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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)** |
| 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) (Deputy Chair of Council)Ryan MURPHY (Chandler)Steven TOOMEY (The Gap)Andrew WINES (Enoggera) | Jared CASSIDY (Deagon) (The Leader of the Opposition)Peter CUMMING (Wynnum Manly)Charles STRUNK (Forest Lake) |
| **Queensland Greens Councillor (and Ward)**Jonathan SRIRANGANATHAN (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: I declare the meeting open.

I remind all Councillors of your obligations to declare prescribed and/or declarable conflicts of interest where relevant, and the requirement as such to remove yourself from the Council Chamber for debate and voting where applicable.

Are there any apologies?

Councillor CASSIDY.

## APOLOGY:

**149/2022-23**

An apology was submitted on behalf of the Councillors Kara COOK and Steve GRIFFITHS, and they were granted leave of absence from the meeting on the motion of Councillor Jared CASSIDY, seconded by Councillor Charles STRUNK.

Chair: Further apologies?

**150/2022-23**

An apology was submitted on behalf of the DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Krista ADAMS, and she was granted a leave of absence from the meeting on the motion of Councillor Sandy LANDERS, seconded by Councillor Sarah HUTTON.

Chair: Councillors, we have a public participant today, Mr Yas Matbouly, who has requested an opportunity to address the Council on the story and vision of Serving Our People.

Clerks, can Mr Matbouly be brought into the Chamber, please? Oh, with a prop on wheels.

Thank you, Mr Matbouly. You’ll have five minutes for your address once you start, and a Councillor will respond to you. Please, when you start—when you press the button.

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

**Mr Yas Matbouly – The story and vision of Serving Our People**

Mr Yas Matbouly: Mr Chair, LORD MAYOR, and Councillors, thank you for your time and for giving us the opportunity to present to you here today. On behalf of Serving Our People, we thank the Council, LORD MAYOR Adrian SCHRINNER, and Lady Mayoress Nina Schrinner for the continuous support and recognition. In March 2020, I founded Serving Our People as a direct response to the pandemic, to serve and to engage in discourse on social action. As thousands of people experienced the ripple effects of social isolation on their health, economics, and mobility, the voices of destitution and desperation grew louder.

Our local charity partners had the will, but not the means, to deliver much‑needed goods. This lack of logistics led to a backlog and the problem kept compounding. The result was a bottleneck, with donors waiting to have goods collected, warehouses stockpiling from floor to ceiling, and most importantly, longer delays before goods could reach recipients doing it tough. Our team of volunteers pooled our heads and hearts to address this, using their own vehicles to assist the local charities and direct recipients with deliveries.

Our Serving Our People reputation gained greater prominence on the streets of Brisbane, delivering good news and hope to the most disadvantaged people. This had a snowball effect, as more volunteer drivers signed up and more goods were donated in response to the cries for help. Our website and helpline accepted increasing details about friends in need. Then, we did something unprecedented. We offered an expedited, free, and express deliveries. Instead of waiting weeks, we coordinated our fleet to deliver within a couple of hours. The deliveries included vital medicine, baby products, groceries, fresh meals, clothes, and furniture.

We then created a mobile vaccination unit to help vaccinate the most vulnerable in our community, even in remote areas. The feedback and emotions were overwhelming for so many people in despair. Mother Nature came through and delivered a wave of tragedy, with floods raging through South East Queensland and northern New South Wales. With our organisational structure and advanced procedures in place, Serving Our People was able to mobilise immediately, similarly to an emergency relief organisation, and bring the same support we had come known to thousands more Australians.

We have also been able to mobilise housing support for homeless people, seeing them placed in humane housing within 48 hours of intervention, and supplied with food, personal care items, clothing and furniture. Serving Our People helps anyone in dire straits, regardless of background, religion, or ethnicity, from our neighbours right here in Australia to displaced Ukrainian refugees building a new home in our country, and all ages from infants to the elderly. So far, we have supported over 52,000 recipients, with over 1,200 volunteers. We have delivered 25,000 meals a year direct from restaurants to hungry Queenslanders, and created five full-time jobs.

We have been dubbed as Australia’s fastest growing charity. Some have described us as an Uber-free-like service in the charity sector, and the go to lifeline for charity deliveries. While philanthropic foundations and corporate businesses have stepped up to support our mission, we now need your support to continue. First, we need to construct more Serving Our People donation boxes—exhibit A. These are strategically positioned at the checkouts of major supermarkets, where the local community can contribute by donating non‑perishable goods on their way out. Those donation boxes then get delivered to our recipients, who are elderly, young single mothers, people with a disability, people experiencing poverty, and homeless friends.

We know that there are more people sleeping rough on benches and under bridges, compounded by the rising cost of living. Each donation box feeds 40 families per week, so that’s feeding over 2,000 people per box per year. Imagine what dozens of these boxes throughout Brisbane would do. We now seek Council support to construct and distribute enough donation boxes to see them in leading supermarkets across Brisbane and one in each Council ward in the Brisbane area.

We apply for financial support to grow our physical, technological and human capacity, but we know that some funds are available at Council’s discretion or by invitation only, and to that, we say, yes please. Invite us to your table so we can share our vision to build a Serving Our People hub in the heart of Brisbane, where it will include a free supermarket to feed struggling households. The hub will also serve as the multipurpose venue to train our volunteers, host events like the Christmas lunch for the homeless, and be used as a warehousing facility to fulfil the current need.

As a final note, we’d love your support in the following areas: making Serving Our People as an emergency relief organisation, creating a Brisbane hub with a free supermarket, placement of donation boxes in all the wards and introduction to leading supermarkets. We’d love the opportunity to serve our community together. Thank you for loving our community.

Chair: Thank you, Mr Matbouly. Your time has expired.

Is there somebody responding?

Councillor HOWARD.

**Response by Councillor Vicki HOWARD, Civic Cabinet Chair of the Community, Arts and Nighttime Economy Committee**

Councillor HOWARD: Well, thank you very much for that presentation, Mr Matbouly. My name’s Vicki HOWARD. I’m the Civic Cabinet Chair for communities, and so all that you have talked about are the things that we have experienced over the last couple of years, really. As you say, with the pandemic arriving, there have been so many wonderful people such as yourself and Serving Our People who have done an amazing job right across Brisbane. We congratulate you and we thank you very much for all that you have done. The Schrinner Council is fully committed to building an inclusive and a connected city, and we deeply value the work that charities and not-for-profit organisations like Serving Our People do to help those in need across Brisbane.

I know that you have held a couple of fundraisers right here in this beautiful City Hall and that our LORD MAYOR and Lady Mayoress were there, and I know how much our Lady Mayoress is keen and committed to the type of work that you’re doing, so really appreciate that you have done that. Thank you for the prop. That’s really great that we’ve been able to see what it is that you would like us to do. Look, I think it’s something that every Councillor in this Chamber would like to help you with, so I think it’s something that we probably just need to meet and have a chat about to see just what we can do in that space.

As I said, our portfolio deals with a lot of different organisations right across Brisbane and it is something that I think that we would all be very willing to have a chat to see what we can do to support you in that. So, again, wish you every success in what you’re doing, look forward to working with you, and thank you very much for speaking to us today. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you for coming in, Mr Matbouly. We’ll allow you to leave the Chamber first before we continue, with your little car. Thank you.

## QUESTION TIME:

Chair: Councillors are there any questions of the LORD MAYOR or a Civic Cabinet Chair of any of the Standing Committees?

Councillor MACKAY.

**Question 1**

Councillor MACKAY: Thank you, Chair. My question is to the LORD MAYOR. LORD MAYOR, two weeks ago, the State Government released their report into the February floods. Could you please update the Chamber on some of the commentary around the IGEM (Inspector-General for Emergency Management) report, including what actually happened when it came to alerts.

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor MACKAY. I know this is something you’re very interested in as one of the many flood-affected Councillors or flood-affected ward Councillors across the city. Now, it was of great interest that we saw a couple of weeks ago the IGEM report released, because we are already into the next storm season after the February floods. We had rightly been concerned that learnings from the flood at all levels of government needed to made within appropriate time so that they could be actioned as we go into another storm season. So I was delighted to see that the report was actually released, not before time. I would point out, Councillor MACKAY, that our own report was dealt with very expeditiously to make sure that we could get on with the job of implementing recommendations.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: We made sure that the report timeframe gave us plenty of time to get on with the job, and so in May, former Governor and Chief Justice Paul de Jersey released his report with 37 recommendations, all of which we are actioning, and a majority of which we have completed at this point in time. So we got on with it, and we were waiting to see what was happening with the State’s report.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Now, it was interesting because a number of months ago, one particular Minister in the State Government had flagged that he sought to politicise the flood response, and in fact, he spoke in Parliament, effectively with a veiled threat against Brisbane City Council. It was quite clear that his intent was to politicise this matter—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —which is really disappointing because we know—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —that in any natural disaster events, there are always things that could have been done better, there are always things that could be improved, and our responsibility is to make sure that we respond better and better each time, and learn the lessons. So, first of all, leaving this report so long is a concern and one that we have raised concerns about. In fact, just recently when I raised my own concerns about where the report is, surprise surprise, the very next day, the IGEM report was released.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Why was it released? Because—

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, please.

LORD MAYOR: —it had been sitting—

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, enough.

LORD MAYOR: —it had been sitting on the Minister’s desk for six to seven weeks.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Six to seven weeks, and then he was shamed into releasing it when we spoke out and said, ‘what is happening? This alert system is broken. It needs to be fixed. We need to get on with it.’ Then, magically, the day after, we saw this report released. Now, unlike some Councillors in this room, I have actually read the IGEM report. I have read it in detail. One of the things that you will see very clearly when you read the report is that what the IGEM report says and what Minister Ryan says are two entirely different things. Minister Ryan came good with his threat to politicise this matter, and it is very disappointing.

A Minister that is responsible for our emergency services and police seeking to politicise a natural disaster is incredibly disappointing, but the reality is this. What did the report say about the alert system? The emergency alert system and national system, funded by the Federal Government and operated by state governments, that is what we are talking about here. The system failed.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: The system was not fit-for-purpose.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON.

LORD MAYOR: The system got overloaded—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON.

