chelmer* *Creek St, Brisbane City* *New Farm Park**Moray St, New Farm* *Castlemaine St, Milton*  | *1**2**2**2**2**1**1**2**2**1* |
| *2014-2015* |  |  |
| *2015-2016* | *Jamieson St, Bulimba*  | *2* |

*Note: 2013-2014 was the last financial year budget was allocated for the post‑2011 backflow device construction program. Following a final review of the list, Jamieson Street in Bulimba was also nominated as being high priority and that was delivered in 2015-2016.*

**Q2.** Provide the total amount spent on the *Flood Resilient Homes Program* for each of the following financial years:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2018/19** | **2019/2020** | **2020/2021** | **2021/2022 (TO DATE)** |
|  |  |  |  |

***A2.***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***2018/19*** | ***2019/2020*** | ***2020/2021*** | ***2021/2022 (TO DATE)*** |
| *$2,268,000* | *$3,091,000* | *$2,849,000* | *$1,631,000* |

**Q3.** When announced in 2018, the *Flood Resilient Homes Program* was to be delivered over four years. How many households received the in-home professional flood-risk assessment, broken down by suburb.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SUBURB** | **2018/19** | **2019/2020** | **2020/2021** | **2021/2022 (TO DATE)** |
| Rosalie |  |  |  |  |
| Inala North |  |  |  |  |
| [*Add name/s of any other suburb*] |  |  |  |  |

***A3.*** *Rosalie and Inala North are not suburbs of Brisbane.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***SUBURB*** | ***2018/19*** | ***2019/2020*** | ***2020/2021*** | ***2021/2022*** ***(TO DATE)*** |
| *Paddington* | *102* | *8* | *1* | *1* |
| *Inala*  | *24* | *2* | *0* | *0* |
| *Wavell Heights*  | *0* | *56* | *6* | *0* |
| *Camp Hill* | *0* | *33* | *14* | *1* |
| *West End*  | *0* | *0* | *0* | *20* |
| *Keperra*  | *0* | *0* | *0* | *18* |

**Q4.** How many households received $50,000 for a flood-resilient retrofit upgrade as part of the *Flood Resilient Homes Program* for each of the following financial years, broken down by suburb.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SUBURB** | **2018/19** | **2019/2020** | **2020/2021** | **2021/2022 (TO DATE)** |
| Rosalie |  |  |  |  |
| Inala North |  |  |  |  |
| [*Add name/s of any other suburb*] |  |  |  |  |

***A4.*** *While there were 144 households across multiple suburbs which received some sort of flood-resilient upgrade to their property within the above periods, no household received $50,000 for the works. All works were managed through the Brisbane Sustainability Agency.*

**Q5.** What is the total amount spent on the $50,000 flood-resilient retrofit upgrades as part of the *Flood Resilient Homes Program* for each of the following financial years, broken down by suburb.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SUBURB** | **2018/19** | **2019/2020** | **2020/2021** | **2021/2022 (TO DATE)** |
| Rosalie |  |  |  |  |
| Inala North |  |  |  |  |
| [*Add name/s of any other suburb*] |  |  |  |  |

***A5.*** *Rosalie and Inala North are not suburbs of Brisbane.*

| ***SUBURB*** | ***2018/19*** | ***2019/2020*** | ***2020/2021*** | ***2021/2022 (TO DATE)*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Paddington* | *$353,990* | *$625,487* | *$695,505* | *$103,114* |
| *Inala* | *$25,043* | *$160,037* |  |  |
| *Wavell Heights* |  | *$75,554* | *$247,925* | *$196,303* |
| *Camp Hill* |  | *$129,875* | *$484,739* | *$195,282* |
| *West End* |  |  |  | *$34,014* |
| *Keperra*  |  |  |  | *$34,580* |

*Note: The above figures represent the total amount invoiced for building works. It does not include costs for home service, architectural drawings, further investigations, or the development of customer reports.*

**Q6.** Provide a list of all companies which have been contracted by Council to assist with the flood clean-up (to date).