LORD MAYOR: —and the system which is designed to get messages—well, it was theoretically designed to get messages quickly to people in the community, took—in the February floods—up to 14 hours to deliver messages. That is a serious challenge that needs to be fixed. We said it immediately after the February flood. It was said again in May when former Governor de Jersey released his review, and it was confirmed in the IGEM report that this system needs to be fixed. The ultimate example of the fact that this system needs to be fixed is what happened on the weekend, when we used the system to send out some advice to residents that the Bureau had predicted up to 150 mm of rain.

Now, we are fortunate that that rain did not come in Brisbane, but it came in other areas. We got an average of 55 mm in Brisbane, so we were very fortunate, but heavy amounts of rain fell in other areas around us. So it was the right thing to do to use that system, and what happened? We were the only Council in the queue. We were the first Council to send a message. There was no one ahead of us in the queue. This system, under ideal conditions with no one else in the queue—

Chair: LORD MAYOR—

LORD MAYOR: —took six to seven hours to reach residents.

Chair: —your time has expired.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Further questions?

 Councillor CASSIDY.

**Question 2**

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair. LORD MAYOR, we’ve found out that you waited until Sunday 27 February to request a flood warning to be sent to residents who were facing imminent danger.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: This message arrived after every single one of those suburban Brisbane residents had already been flooded from creek and flash flooding.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: You requested the message after residents had flooded.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: Do you regret this delay, LORD MAYOR?

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Well, Councillor CASSIDY, unfortunately, it appears you’re taking the same tack as Minister Ryan and choosing to play politics—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —with a natural disaster. Now, to be very clear about the timeline of events here, Saturday was the day that the Leader of this State got up and told the community, there is no cause for concern.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Saturday was that day.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Now, on Saturday evening, I was in fact the first elected representative in Queensland to warn that there’s potential flooding coming, and that illustrates just how quickly the situation continued to evolve and change. It was a rapidly evolving situation. What we saw is, throughout those several days of rain, the Bureau was updating their weather advice, and it was getting worse and worse and worse progressively over hours. There were multiple changes to the weather advice, and every time the Bureau put out a new advice, in fact, in reality, the amount of rain that fell exceeded that Bureau advice. So not even the Bureau’s changing predictions were correct, so this was a really rapidly evolving situation.

On the Saturday, the Premier had said, there is no cause for concern. By the Saturday evening, the situation was continuing to evolve and we started to warn people that there’s potential flooding coming. Now—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —we had started sending our own alert messages on the Thursday. Not the Saturday, not the Sunday, but on the Thursday.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Right—and in fact, at the point when—

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —the rain started falling and there was predictions that rain was coming, we started sending alerts—

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —and our system—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —our system—

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON.

LORD MAYOR: —our severe weather alert system, which is the Council system as opposed to the national system, gets to people instantaneously. In fact, we’ve been tracking this system very clearly. It gets to people usually within a couple of minutes of the alert going out, within minutes.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Yet the State-controlled system takes anywhere from six hours to 14 hours to reach the people of Brisbane.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —and we have found out since—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: Point of order.

LORD MAYOR: —there is important—

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Yes, just on relevance, I asked a very simple question of the LORD MAYOR, Chair, whether he regretted delaying requesting a message until Sunday 27 February, after residents had flooded. Whether you could bring him back to that part of the question, does he have any regret?

Chair: You’re debating the question. I believe the LORD MAYOR is relevant to the question asked.

LORD MAYOR: We started sending out messages on the Thursday, so we acted—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —really quickly. We used the technology that we had within our control—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —and that technology worked. That technology got to people really quickly.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY.

LORD MAYOR: What we saw—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY.

LORD MAYOR: What we saw, though—

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY, please.

LORD MAYOR: What we saw is a situation where the State-controlled Federal system got overloaded really quickly and became, essentially, worthless. The national emergency alert system became worthless in the 2022 floods because it was not fit-for-purpose and it took too long. This system was designed in response to bushfires in regional towns and communities. It can deal with a small number of people. It sends out messages in lots of 50,000 to 100,000, and in Brisbane, the largest city council area in Australia by a factor of more than two compared to the next biggest Council, this system was quite clearly not designed to deal with flooding in a city like Brisbane.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: So, we’ve been warning about this since February. Governor de Jersey warned about it in May, when the IGEM report came out just a couple of weeks ago, it confirmed that the system was broken and needed to be fixed—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —yet Councillor CASSIDY and Minister Ryan, all they can do is play politics.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: We have this ridiculous situation where the Minister got up yesterday and tried to defend his broken system. He tried to defend and say that it was okay that it took six hours to reach Brisbane residents on the weekend. This is unacceptable. I again make the plea to Minister Ryan. Please, this is not the time for politics. This is the time to get on, work together and fix this broken system. We do not know when we will need to use this system again. Let’s learn from what happened in February.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Let’s learn from what happened on the weekend, and let’s fix this system together so that the residents of Brisbane can be better informed in a time of need.

Chair: Thank you.

Further questions?

Councillor HAMMOND.

**Question 3**

Councillor HAMMOND: Thank you, Mr Chair. My question is to the Chair of the City Planning and Suburban Renewal Committee, Councillor ALLAN. Councillor ALLAN, during the budget debate, Councillor GRIFFITHS was outraged when we said that he didn’t support the construction of new homes, but during the recess, we found Councillor GRIFFITHS campaigning against the future construction of new homes.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor HAMMOND: Can you please update the Chamber of Labor’s hypocrisy on the housing in Brisbane?

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor ALLAN.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, please.

Councillor ALLAN: Thank you, Mr—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Cease interjecting.

Councillor ALLAN: Thank you, Mr Chair, and—

Chair: Councillor ALLAN, you have the floor.

Councillor ALLAN: —through you, thank you Councillor HAMMOND for the question.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor ALLAN: It was during the budget debate that the LORD MAYOR made a general statement in regards to the South East Queensland Regional Plan, and commented that Labor, Greens and Independent Councillors continue to actively oppose the construction of new homes in their areas.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor ALLAN: What the LORD MAYOR was highlighting was that the Labor Opposition—

Chair: Councillor STRUNK, please.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor STRUNK.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor STRUNK, enough.

Councillor ALLAN: Yes, what the LORD MAYOR was highlighting was that the Labor Opposition had abstained, not even voted against the recent Eight Mile Plains neighbourhood plan. So outraged was Councillor GRIFFITHS by the comments that he jumped out of his seat, wanting the LORD MAYOR to withdraw his comments as they were misleading and not true, but what is misleading are the mistruths Councillor GRIFFITHS continues to spin, including at a recent public meeting held a few weeks back on the draft Nathan-Salisbury-Moorooka neighbourhood plan, a public meeting, one which he called and Councillor CASSIDY was there too, as part of the deception.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor ALLAN: His own flyer to the event—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor ALLAN: —outlined mistruth after mistruth after mistruth.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor ALLAN: Mr Chair, I don’t know where to begin—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor ALLAN: —in addressing these—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, enough.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor ALLAN: —but let’s start with the neighbourhood planning process. This particular neighbourhood plan is still in early draft form and we are about halfway through the process. It is also an area that does not appear to have seen any updates to the planning provisions for roughly 20 years, and give or take a few years, this is also the same amount of time Councillor GRIFFITHS has been the local Councillor. The draft strategy—and I point out it was a draft strategy, not the plan—was released last year for community feedback.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor ALLAN: Council officers are currently reviewing public feedback in preparation of releasing a draft neighbourhood plan for further community consultation. Yes, I appreciate this is a lengthy process, but we are committed to ensuring that research is thorough and multiple community consultation opportunities are provided for. As part of the draft strategy release, there were maps that stated Council would investigate and update character protections within the study area. I certainly don’t recall the draft strategy stating we were going to remove protections on over 200 homes, and Councillor GRIFFITHS has repeatedly and incorrectly stated this.

Interestingly, back in August in this very Chamber, Councillor GRIFFITHS spoke to and voted in favour of the Temporary Local Planning Instrument for the Moorooka War Workers Housing Estate, a TLPI that will see protection granted to 180 properties. On this basis alone, he knows very well that Council is in the process of protecting the local heritage—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor ALLAN: —within his precinct and his ward.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Excuse me, Councillor ALLAN.

Councillor JOHNSTON, I have informally warned you now on no fewer than eight occasions. I’m happy to move to the formals—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: —and ask that you cease interjecting. This is your first formal warning.

Councillor ALLAN: Another mistruth was that Council voted against maintaining existing character protections in the Nathan-Salisbury-Moorooka neighbourhood plan area. This is absolutely absurd, and again, it shows that Councillor GRIFFITHS has limited understanding of the neighbourhood planning process. We did not vote against it. We just said we wouldn’t make a decision until we had heard from members of the community through the next round of consultation.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor ALLAN: It would be inappropriate to even predict or anticipate the outcome of the neighbourhood planning process prior to further research being undertaken and stakeholder and community input sought. As to Councillor GRIFFITHS’ comment that Council refuse to do public meetings with residents, again more mistruths and comments that are offensive to Council’s Strategic Planning team. The team held three community planning meetings in 2019, a further three information sessions in 2021, and of those meetings, 272 people attended. Furthermore, during this consultation phase in 2021, Council received 271 comments via email, over 300 comments on an interactive map, and 1,188 completed surveys, so plenty of community input.

Now, ultimately, Councillor CASSIDY and Councillor GRIFFITHS have been spinning quite a lot of mistruths. They’ve been putting a lot of misinformation out into the marketplace. We are currently awaiting the State Government’s review of the South East Queensland Regional Plan. So, ultimately, I believe that the approach that we’ve taken is consistent with our neighbourhood planning process, and Councillor GRIFFITHS and Councillor CASSIDY really need to get onboard and stop the misinformation.

Chair: Councillor ALLAN, your time has expired.

Further questions?

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN.

**Question 4**

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Thanks, Chair. My question is to the Mayor. It’s not a trick question. I hope you’ll engage with it seriously. LORD MAYOR, you’ve previously noted that, if we were to prevent private property developers constructing new housing on flood-prone land, that this would reduce the supply of available land for housing across the city and make it harder to deliver housing stock for a growing population, but the reality is that right now, across our city, there are many corridors and precincts that have already been rezoned for high‑density development, such as Ipswich Road, along parts of Lutwyche Road and Gympie Road, et cetera.

So my question is, do you accept the premise that if we made it harder for developers to build on flood-prone land, they would be more likely to redirect investment and build in other parts of the city that have already been rezoned for new development and aren’t vulnerable to flooding?

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Well, thank you for the question, Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN. The premise here that if we make it harder for developers to build in flood-prone areas is an interesting question, because what we do at the moment is if an area is flood prone, but has been previously developed in the past, i.e. before modern planning requirements came into existence—and there are significant areas of the city where that is the case—that premise that we are somehow making it harder, I would simply say we’re requiring standards that take into account the flood factors on the property. We already do that, and we’ve continued to upgrade those requirements progressively over the years. There were changes made to our planning framework in 1974—or after the 1974 floods. There were further changes that have been made following the 2011 floods and there will be changes made further after the 2022 floods.

We’re continuing to put additional requirements on new buildings, so I guess if that’s consistent with the premise that he’s saying, well then, that’s what we’re doing, but I think the debate has simply been, we can’t just say that you can’t build on a site that already has a home or a building or a business and that someone owns. Unless you’re prepared to actually buy every single one of those sites and compensate the owner for the loss of their asset and investment and the loss of their property, then I don’t see how we can stop people building something on a site that they own that already has a building on it in most cases, because that would take out a significant percentage of the entire city.

Now, Brisbane was built on a floodplain and, in fact, we’ve seen examples of significant parts of entire suburbs that do get flooded. The suburb of Rocklea is one example, but there are other suburbs, such as Fairfield, where significant sections of the entire suburb have some level of flood risk. To simply say you can’t do anything in Rocklea or you can’t build anything in Fairfield is not a realistic prospect. Unless we suddenly come upon billions of dollars to buy all of these properties, which we simply don’t have, you start to add up the cost to ratepayers or the cost to government of doing this, and it becomes quickly unfeasible.

So, we do put requirements on properties that may have a flood risk. We already do, and they continue to get more and more stringent as we take into account events that have happened. It’s interesting, one example that I guess has really stuck in my mind is the way that planning has changed, even since 1974. Councillor Lisa ATWOOD, her area of Carina experienced some flooding, and it was the area of Carina that was developed before 1974 that was hit by the floods, yet the area of Carina and nearby Carindale, that was developed after 1974, was built to a different standard and it didn’t flood.

You can see how planning changes have provided these, I guess, additional requirements, additional building standards, but if you have a Queenslander that was built well before 1974—and they virtually all were—and you sit there and you say, well, you’re not allowed to live in your home anymore, you’re not allowed to do anything with your home and, in fact, you should move out of your home, that is not a way to deal with a city that has a housing crisis.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, Councillor SRI’s question was to the LORD MAYOR, and this is a relevance issue, if you make it harder for people to build on flood-prone land, isn’t the premise that they will go and build on other land that doesn’t flood, such as up on Ipswich Road, Annerley, or other places in the city? So that was the premise of the question, which the LORD MAYOR is talking about letting people build on flood-prone land. That’s not what the question was about.

Chair: Thank you.

LORD MAYOR, to that point of the question.

LORD MAYOR: Well, Councillor SRI’s policy is to make it harder for everyone to build anything anywhere, except for if it’s government housing, and then he wants a lot of that, but he won’t specify where it is. The reality is, it has become harder to build on flood-prone land, consistently harder. It became harder after 1974, it became harder after 2011, and it is becoming harder after this flood, as well, because we’ve put extra requirements on anything that is built on a site that is privately owned, that already has development on it, but if there’s any changes to that, the requirements are stricter, as they should be. I think evidence shows that, even with those stricter requirements, people will still build things in those areas, and the reason is because people want to live in those areas still.

Chair: Thank you, LORD MAYOR. Your time has expired.

Further questions?

Councillor HUANG.

**Question 5**

Councillor HUANG: Thank you, Mr Chair. My question is to the Chair of the Transport Committee, Councillor MURPHY. Councillor MURPHY, the Schrinner Council is planning for the growth of our city with a citywide review of our bus network. Can you please update the Chamber on this body of work which is now underway?

Chair: Councillor MURPHY.

Councillor MURPHY: Yes, thank you very much, Chair, and thank you, Councillor HUANG, for the question. Here at Brisbane City Council, we have been transporting Brisbane residents for more than 90 years, and many things have changed in that time. We have gone from trains and trams to buses, and now we have new modes like e-mobility. With the commencement of Brisbane Metro services in 2024, our city will enter a new era of public transport, one which help cater for our city’s population growth and deliver efficient, reliable, and high-frequency services. Brisbane is fundamentally a bus city.

Our bus network is well loved and it does the heavy lifting when it comes to public transport, but that also means that our network has some problems. Each hour during the peak, over 385 buses use the Cultural Centre station alone, and that creates major congestion and reliability issues in our network. With the introduction of Brisbane Metro, we will have the opportunity to evolve our bus network from a largely direct service model to a hybrid network. Metro will act as a high-frequency trunk, transporting residents through the core of the CBD. This review is about improving services right across the network to allow them to connect in with Metro. Metro lines one and two will replace the 111, the 160, and the 66, but delivering Metro and the revised bus network will also mean more buses will be available for the suburbs, as well.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor MURPHY: Council’s transport planners have been working with TransLink for several years now to review and evolve the current bus network, and so I was extremely proud as Transport Chair to be able to share—with the LORD MAYOR—Brisbane’s new bus network with residents earlier this month. As part of the changes, a number of routes will be combined to simplify the network, and two routes with extremely low patronage will be removed. This allows us to make better use of our resources, to give high-frequency services to more streets, to introduce new routes and deliver more reliable services from the suburbs to the city. Three new routes are proposed and there are seven suburbs with new all-day services, as well as newly serviced roads in Yeerongpilly and Coopers Plains.

The proposed changes will also improve connections to a range of suburban locations like Mt Gravatt Plaza, Fairfield Gardens Shopping Centre, and the Greenslopes Hospital, as well as our university campuses which are the big winners, QUT (Queensland University of Technology), UQ (University of Queensland), and Griffith’s Nathan campus, but residents right across the city will see an improvement in the reliability of their bus services and a marked reduction in inner city bus congestion, in fact a reduction by a third. They’ll also see easy transfers between new modes and increased frequencies and operating hours on key services. We’ll do that by creating more consistent bus stop locations in the CBD, no matter what your direction of travel is, so more of us can expect to get on our afternoon service in the same spot we got dropped off in the morning.

We’re also planning to take pressure off the overloaded Cultural Centre station by shifting some transfer locations to other major busway stations in the CBD. We’re introducing a new CBD corridor to service the southern CBD and integrate with Cross River Rail’s new Albert Street station, just as the Adelaide Street bus corridor services the northern CBD area. Of course, we’re bringing Brisbane residents along with us on the transport journey to ensure that we can get the best outcome for our city. We want residents to join the conversation and provide their feedback to help us create the best network possible.

Consultation is open until 14 December and we have plenty of resources for residents to learn about the new network, both online and in person. Searching Brisbane’s new bus network on the Council website will take you to the network guide, an interactive map portal where you can explore the changes, play the Brisbane Metro game, and complete the feedback survey. We’ll also be out and about in the community at libraries, community halls, and busway stations to talk to residents about how the changes might impact their travel patterns. We will refine the bus network based on community input before releasing the final network in mid-2023, ahead of it being rolled out from late 2024.

Mr Chair, I’d like to conclude by giving special thanks to some of the officers who’ve worked extremely hard to plan and deliver Brisbane’s new bus network. It’s been a big team effort with great collaboration across Council, but I’d like to particularly mention a few names. Firstly, Dr Greg Spelman, Brian Bothwell, Daniel Martiri and their teams, who under the guidance of Transport for Brisbane’s Divisional Manager, Geoff Beck, are the brains behind this network. They spent countless hours poring over patronage data, route maps, timetabling, and their commitment to this network and public transport for Brisbane residents is unmatched. I’d also like to mention Amy Driscoll, Bethan Stanway, Nicholas Culpeper and their teams within the Metro project who’ve led the charge on community consultation.

Finally, I’d like to thank the LORD MAYOR, who has had the faith and kept the faith through this very difficult project—

Chair: Thank you, Councillor MURPHY.

Councillor MURPHY: —to improve public transport for Brisbane residents.

Chair: Your time has expired.

Further questions?

Councillor JOHNSTON.

**Question 6**

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, thank you. Oh, that started at 42 seconds. I’ll start again. I know, but—thank you. My question is to the LORD MAYOR. LORD MAYOR, on 15 March, you stated twice in answer to a question from me that you had seen no information from me or anyone that homes were flooded on Saturday 26 February. I table the 22 emails I sent to you and the LDCC (Local Disaster Coordination Centre) from 10.49am on Saturday, including the one to you at 3.04pm which you responded to, through to Sunday at 11.16am.

LORD MAYOR, do you now accept that you and Council failed to send out timely evacuation and flood warnings via emergency warnings and alerts, which didn’t happen until Sunday night when it was too late for thousands of Brisbane residents who had flooded on Saturday, which Council had been advised about since 10.49am on Saturday morning.

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: I certainly agree that the emergency alert system is broken and it’s certainly not in any way suitable for use during the floods. That is the reality. We have seen it confirmed time and time again, which is why we used our own system to send out—

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

LORD MAYOR: —messages from Thursday—

Chair: Point of order, Councillor JOHNSTON.

LORD MAYOR: —from Thursday.

Councillor JOHNSTON: My question is whether the LORD MAYOR accepts that he failed to send out timely warnings to thousands of Brisbane residents, despite the Council knowing—

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, I—

Councillor JOHNSTON: —from 10.49am on Saturday—

Chair: We heard the question.

Councillor JOHNSTON: —that residents were flooded.

Chair: You’re now debating the question.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Well, he’s not answering the question.

Chair: The LORD MAYOR was 20 seconds into the answer. The LORD MAYOR is being relevant to the question.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you. It’s interesting because everyone seems to be an expert in hindsight. The nature of these situations is they move rapidly. Some of the information you have is accurate, some of it is not so accurate. It continues to change and you get, essentially, what is referred in military terms as the fog of war, where you get bits of information coming at you and you don’t have the time in an emergency situation to be able to verify every piece of information. So what we have to do is we have to rely on the advice that comes in from—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, allow the answer to be heard.