***A6.***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Active Tree Services Pty Ltd* |  | *Adapt-a-Lift Group Pty Ltd* |
| *Advanced Shade Systems Pty Ltd* |  | *Advanced Temporary Fencing P/L* |
| *All Terrain Earthworks* |  | *Alpha Omega Excavations* |
| *Altus* |  | *Ampol Australia Pty Ltd*  |
| *Aquaspec Pty Ltd* |  | *As You Like It Landscaping Pty Ltd* |
| *Aussie Excavators Plant Hire P/L* |  | *Australian Regional Wholesalers P/L* |
| *Autowash Pty Ltd* |  | *Bayton Property Services* |
| *Beltec*  |  | *Bemcove Pty Ltd* |
| *BOC Limited* |  | *BPH Brancatella Plant Hire Pty Ltd* |
| *Braums Pty Ltd* |  | *Brisbane Livestock Control* |
| *Budget Rent a Car Australia Pty Ltd* |  | *Bunnings Group Limited* |
| *Centenary Landscaping Supplies* |  | *Cleanaway Industrial Solutions Pty* |
| *Cleanaway Pty Ltd* |  | *CNW Pty Ltd* |
| *Corridor Sands Pty Ltd* |  | *Create Security* |
| *Creative Lighting* |  | *D & M Plant Hire* |
| *D.A. Christie P/L T/As Christie Par* |  | *Downer EDI Works Pty Ltd* |
| *Eagle Alliance Earthmoving Pty Ltd* |  | *Elite Helicopters Pty Limited* |
| *Eltech Electrical Pty Ltd* |  | *Emergency Medics Pty Ltd* |
| *ENGIE Mechanical Services* |  | *EPH Contracts (Qld) Pty Ltd* |
| *Eversafe Extinguisher Aust Pty Ltd* |  | *Executive Helicopters Pty Ltd* |
| *Forge Bros Engineering* |  | *Frank & Dorothy Tipper Hire* |
| *FSA (Qld) Pty Ltd* |  | *Fuelfix Ltd* |
| *GCE Contractors Pty Ltd* |  | *Gravel City Pty Ltd* |
| *Ground Works Aust* |  | *H2 Flow Hire* |
| *Hart Valley Investments Pty Ltd* |  | *Hastings Deering (Aust) Pty Ltd* |
| *Herbies Earthmoving Pty Ltd* |  | *Heritage Tree Services* |
| *Hexlawn Pty Ltd* |  | *IDC Electrical Pty Ltd* |
| *Independent Tree Services Pty Ltd* |  | *J Blackwood & Son Pty Ltd* |
| *J J Richards & Son Pty Ltd* |  | *Jet Excavators & Trucks* |
| *JET Excavators and Trucks* |  | *Jimboomba Turf Co Pty Ltd* |
| *JK Cartage* |  | *John R Turk* |
| *Kennards Hire Pty Ltd* |  | *Kennards Hire Pty Ltd* |
| *Lawrence and Hanson Group Pty Ltd* |  | *Lincon Logistics Pty Ltd* |
| *Lind Contracting Pty Ltd* |  | *Master Hire Pty Ltd* |
| *Mi Electric Pty Ltd* |  | *MJF Group Queensland Pty Ltd* |
| *Multhana Property Services Pty Ltd*  |  | *NAPA* |
| *Neverfail Springwater Ltd* |  | *Nugrow Ipswich*  |
| *Patriot Tankers Pty Ltd* |  | *Pensar Utilities Pty Ltd* |
| *Phoenix Power Recyclers* |  | *Pipe Management Australia Pty Ltd* |
| *Platinum Electricians Pty Ltd* |  | *Powerclear Pty Limited* |
| *Q-Crete Premix Pty Ltd* |  | *Qld Civil Engineering* |
| *Queensland Police Service* |  | *Randstad Pty Ltd* |
| *Recom Group Pty Ltd* |  | *Remondis* |
| *Remoplains Pty Ltd* |  | *River City Garden & Lawn Pty Ltd* |
| *River City Trees* |  | *Rogers Energy Services Pty Ltd* |
| *Southern Pacific Sands* |  | *Specialised Pavement Services* |
| *Speedy Bins* |  | *Stapylton Resource Recovery (Qld) Pty Ltd* |
| *Suez Environment Recycling and* |  | *Sulo MGB Australia Pty Ltd* |
| *Swanns Arboricultural Services* |  | *TFH Hire Services Pty Ltd* |
| *Titree Bioenergy* |  | *TNS – Flood* |
| *Toni Cook Excavations Pty Ltd* |  | *TPM Plumbing Services Pty Ltd* |
| *Tradelink Plumbing Supplies* |  | *Treescape Australasia Pty Ltd* |
| *United Hire* |  | *Vacuum Excavation (Aust) Pty Ltd* |
| *Verifact Traffic Pty Ltd* |  | *Viking Industrial Pty Ltd* |
| *Waller Plumbing Pty Ltd* |  | *Williams Cranes & Rigging Pty Ltd* |
| *Wilson Security Pty Ltd* |  | *Wood Mulching Industries* |

**Q7.** During the Brisbane 2022 severe weather event, the Lord Mayor and Deputy Mayor provided regular updates on the number of people who registered as volunteers for the Brisbane Mud Army 2.0. In total, how many people registered as volunteers for the Brisbane Mud Army 2.0 and how many of those volunteers were physically deployed?

***A7.*** *16,747 people registered with Volunteering Queensland for Mud Army 2.0. Of these, an estimated 1,795 were deployed through our marshalling stations on Saturday 5 March. This number doesn’t capture those that registered but deployed themselves on 5 March, as well as those who have helped throughout the whole clean-up period.*

**Q8.** Provide all dates where traffic counts were done before the installation of traffic lights at Rickertt and Chelsea Roads.

***A8.*** *26/08/1992, 11/08/1998, 02/09/2004, 17/11/2004, 12/02/2009, 10/06/2009, 29/07/2009 to 04/08/2009, 22/11/2010 to 28/11/2010, 09/09/2014, 15/07/2015, 22/07/2015, 16/06/2017 to 22/06/2017, 15/07/2019 to 21/07/2019.*

**Q9.** Advise whether residents paid for their newly upgraded concrete driveways on Rickertt Road, Wakerley or if this was at cost to the project (and if so, how much).

***A9.*** *The upgraded driveways were included in the overall project, costing $16,740.*

**Q10.** Provide details as to why the decision was made to keep the drainage system still open after all the completion of the Rickertt and Chelsea Roads intersection works, rather than constructing a covered system.

***A10.*** *The open drain system was retained to capture water entering the affected area from properties where no kerb and channel exists.*

**RISING OF COUNCIL: 10.08pm.**

**PRESENTED: and CONFIRMED**

 **CHAIR**

**Council officers in attendance:**

Victor Tan (Council and Committee Coordinator)

Dorian Maruda (A/Senior Council and Committee Officer)

Ashley Bailey (A/Council and Committee Officer)

Billy Peers (Personal Support Officer to the Lord Mayor and Council Orderly)