LORD MAYOR: —that comes from the Bureau and, in fact, while everyone tries to be an expert and say, why wasn’t something sent out on the Saturday, the day when the Premier was saying there was no cause for concern, it wasn’t in fact until the Sunday that the Bureau of Meteorology issued a major flood warning. It wasn’t until the Sunday. So, for anyone to suggest that before the Bureau, who has better information than any individual Council does, who has a bigger picture than any individual—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —government does, to question that the Bureau only issued an alert on the Sunday, which is the reality, is I think being an expert in hindsight. Now, I have committed time and time again that we would learn from this event so that we can improve our systems, and we are doing that and we have done that. What I am concerned about is that the State Government keeps defending a broken system. Now, the emergency alert system has its limitations, and that has been confirmed in the State Government’s own IGEM report. There are 19 recommendations in the IGEM report. Recommendations three, four and five of the report acknowledge the inadequacies of the emergency alert platform and make recommendations on how to make the system better. The IGEM report did not criticise Brisbane City Council. It did not—

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: My question is not about the IGEM report. It is about the advice that I provided in 22 emails on Saturday and Sunday to the LORD MAYOR and the LDCC, clearly stating that houses were flooding.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON—

Councillor JOHNSTON: Does the LORD MAYOR now accept—he denied it twice.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, you’re now debating the question.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Does he now accept his alerts were too late?

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, your question—

Councillor JOHNSTON: That was the question.

Chair: —was about the emergency warning alerts.

Councillor JOHNSTON: No, it wasn’t.

Chair: The LORD MAYOR is responding to that question.

Councillor JOHNSTON: No, it was not.

LORD MAYOR: So, what we see here is the Bureau, who’s the expert organisation that we all rely on advice for when it comes to major weather events, natural disasters, particularly floods and storms, only issued a major flood warning on Saturday. So, if it was indeed news to the State Government—which we know it was on Saturday, they were saying there’s no cause for concern—or if it was news to other levels of government, it was also news to the Bureau of Meteorology, who has all of the rain gauges, all of the technology, and all of the predictive modelling to determine when a major flood is coming. It was only on the Sunday—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: It was only on the Sunday that they issued a major flood warning. So the reality is, I say again—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —this was a rapidly moving situation. The important thing here is that we learn from it, and we have learnt as an organisation. I am concerned that the State Government is burying its head in the sand on a broken system as we go into a new storm season.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: So this system needs to be fixed—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, enough, please.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —but having said that, our alerts through the Brisbane Severe Weather Alert system were going out from the Thursday. So any suggestion that we didn’t send out alerts is rubbish.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: It is rubbish.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Our alert system—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —provides both general weather updates from the BoM (Bureau of Meteorology), but any flood warnings, it sends out, as well, and they come automatically from the Bureau of Meteorology.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: So the system works in an automated way and very quickly. It appears within minutes. The minute the BoM issues a flood warning for a particular area, that goes straight out to residents and they get it on their email and their phone. That’s a great system that works well. What we are raising concerns about is the State and Federal system which delays messages by anything from six to 12 to 14 hours in a time of emergency. It is unacceptable. It needs to be fixed. We’ll continue doing all of our things and our responsibilities to improve the situation and to learn the lessons—

Chair: LORD MAYOR, your time has expired.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Further questions?

 Councillor LANDERS.

**Question 7**

Councillor LANDERS: My question is to the Chair of the Environment, Parks and Sustainability Committee, Councillor DAVIS. Councillor DAVIS, the Schrinner Council’s plan to build Brisbane’s biggest new park in 50 years has reached its next important step. Can you please update the Chamber on the latest in the Schrinner Council’s Victoria Park/Barrambin vision?

Chair: Councillor DAVIS.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor DAVIS: Well, thank you, Mr Chair and through you, I’d like to thank Councillor LANDERS for the question. I know Councillor LANDERS really enjoyed coming to Victoria Park back in May where we hosted the Green Heart Fair for the first time in this wonderful, iconic space in Brisbane. I know you’re looking forward to coming to the Green Heart Fair next year. Mr Chair, it was wonderful to join the LORD MAYOR, Councillor HOWARD, and Councillor MATIC back in September when the LORD MAYOR released the Draft Master Plan for Victoria Park/Barrambin, which is the next phase and the next exciting step in the transformation of Brisbane’s newest iconic parkland.

 The Draft Master Plan has been informed by over 51,000 pieces of community feedback which was provided throughout the vision phase. The Draft Master Plan provides another opportunity for the community to have their say on what they want to see in Brisbane’s biggest park in 50 years. Since the draft was released, we have been busy holding consultation and engagement events both in the park and around the city and they include pop‑up consultation events in Queen Street Mall, at the busway station at Herston and at Spring Hill Common. I thank Councillor HOWARD for attending that.

We’ve also had an online community information session and a community workshop in the urban pump track for the design of that particular feature. Unfortunately, our Discovery Day, which was to be held on the weekend, had to be cancelled due to the wet weather, but there is still an opportunity for people to have their say when we host the next Cinema in the Suburbs event for Halloween. The team will be available to chat about the plan and to take any feedback from the community. The project team will also be hosting an extended pop-up in the Queen Street Mall this week to be able to talk to residents about the plan and what they’d like to see in the park.

Mr Chair, initial feedback from the consultation is extremely encouraging, with the majority of people showing overwhelming support for the Draft Master Plan. I would like to think that people that work in the city or residents that are visiting the city pop down to Queen Street Mall and provide their feedback to the team and learn a little more about what the plan provides the city. The feedback from the vision showed that the residents’ number one priority was rewilding the park with more vegetation and natural areas and the Draft Master Plan speaks to this by a planned increase in the canopy from 10%, which it is currently, to 60%, as well as the restorations of the wetlands and the waterways across the park.

A key part of the strategy is to use native flora and fauna to re-establish the ecology which predated the European settlement and this will provide not only habitat for Brisbane’s native wildlife, but a cleaner, greener, and cooler park for the inner city. The Draft Master Plan incorporates state-of-the-art facilities for community, sporting and cultural events into the park’s design, as well as flexibility to host temporary major events such as the venue for the Olympics and Paralympic Games. Already, we have new barbecues and shelters being erected across the park to make the amenity even better for people when they come along and make use of this fantastic space.

The new Spring Hill Common, Councillor HOWARD, will feature a relaxed parkland setting with tiered step seating for activations, performances in the park, as well as a flat, outdoor area for activities, gatherings and picnics. It’s a very slopy area over there and this would provide a nice, flat area for people to enjoy and that should be delivered by the end of next year.

On the Herston side, the urban pump track is designed to take advantage of the park’s natural topography and it offers a track for riders of all skillsets. It will include small, skateable features along with additional picnic shelters and seating, making it a new⎯and what I believe will be an exciting element for families in the inner city to come and enjoy.

There’s a lot happening right now at Victoria Park, which is becoming a very desirable place for people to come and visit. We’ve had over 15,000 locals at the Green Heart Fair and 10,000 people over two weekends ago coming to the Emergency Services Expo this month. So there’s never any shortage of things to do at Victoria Park and we are really looking forward to receiving the feedback from the community so that we can move forward with delivering a park for everyone, not only for residents in Brisbane, but for people that come and enjoy our wonderful city. Thank you, Mr Chair.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor DAVIS.

Further questions?

Councillor CUMMING.

**Question 8**

Councillor CUMMING: Thank you, Mr Chair. Mr Chair, my question is to the LORD MAYOR. LORD MAYOR, the same time you increased the budget for your inner city Metro project by $500 million, you only increased funding for suburban drainage projects by $2 million. The advertising budget for the Metro is bigger than the meagre boost you gave drainage. Why do the suburbs constantly miss out on your watch?

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor CUMMING, for the question. I’m not sure where you’re getting your figures from, but they’re wrong. They are wrong.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: We have in fact doubled the budget for drainage in the recent budget⎯we have doubled it.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: It is more money than any other Administration has spent—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —in the city of the history—in the history of the city on drainage and all types of drainage.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: So the idea that there’s been a small increase is just simply wrong⎯it is simply wrong. But the reality is, we have invested heavily in providing funding available for drainage projects in this budget by doubling the budget⎯ in fact more than doubling the budget. So if you had to measure the level of increase in any kind of program or initiative in the budget, this is one of the ones that has had the biggest increase of any. So, Councillor CUMMING, like I said, I’m not sure where you got your figures from, but they’re not correct.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Thank you.

 That ends Question Time for today.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Before you continue, LORD MAYOR, with the E&C (Establishment and Coordination) report, I just have to do a slight swap out.

*At that time, 1.55pm, the Deputy Chair, Councillor Peter MATIC, assumed the Chair.*

## CONSIDERATION OF *RECOMMENDATIONS* OF THE ESTABLISHMENT AND COORDINATION COMMITTEE:

### ESTABLISHMENT AND COORDINATION COMMITTEE (Report of 12 September 2022)

The Right Honourable, the LORD MAYOR (Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER), Chair of the Establishment and Coordination Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Sarah HUTTON, that the report of the Establishment and Coordination Committee meeting held on 12 September 2022, be adopted.

Deputy Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair.

Councillor ALLAN: Point of order, Mr Chair.

Deputy Chair: Point of order, Councillor ALLAN.

**Declaration of Declarable Conflict of Interest in Clause A – ASSIGNMENT OF LEASE FROM CRUSHERS LEAGUES CLUB LIMITED TO BRISBANE RACING CLUB LIMITED – Councillor Adam ALLAN**

Councillor ALLAN: I have a declarable conflict of interest in Clause A. I have received gifts totalling more than $500 but less than $2,000 from the Brisbane Racing Club within the relevant period. As such, I will remove myself from the Chamber for the duration of debate and voting on this item.

Deputy Chair: Thank you, Councillor ALLAN.

Councillor MARX: Point of order, Mr Chair.

Deputy Chair: Point of order, Councillor MARX.

**Declaration of Declarable Conflict of Interest in Clause A – ASSIGNMENT OF LEASE FROM CRUSHERS LEAGUES CLUB LIMITED TO BRISBANE RACING CLUB LIMITED – Councillor Kim MARX**

Councillor MARX: I have a declarable conflict of interest in Clause A. I have received gifts totalling more than $500 but less than $2,000 from the Brisbane Racing Club within the relevant period. As such, I will remove myself from the Chamber for the duration of debate and voting on this item.

Deputy Chair: Thank you, Councillor MARX.

Councillor McLACHLAN: Point of order, Mr Deputy Chair.

Deputy Chair: Point of order, Councillor McLACHLAN.

**Declaration of Declarable Conflict of Interest in Clause A – ASSIGNMENT OF LEASE FROM CRUSHERS LEAGUES CLUB LIMITED TO BRISBANE RACING CLUB LIMITED – Councillor David McLACHLAN**

Councillor McLACHLAN: I have a declarable conflict of interest in Clause A. I have received gifts totalling more than $500 but less than $2,000 from the Brisbane Racing Club within the relevant period. As such, I will remove myself from the Chamber for the duration of debate and voting on this item.

Deputy Chair: Thank you, Councillor McLACHLAN.

 Any other conflicts at all?

*Councillor interjecting.*

Deputy Chair: We’ll just wait for Councillor McLACHLAN to leave the Chamber.

 We’ll now proceed with debate.

 LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair. As I always do, I wanted to talk about the lighting up of assets that we’re doing in support of important community causes. Last night, Reddacliff Place, the Tropical Dome, Victoria Bridge and Story Bridge were lit up in turquoise to support Queensland Children’s Week. Queensland Children’s Week is a national occasion and a range of events and activities are organised at both national, state and local levels to celebrate children’s rights and for the wider community to rejoice in their talents, skills and abilities.

Tonight, the Story Bridge, Tropical Dome, Victoria Place and Reddacliff Place will be lit up in purple for World Polio Day. Rotary International was responsible for starting the global polio eradication initiative, which has resulted in polio cases falling from 1,000 cases per day worldwide to around 150 cases per day—per year, sorry, so that’s an incredible achievement. Polio is now only present in two different countries, so a wonderful outcome there.

Tomorrow is Intersex Awareness Day and all of our assets will be lit up in purple and yellow to support this occasion. The Awareness Day is held internationally each year on 26 October to raise awareness of intersex people to the general public and also highlight the challenges that they face.

On Thursday night, our assets will be lit up in purple, aqua and green to support World Teachers Day and lighting up our assets helps support the important work of our teachers. Quality teachers are obviously critical to the future of our community, our city and our nation.

On Friday night, the Story Bridge, Victoria Bridge, Tropical Dome and Reddacliff Place will be lit up in red for the Day for Daniel. The Day for Daniel is Australia’s largest child safety education and awareness day which honours the memory of Daniel Morcombe. Schools, early learning centres and workplaces come together to wear red, educate and donate on this special day.

On Saturday night, the Story Bridge, Reddacliff Place and Victoria Bridge will be lit up in red and white to celebrate the Turkish National Day.

Sunday is national Grandparents Day and our assets will be lit up in yellow to mark this day, as well. This celebrates the contribution of grandparents that they make to families and communities and in Queensland, Grandparents Day is celebrated every year on the last Sunday in October and is an opportunity to connect with loved ones and showcase what they mean to all of us.

I also just did want to touch on the Queensland Auscontact Awards. Councillor HOWARD, I know you’re very excited about these awards because this is the awards process for contact centres, such as our own Contact Centre. A few weeks ago, on 7 October, the Annual Queensland Auscontact Awards night was held. Council has historically done very well in these awards and I’m pleased to report that this is the case again this year. Council had 10 officers nominated for awards this year, seven of whom made the finals and, of those, three were winners.

So we had—finalists were Christine Martin, Julia Silson, Sue Kelleher, Bianca Chembry and also winners were Rebecca Frey and Kristy Pascoe. So, congratulations to all of those finalists and winners, and congratulations to—oh, hang on a second. There’s a second page here that I’ve missed of more winners. Denise Olsen, as well, was one of the winners. So, Rebecca Frey won the Customer Contact Professional Award. Kirsty Pascoe won the People’s Champion Award. Denise Olsen won the Customer Experience Champion Award.

So I congratulate all of those finalists and winners and, in fact, I want to congratulate and thank everyone that works in our Contact Centre. As one of the front doors of Council, they do a fantastic job 24-7. It has been a challenging year in many ways and the Contact Centre has been at the forefront of our response, not only to the pandemic and other community issues and the floods, but for them to win awards in such a difficult year is a credit to everyone involved, so I thank them personally for their efforts.

On Friday night, we had the annual Lord Mayor’s Business Awards in City Hall and 13 awards were given out on the night, showcasing the very best of Brisbane local business. The winners were, in the CCIQ (Chamber of Commerce and Industry Queensland) Award for Outstanding Small Business, Audeara Limited. The Accenture Award for Product Innovation was given to Vaxxas. The Urban Utilities Award for Environmental Sustainability in Business was given to Save Our Supplies Limited. The Hutchinson Builders Award for Outstanding Social Enterprise was given to Australian Spatial Analytics Limited. The Xero Award for Outstanding Micro Business was given to Kiddo.

The HSBC (Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corporation Limited) Award for Excellence in International Business was given to Populous. The Australia LNG Pacific LNG (liquefied natural gas) Award for Business Innovation was given to DoubleTake Sports Pty Ltd. The ANZ (Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited) Award for High-Growth Business was given to simPRO. The ISPT Award for Investment in Brisbane was given to the Princess Theatre. The Port of Brisbane Award for Young Business Person of the Year was given to Dr James Fielding who was the founder of Audeara. The Courier-Mail Award for Business Person of the Year was given to Elena Gosse OAM (Medal of the Order of Australia), the CEO of AIS (Australian Innovative Systems) Water.

A Lifetime Achievement Award was given to Jonathan Stoddart, the Managing Director and Chair of Stoddart Group and the Optus Platinum Award was given to simPRO. Yet again, another fantastic set of examples of Brisbane businesses that are innovating, despite the challenging times that we’re in, employing jobs and creating opportunities for Brisbane residents and also, in a number of cases, kicking goals on the national and international scale, as well. So it is right that we celebrate our business community and the contribution they make to a stronger Brisbane.

Now, there’s been some questions raised today about emergency alerts and as I said before, it is easy to be an expert in hindsight with these sort of situations, but you’ve actually got to drill down and have a look at what happened and how we responded and how we can respond better. That is the important thing. I’ve said it repeatedly. All levels of government should have one aim and one aim only and that is to make sure that each time we respond in a better way and we learn from the lessons of each event and make sure that we adapt our response and respond better each time to each natural disaster that might come our way.

` So we have faithfully done that. We have not just relied on a State Government review to cover Council’s response. We commissioned our own review to have a look at, specifically, items relating to the Brisbane City Council. Now, when it comes to the IGEM report, there were 19 recommendations in the IGEM report. Our report went into more detail than that and had 37 recommendations. In fact, that’s not the only thing that we’re doing in response to the flood. We’ve also developed our own Flood Action Plan.

 So we’re taking this incredibly seriously, and we’re making changes and improvements to a range of different areas, but this claim about the EA (emergency alert) system, it’s incredibly⎯I guess, misleading to suggest that one individual system is a silver bullet when it comes to responding to a quickly evolving natural disaster, particularly when that system has its big problems and big constraints. We discovered just how big those problems and constraints were from the various reports that were done. An emergency alert system that was designed for bushfires in small regional towns and communities is not fit-for-purpose in a big city the size of Brisbane, where you’ve also got other Councils around us trying to access the system. Now, what we found is that—

Deputy Chair: LORD MAYOR, your time has expired.

**151/2022-23**

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

Deputy Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair and thank you to the Chamber. Now, what we found is that the system became quickly overloaded and there were queues of Councils waiting to send out messages and the messages were taking far too long to get out to people. Now, we didn’t put all of our eggs in one basket. We used multiple channels to communicate with people. We have our own system, the Brisbane Severe Weather Alert system, which was sending out messages and notifications from the Thursday and all the way through that event. In fact, between the Friday and the Saturday, when things evolved really quickly, there were 275 different alerts that we sent out on our system. Those alerts were sent—included over 208,000 text messages and 116,000 emails.

 Now, just remember, there were 23,000 properties that flooded and so there were large parts of the city that did not flood. There are people who are actively interested in getting this information and have actively signed up to our system and we now have over a third of households signed up to our system and we’ve worked to increase that following the flood, but we also know that when around five per cent of the city flooded, we have 35% of households on our system. So there is a significant reach and that reach goes over and above just the people who flooded, but to other members of the community as well. That system is almost instantaneous and so we used it from the Thursday on and we sent multiple warnings and we used multiple channels to communicate with people.

 One of the interesting things that I have some concerns about is this idea that the emergency alert system, this national system is some kind of silver bullet and should have been used more. Well, it was already overloaded. It got overloaded very quickly, and using it more would only cause further delays. A system that is delayed by anywhere from six to 14 hours is basically useless in a natural disaster. It is useless⎯it is a useless system, because the functionality of the system means it gets out to people too late. So we have to use all channels and we did, but this claim by Minister Ryan that we should have used the system more is interesting because we had the same information that the State Government had.

 In fact, in our control centre, there were State representatives. There were representatives from different State agencies. They saw all the information we saw. Now, did the State Government send out any emergency alerts during the flood? Not a single one, not a single one.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Well, Councillor CASSIDY has interjected—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —saying it’s up to us to request.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Well, that—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Deputy Chair: Councillor CASSIDY, please.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Well, that’s an interesting claim, Mr Chair, because did anyone happen to get some unnecessary messages from the State during COVID on that same number?

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: They used the Emergency Alert System to tell people about COVID-related messages and—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Deputy Chair: Councillors, please. The LORD MAYOR is speaking.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: And—

Deputy Chair: Councillor CASSIDY, Councillor JOHNSTON, please.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Point of order, Chair.

Deputy Chair: Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: I am just having a bit of trouble hearing. I thought I heard the LORD MAYOR say that the Council was the lead agency for health crises and pandemics. Is that correct?

Deputy Chair: Well, Councillor—

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: I think I—

Deputy Chair: —SRIRANGANATHAN, are you asking the LORD MAYOR a question?

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: I just couldn’t hear.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Deputy Chair: We should give the LORD MAYOR the opportunity to answer the question in silence, please.

 LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: It’s interesting when you saw the Labor Party run a campaign at the last Federal election where they portrayed the Prime Minister, the former Prime Minister, saying it’s not my job. That’s what they were claiming that he said. This is exactly what Councillor CASSIDY is saying about the State Government right now.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Apparently, it’s not their job. The State Government doesn’t hold the hose.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: The reality is—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: The reality is, they could use this emergency alert system to let us know about a school closure—

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Point of order, Chair.

Deputy Chair: Point of order—

LORD MAYOR: —or a general COVID message—

Deputy Chair: LORD MAYOR, just one moment please. Councillor—

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Will the Mayor take a quick question?

Deputy Chair: LORD MAYOR, will you take a question from Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN?

LORD MAYOR: No.

Deputy Chair: LORD MAYOR, please continue.

Councillor MURPHY: Point of order, Chair.

Deputy Chair: Point of order, Councillor MURPHY.

Councillor MURPHY: Deputy Chair, just before the LORD MAYOR continues, I have seen two Councillors, particularly Councillor CASSIDY and Councillor JOHNSTON, every time the LORD MAYOR is talking, scream at him over the Chamber, over what he’s saying. I wonder if you consider that an act of disorder and worthy of a warning, because I think it is extremely unbecoming behaviour and we cannot allow that kind of behaviour to become normalised in this Chamber.

Deputy Chair: Councillor MURPHY, I accept your point of order. I understand and accept that this is a place of debate and this is an issue that everyone feels strongly about. However, the LORD MAYOR is speaking on an important issue and should be given the opportunity to be heard. On top of that, this matter is open for you to discuss any General Business should you wish to later on.

 LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you. So, the nature of Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN, Councillor JOHNSTON, and Councillor CASSIDY’s interjections here have been, this is not the State’s job. That’s what they’re saying. So there is a multimillion dollar disaster—

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Point of order, Chair.

LORD MAYOR: —control centre at Kedron, funded—

Deputy Chair: LORD MAYOR, just one moment, please.

 Point of order, Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Claim to be misrepresented.

Deputy Chair: Councillor—claim to be misrepresented.

LORD MAYOR: That’s a bit rich, coming from Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN. So, there is a well-funded, well-staffed State disaster control centre at Kedron. But we’re hearing today from some Councillors that it’s not their job⎯it’s not their job. Well it’s interesting because I asked our own team, has the State Government ever sent out emergency alerts in the case of a severe weather system or a flood or some kind of weather-related alert? The answer was yes, absolutely they have done that in the past.

 So they have done it in the past yet Labor Councillors and others are arguing that it’s not the State’s job. They actually control the system, they’re the ones sitting at the desk. So, for Minister Ryan to suggest that oh, no, it’s up to Councils to do that. He’s simply saying it’s not his job. I expect better from a Police Minister and an Emergency Services Minister than to say it’s not his job. Because that’s effectively what he’s saying.

 The State had access to all the same information we did. There was information sharing all the way through that event. Yet some people have chosen to play politics with this and it’s very disappointing. Now, you know what, I have not criticised—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: I have not criticised the State’s response in any way.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: I have not criticised the State’s flood response in any way. What I have criticised is their lack of action since the flood.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: That’s what I have criticised. Why? Because we’re going into another storm season and I am concerned. Now there’s things the State could have done a lot better during the flood. You know, the IGEM report goes into some of them, but I have not criticised the State for their flood response. So for the Minister to play politics with this is not in the spirit of genuine cooperation in which we should act in a natural disaster. I haven’t criticised their flood response but I have simply said we need to fix this broken system.

 Now I have also said that we need to consider proactive dam releases. Despite me being criticised by State Ministers. Guess what? They’re doing proactive dam releases. They eventually listened to common sense and reason and they have taken my suggestion on board.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Deputy Chair: Please LORD MAYOR, continue.

LORD MAYOR: I didn’t see anyone else suggesting there should be proactive dam releases. In fact it was only me, yet they’ve done it because it was the right thing to do.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: So I will also fiercely advocate for improvements to the emergency alert system run by the State Government on behalf of the Federal Government because it needs to happen. It needs to happen. So despite the political games that are being played here.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: My interest is purely—

Deputy Chair: Councillor STRUNK, please.

LORD MAYOR: —in making sure that we are prepared for whatever comes next. The system needs to be fixed, it’s as simple as that, Mr Chair.

 Now moving on to the items that are in front of us. Item A is the—well it’s the only item in front of us on this particular report. Item A is the assignment of a lease from Crushers Leagues Club Limited to Brisbane Racing Club (BRC) Limited. Now this item seeks Council approval to assign the lease of the former Stafford Bowls Club from Crushers Leagues Club to the Brisbane Racing Club.

On 11 June 2019, Council approved a 20-year lease for Crushers for the site. Unfortunately, since this time, Crushers have been unable to resolve the transfer of previously held licences to the premises. Which has impacted on the ability of Crushers to operate the site. So on 5 August 2022, Council received a request from Crushers to assign the lease to Brisbane Racing Club.

In their plans to operate the site, Brisbane Racing Club estimated that activating this facility will create approximately 60 new jobs and employment opportunities in the local area and deliver a revitalised community hub. To be used by locals, social members and sporting clubs. In addition, Brisbane Racing Club will also make community contributions in the lease to provide financial and in-kind support to the activities of Gibson Park Committee which manage Gibson Park and support its three member organisations. Those being Stafford District Cricket Club, Padua College and the Brothers Junior Rugby League Football Club.

In total, the community contributions expected to be provided under this lease will see a minimum of $200,000 per annum being provided to the local community for the first 20 years of the lease and the delivery of approximately $7.5 million in capital funding going towards the improvement of the facility.

Before I sit down, I also did want to table some documents, this being the first meeting after a recess. If there’s someone who can grab these documents as I table them. I table the Queensland Audit Office final management letter dated 6 September. They’re all together there. The controlled entity financial statements of City Parklands Services Pty Ltd, the controlled entity financial statements of the Brisbane Economic Development Agency and the controlled entity financial statements of Brisbane Powerhouse Pty Ltd. Thank you, Mr Chair.

Deputy Chair: Thank you, LORD MAYOR.

Before I get to you Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN, in regards to misrepresentation.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Yes, thanks, Chair. The Mayor was putting words into my mouth. He said that I said that the State Government wasn’t responsible for alerting residents to flooding and that’s certainly not my view and not what I said.

Deputy Chair: Thank you Councillor.

Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks, Deputy Chair. On the item before us, the transfer of the lease from Crushers Leagues Club to Brisbane Racing Club. We supported this item back in 2019 when the lease was originally awarded to Crushers Leagues Club because that site, the former Stafford Bowls Club site and other associated land and community sporting facilities around it were left vacant. You’ll remember seeing those images of Stafford Bowls Club with knee high—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: —grass. Totally unusable. So the community certainly wanted to see that community facility used. It was a tender process, which Crushers won because they made certain commitments to the local community and certain commitments to Council.

We did at the time place on record concerns about the ability of Crushers to make this proposal viable. So three years ago we said we would support it but we do have some reservations about what they are putting forward. We have to trust what they say they can deliver and we, at the time, trusted the Administration to have figured all of that out with the successful tenderer.

Now that was three years ago and there was $200,000 a year commitment to the community made then. That never came to fruition, obviously.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: As far as we know, no follow up, it just sort of sat there for three years not happening. Before an arrangement has been made between Crushers Leagues Club and the Brisbane Racing Club, behind closed doors and some sort of arrangement they have made and an approach made to Council over this.

 So given Crushers have not come good on any of the upgrades, any of the community contributions that they promised, it is appropriate that they no longer have the lease. We agree with that. However, the item before us today is not open, transparent or accountable. Obviously, a deal has been struck between Crushers Leagues Club and the Brisbane Racing Club, to transfer this lease over but what input did the new local community have?

 It’s not clear in these papers before us today that they have had any meaningful say over the last three years about the future direction of this site. Other than a very cashed up entity, the Brisbane Racing Club, who’s snapping up community lease sites all around the city, coming in and taking over this lease here. Now the local LNP Councillor has been promising residents out there for years that this community facility would be a community facility again.

Since we’ve seen the end of the Stafford Bowls Club particularly, six years ago as I mentioned they have failed their community. That LNP Councillor has fundamentally failed to preserve and protect a community facility for the community, which was thriving. I remember going to events there many years ago ideally located at a—what we know in planning terms—as a community centre right next to the Stafford Shopping Centre out there. But that community has been failed by their local LNP Councillor.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: To just simply hand over the lease from one organisation to another in this fashion is very lazy, it doesn’t involve the community, it’s not open and it’s not transparent.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: There’s no public tender, there’s no input from the community about what they want to see. Particularly we’re in a whole new context now, it’s a rapidly growing part of the city, we’ve got the Olympic and Paralympic Games in less than 10 years now. There are amazing opportunities right across the northside and the southside for an historic investment in community and sporting clubs, that delivers genuine community benefits. It must, it must include the community along the way.

You can’t simply say well the Stafford Bowls Club closed in 2016. Crushers got a lease in 2019, it’s now 2022 we’ll just give it to someone else and cross our fingers and hope that they deliver a good community benefit. Because they’re clearly going to be reaping an amazing commercial benefit from this site if they’re going to be investing $7.5 million and giving $200,000 back to the community. You can just imagine the profits margins that are going to be operating in this former community club.

So if, in fact, they went through an open tender process and the community knew what was going on and they had the best value for money and we got the best outcome for that then so be it. But that simply hasn’t happened in this case. It’s just a behind closed doors transfer, E&Cs decided that that’s what they want to see as well. It’s being brought here to rubber stamp at Council and it’s not something we’ll be supporting today.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Deputy Chair: Further debate?

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Thank you. I rise to speak on this item before us today, the transfer of the lease from the Crushers Leagues Club. I say in the outset I will not be supporting this arrangement. I find this to be probably one of the worst decisions that Council is making when it comes to community life in Brisbane.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: I listened to what the Leader of the Opposition said and I’ve got a few sort of additional things to put on the record about this. Firstly, when an organisation fails to deliver, a community organisation fails to deliver on this lease commitments, Brisbane City Council has an obligation to step in and take action and it has clearly failed to do so here—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: —for three years. Thank you, Councillor STRUNK. Secondly, the normal procedure is the lease is handed back to Council and an expressions of interest process is undertaken in the community to determine who the successful applicant for the lease premises will be.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: So Brisbane City Council has deviated from its policy and its practice to hand over this lease to a major for-profit organisation that does not have the interests of community-based, grass roots sport at heart. The question is why? I don’t think that that has been answered here at all today. Why is it that this organisation, which is clearly donating tickets or money or whatever it might be to the LNP hand over fist, is getting a rails run of a lease for a community sporting facility? Without any transparent and independent process, in accordance with Council policy. That’s the fundamental question here.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: The Crushers have failed. Now they’re seeking to do a deal with the Brisbane Racing Corporation. Let’s have a look at that deal. There is already a 20-year lease in place which started in 2019. So there’s approximately 18 years left to run on that lease. Brisbane City Council is now suggesting that on top of the 18 years still to go, another 10-year—sorry, another three years and an option for 10 years is added. So all up, the decision that Brisbane City Council is going to make here today, led by the LNP, is that the Brisbane Racing Corporation get a 33-year maximum term lease from Brisbane City Council.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: Do I think that that is acceptable? Under no circumstances is that acceptable. This lease could run for 33 years. Now also on the agenda today, this Council is being told from year to year that prices go up and we’ve got to change things. But this LNP Administration, so enamoured is it by the horse racing industry, that it wants to hand over an up to 33-year community lease to the Brisbane Racing Corporation without an expression of interest and tendering process that is normally done for community leases. Why?

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: Why is this sweetheart deal being done? It is absolutely not good enough that the LNP put their heads down and pretend that this is somehow going to help the community. It does not help when big business takes over small community groups. Now Councillor GRIFFITHS is not here today but I know there are still problems with the Brisbane Racing Corporation’s involvement out at Acacia Ridge. They definitely haven’t done all the things that they were supposed to have done out there and there’s no guarantees that that’s going to happen here.

 We don’t even know, we don’t even know in this paper before us today whether all of the local groups that use these fields, the Cricket Club, Padua, Brothers and the Stafford Bowls Club, do they even have subleases? Are they still valid? I know, I hear you Councillor HAMMOND.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: But here’s the issue, once there’s a—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: —once there’s a new entity controlling the lease, they don’t have a lease anymore because their sublease has been with Crushers. So the big issue here is do all these small sporting clubs have their leases assigned over? Do new subleases have to be done with the Brisbane Racing Corporation? Which, legally, they will have to be done. Because the sublease is between an organisation that doesn’t hold the tenure any more.

 So are they protected? Is the question. Now Councillor HAMMOND’s obviously gone out and gone well, hallelujah, the racing’s coming to the suburbs of Brisbane. Maybe I’ll get $500 worth of tickets to the races as well.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: But meanwhile, meanwhile, there is no guarantee that the subleases to these groups are actually going to be honoured by the Brisbane Racing Corporation. Once we have legal tenure to them, there is nothing left protecting these groups.

Now what are the terms that we’re going to undertake? Let’s look at that next. So there is possibly up to 33 years on the lease. Now I know that Councillor CUNNINGHAM won’t be here in 33 years but I’d be thinking within that period of time, there may be some other things that happen. There may be new sporting clubs, other sporting clubs might fold, but there needs to be flexibility built into the process.

The 20-year lease to Crushers was wrong. Adding another 10 years or up to 13 years, I’m sorry. Up to 13 years to an existing 20-year lease contract is unacceptable. It is unacceptable. I think this will be maybe, together with the rubbish contracts, which was what, 36 years or something I think?

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: I just can’t remember the Broncos, I think it’s probably even longer than the Broncos’ lease there at Red Hill, but that may be longer. But this would be one of the biggest leases Council’s ever handed out and there is no expression of interest process.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: Council’s handing over this site to a for-profit company without any independent scrutiny and any independent checks and without any safeguards. Other than BRC is committed to supporting local sporting organisations. Well, I’m sure they are but what does that actually mean? It’s our job as a Council to make sure that those protections are enshrined in the governance and the leasing arrangements that are in place. There’s nothing in here that does this. This is the handing over control of a site to a racing organisation for 33 years. That is unacceptable.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: Now you’d think that we’re going to get a lot of outcomes, we’re going to get some wonderful outcomes. So it says here that a minimum of $200,000 per annum will be provided to the local community for the first 20 years of the lease. Now we know for the first three that didn’t happen. So does that mean there’s going to be $600,000 which is for the three years that hasn’t happened? Then the next 17 there’s going to be $200,000 a year, so this is not right. I mean maybe the LORD MAYOR wants to stand up and explain to us whether they’re going to pay the $600,000 shortfall that the Crushers didn’t put in.

 It then goes on to say that rents and community contribution will be renegotiated prior to the exercise of further option term, based on market review at that time. So maybe in 20 years or 18 years, I’m sorry. Maybe in—no, I’m sorry it will be three and 18, so it will be in 21 years from today, there’ll be a renegotiation of the terms of the lease. In 21 years. Does anybody think that the Racing Club of Brisbane should be given a 21-year lease and probably another 10 years after that without having any independent scrutiny? I don’t.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: It also goes on here to say that they’re going to invest some $7.5 million in capital works. Now, over 33 years, do you know how much that works out to be? About $200,000 to $250,000 a year. So the community is not even getting a windfall from this. If I was a community club out in this part of Brisbane, I would be throwing my hands up at my local Councillor and going why are you doing a sweetheart deal with a for-profit racing company? Why are you not-for-profit looking after the interests of the community sporting clubs? Why isn’t there a lease arrangement here that protects them? Why hasn’t Council looked at putting this out for an expression of interest to see who can manage it?

 None of these questions have been answered here today. Instead the LNP wants to do a sweetheart deal with the Brisbane Racing Corporation. No doubt we’re going to see poker machines, we’re going to see everything else go in out here. How does that help little sporting clubs? It does not.

Deputy Chair: Further debate?

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Thanks, Chair. Probably won’t surprise anyone to hear me say that Brisbane Racing Club is a parasitic leech that strips money from the pockets of the poor, so it can cross-subsidise the recreational activities of wealthier people and the systematic abuse of animals. I do share the concerns that other Councillors in this Chamber have raised, particularly about the sequence of events leading up to this proposed lease.

 I think, not only is the Racing Club an evil organisation that does a lot of harm in society, but it also has nothing to do with this site and it doesn’t seem like a good fit for this particular community facility. The length of the lease that Councillor JOHNSTON has raised concerns me. I agree that that’s very concerning. I also share concerns that the process of just giving them priority on this thing is very flawed and concerning.

 The correct process would have been to go out to tender or to seek expressions of interest. So that a range of community groups across the city could offer to take on this facility and activate it. Alternatively, the Council could have gone back through previous expression of interest and previous tender processes for this site and see if any of those previous groups that had offered are still interested.

 There’s a range of processes that could have been undertaken but instead the Council is simply saying okay, cool, we’ll just let the Racing Club have it, that’s easy. That’s not good process.

 The rent on this facility is very cheap. I assume it’s going to only be a couple of hundred or a couple of thousand a year. That’s really cheap real estate, right? We know the Racing Club is going to use the advantages of that cheap real estate to prop up and cross-subsidise the other less profitable parts of its business model.

 I think Councillor JOHNSTON could be wrong in that it might technically be a non-profit entity. I’m not sure about that. I think it’s acting like a for-profit entity though, I don’t think it’s actually serving a community purpose. I actually think it shouldn’t be seriously considered a non-profit entity if indeed it legally is structured as such.

 I’ve said before that I don’t feel comfortable in general with Council-owned community facilities being leased out to the Racing Club. I again say that if in future The Greens have the ability to do so, we would certainly be looking to revoke this lease or renegotiate it to kick the Racing Club off this site. Because they do more harm than good in communities. That’s what it boils down to.

 I’m sure there are Councillors in this Chamber who will say oh, but it’s great, we’ll be able to reopen this, we’ll be able to have a bit more funding for that. But where does the money come from? That’s what you have to think about at the end of the day. It comes from people, predominantly vulnerable people and predominantly people on lower incomes, getting swindled out of their money by poker machines and horse racing and problem gambling addictions. That’s where the money comes from.

 So even if you look at this on paper and you say oh, but they’re offering this much money in terms of updates. Then we’re offering this much support for these other clubs. The money comes from harming people. It comes from problem gamblers. So whatever else you think about the deal, whatever you’re weighing up the benefits. You have to, when you’re looking at the costs and the downsides of this deal, you have to fully factor in the social harms of problem gambling that the Brisbane Racing Club is profiting from.

 If, in your balance sheet, if in your cost-benefit analysis you exclude those harms of problem gambling and you don’t include them on the ledger, then sure, it might look like a pretty good deal. It might look like a good deal for the other clubs that are going to be able to leverage off this facility and the people who will get some work behind the bar or whatever.

 But once you include those harms of problem gambling. Once you include and factor in all those people who are losing more money than they can afford at the horse races or on the pokies, this is a very, very bad deal for the public interest. That’s before we even talk about the systematic animal abuse that the Racing Club is complicit in.

 I guess the one thing that gives me some confidence is that it don’t think horse racing will be a sport 20 years from now. The Racing Club will be probably in structural decline or else seriously recalibrating the way it does business. I think a lot of its primary activities are already unprofitable and that’s why it’s seeking to gain control of more of these different community facilities and diversify its revenue streams. So that it can continue to operate even as horse racing becomes unprofitable. I suspect that’s what’s going on and that’s what the long-term strategy here is.

 But as a basic matter of principle, it’s not good for our city that a single, large entity is starting to take control of more and more community facilities across the metropolis to manage them essentially as for-profit businesses. The purpose of these community facilities is to meet the needs of the local communities. To provide heavily subsidised spaces for sporting groups, as I understand it, but that goal or overarching purpose of community facilities seems to be taking a back seat here.

 I do think the Council is heading down the wrong track with this. I think there will be a very strong case for tearing up this lease in a couple of years. I’ll certainly do whatever I can to make that happen because I have no interest in Brisbane City Council becoming a closer partner with the Racing Club.

Deputy Chair: Further debate?

Councillor HAMMOND.

Councillor HAMMOND: Thank you, Mr Acting Chair. I rise to support this item in front of us. I would like to start with Councillor CASSIDY’s comments and I know that the likes to stray from the truth quite regularly and not tell the whole truth. Just swingle around it. So let me say yes, the lease was signed in 2019 to Crushers. Yes, there was a delay. Yes, Crushers were spending over $6 million doing up this site. Yes, Stafford Bowls Club handed in their lease because they couldn’t do it.

 Might I also remind people in this room that Queensland Bowls wanted to put high-density retirement village on Council land, which we said no. Crushers got the lease in 2014, why was there a delay? Because the State Government took four years to transfer their liquor licence.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor HAMMOND: They didn’t get their liquor licence approved—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor HAMMOND: —until 24 December 2021. Now, not only did that happen, now Councillor SRI, I just want to say I’m against gambling as well. That’s a personal—sorry SRIRANGANATHAN, I’ll work on the pronunciation, I’m sorry. So not only did they just have to transfer their gambling licence—and I’m against gambling Councillor SRI, that’s a personal choice. Other people can actually gamble if they want to but I’m actually personally against it.

 So they still haven’t got that because the State Government couldn’t decide. Now the previous State Member for Stafford, Doctor Anthony Lynham, said he wouldn’t do anything about it. Apparently he was against gambling as well, he wouldn’t interfere. He wrote to the State saying that the did not approve of the gambling licence come through.

 Now I’m pretty sure the current State Member for Stafford hadn’t even met with Crushers. Now I need to explain, because he doesn’t meet with anybody, I’ve requested 14 times in writing and he can’t even be bothered to respond.

 Now I’ll move on to Councillor JOHNSTON, the Councillor who knows—

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Point of order.

Deputy Chair: Point of order Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Will Councillor HAMMOND take a question?

Councillor HAMMOND: No, I haven’t got time, there’s too much to do.

Deputy Chair: Sorry Councillor.

Councillor HAMMOND: So Councillor JOHNSTON who knows everything about the city, who’s an expert on everything in the city, knows nothing.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor HAMMOND: Because this site, the old Stafford Bowls Club, Crushers site, is totally different from the Gibson Park Committee. Now the Gibson Park Committee have a separate organisation which controls Padua—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Deputy Chair: One moment, Councillor HAMMOND.

Point of order, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Claim to be misrepresented.

Deputy Chair: Claim to be misrepresented.

Councillor HAMMOND: I don’t know how because she said the subleases, how are they protected?

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor HAMMOND: Well they’re actually not subleases. Brainstorm here. It’s actually Gibson Park Committee which is Padua representatives, Padua College, the Stafford Cricket and also the fabulous Brothers Rugby League Club. Now we’ve had to—Council officers have worked very closely with this, as have I, for a lot of years. Against what Councillor CASSIDY says.

 We’ve been working quite closely. In fact Gibson Park Committee had to do a realignment on their boundaries to give the site extra land so they could go ahead with their development application. The Gibson Park Committee have been talking very strongly with Crushers or you know the Brisbane Racing Corporation to organise all these things. They’ve negotiated quite well.

 The Gibson Park Committee are absolutely—I just spoke to them again today—absolutely over the moon that they’re getting over—or getting $200,000 a year help with their fields. They were talking about extra work with their lighting, which is not a cost to Council. They’re working so close together they’re rapt that they’ve come in.

 They can work with this organisation, they’re going to get so much benefit out of it. Again, they’re not a sublease, they’re actually got a lease of their own and they work very, very hard to contain that. So Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor HAMMOND: I hope that’s better, sorry.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor HAMMOND: Sorry. I’m not doing that disrespectfully. I will practice. I am concerned too that it took four years for something to happen on the site. I am concerned of the State Government’s absolute incompetency to actually getting a transfer of a liquor licence over sooner. Also the gambling licence still hasn’t arrived. I’m absolutely devastated that the previous State Member for Stafford lied to the community, lied to the group and said he wouldn’t do anything about it. When it’s in writing where he absolutely opposed that going head.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor HAMMOND: I’m upset that the current State Member for Stafford, his office actually said when the building was broken into, that they don’t control the police and that the community should actually—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor HAMMOND: —ring the police—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor HAMMOND: —themselves. Instead of actively getting involved, especially when this group is only approximately 400 metres from the State Member’s office, which is completely disgusting. I fully support this lease. About time it’s happening. The community are so excited that it’s finally happening. Can’t wait until they can start using is in April next year. Again, Gibson Park Committee—again, when I spoke to them today, are over the moon.

They are going to have the best, the best, sporting fields on the northside of Brisbane. Watch out Valleys. I love Valleys but your fields are amazing. But look what Brothers and the Gibson Park Committee are going to do with theirs. These fields and separate lease, Gibson Park Committee, are used all year round. So they’ve got the summer cricket, I don’t know how you can play cricket in summer in this State.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor HAMMOND: But summer cricket and also winter football. Touch football and all the other activities that happen on this site. So I’d like to thank the Administration and I can’t wait to have this site activated finally, thank you.

Deputy Chair: Thank you, Councillor HAMMOND.

Councillor JOHNSTON, claim to be misrepresented.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, look, it sometimes is a bit hard to understand Councillor HAMMOND. But she did say that I said some things about the Gibson Park Committee. I didn’t refer to them at all in my speech.

Deputy Chair: Further debate?

*Councillor interjecting.*

Deputy Chair: Councillor HOWARD.

Councillor HOWARD: Thank you, Mr Acting Chair. I’d like to rise to speak in support of item A. Which, as previously was mentioned, is the assignment of the lease of the former Stafford Bowls Club at 352 Stafford Road, from Crushers Leagues Club Limited to Brisbane Racing Club Limited. Just thought that I should make that very clear. We’ve just heard from the local Councillor and how fortunate are they to have such a strong advocate.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor HOWARD: I’ll start off with Councillor CASSIDY’s comment that they supported this in 2019. What do you suppose happened just after 2019? I think there was a pandemic. I think that a lot of our sporting clubs suffered severely. You know Crushers have been working very hard to be able to put something together. They haven’t been able to do that. They’ve talked to Brisbane Racing Club and it’s previously been mentioned, due to those successes, the previously successful lessee—which was given a 20-year lease—has been unable to enact and unable to take the reactivation.

 So Councillor JOHNSTON was adding up and not really getting to the right number. Because BRC has requested an extension of an additional three years to make it 20 years, as the lease was when it started in 2019. So the additional three years will make it 20 years. I think we’ve already covered Gibson Park in that that is not part—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor HOWARD: —of this. So through you, Mr Chair.

Deputy Chair: Please continue Councillor HOWARD.

Councillor HOWARD: Thank you.

Deputy Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, please.

Councillor HOWARD: You know, it’s wonderful when other people can stand up and be listened to carefully and we are not given the same respect. So Council is proposing to enter into an agreement with the incoming lessee that is not only able to reactivate this community facility, which is the Bowls Club—and I need to make that very clear that what we’re talking about is the assignment of the lease of the Stafford Bowls Club. So it’s the Bowls Club and the bowling green. Nothing to do with the Gibson Park Committee.

 As it relates to that Stafford Bowls Club facility, I understand that the incoming lessee estimates that the operation of this facility will create approximately 60—60—new employment opportunities in the local area. We’re very supportive of that taking place. In order to achieve this, Brisbane Racing Club have committed to investing approximately $7.5 million into the renovation and the upgrade of 352 Stafford Road, delivering a revitalised community hub to be used by locals, social members and sporting clubs in the area.

 This really is a genuinely significant investment into the local area and is a commitment that is approximately $3 million more than the investment committed by the previous lessee. Brisbane Racing Club also have significant project management experience as it relates to the delivery of large-scale infrastructure projects like these. So we are confident in their project management capability to deliver this revitalisation.

 In regard to committing to supporting sport within the local area, Brisbane Racing Club have also agreed to honour the commitment to the Gibson Park Committee. For those who were unaware, the Gibson Park Committee exists to manage and improve the facilities at Gibson Park for the benefit of members and the broader public and to encourage other organisations with similar goals to use Gibson Park.

 The committee currently comprises of three members. Those being Stafford District Cricket Club, Padua College and Brothers Junior Rugby League Football Club. All of whom play a significant role in fostering sport being played at the site. The lease before us today will see a minimum of $200,000 per annum provided to the local community for the first 20 years of the lease through the Gibson Park Committee. Which represents a significant financial investment into sports and recreational activities undertaken at the site,

 While some in this Chamber will be unable to resist criticising the appointment of this lessee, as we have seen. We see it as important to remind those here today of what impact this decision will have. Not only in reactivating and revitalising a community hub for all to enjoy, but to also foster and develop local sport in the area.

 I recommend item A to the Chamber.

Deputy Chair: Thank you, Councillor HOWARD.

Further debate? No further debate.

LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair. Just briefly, thank you to the Councillors who contributed to this debate. Particular thanks to my colleagues, Councillor HAMMOND and Councillor HOWARD for bringing some common sense to a debate that has taken an interesting turn. Sadly, some of the comments, while I was disappointed in them, wasn’t particularly surprised.

 Now we heard, and we’re not surprised, that Councillor SRI is against horse racing and that he’s against gambling. Some may think that he has quite a puritanical view of life. Which is interesting. Because both of those activities are perfectly legal.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Comes down to individual choice and we all have a right to express our opinion on them as he is doing. But it is the law of the land at the moment that these things are legal activities and there are plenty of Aussies that like horse racing and there are plenty of Aussies that like to take a punt.

 But for someone who’s expressing quite puritanical views on horse racing, I’m quite surprised that Councillor SRI advocates illegal squatting.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: He advocates break and enter, he advocates shoplifting, he advocates vandalism of public assets—

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Point of order.

Deputy Chair: LORD MAYOR, point of order.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Relevant, to the lease?

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: A general attack on a Councillor is just relevant to the lease now?

Deputy Chair: LORD MAYOR I bring you back to the report.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Well Councillor SRI’s talking about good and evil here. We all heard him. He claimed that the Brisbane Racing Club was evil. He was talking about good and evil. Well, he’s entitled to that view but I think it’s actually evil to encourage people to break the law. I think that that is a problem. But maybe that’s just me. Maybe we live in a different world these days where the law doesn’t matter. That’s not really a world that I see as a positive thing.

 So Councillor SRI is railing against perfectly legal activities. While, at the same time encouraging people to break the law in other areas.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: I think that is fair degree of hypocrisy and should be a great deal of concern to many people in the community.

 What we see here is really simply the Racing Club has stepped in to provide what will deliver significant community benefits, 60 jobs and support of three different organisations that really need that support. We’ve heard that unfortunately Crushers was not able to achieve the outcome that they wanted to. A part of that was the long delay with State Government approvals and liquor licensing. Which is disappointing.

 But look, I simply think that this is a sensible outcome and one that will see an organisation giving back to the community. That’s what is happening here. Now I mentioned that gambling and horse racing were legal. Because they are legal, there is a process by which the proceeds of gambling and horse racing go through governments, various governments, and they get funnelled back into the community.

 In areas where horse racing or gambling is illegal, these things generally happen anyway but there’s no community return. We’ve seen that in the past. So this is a structured way of ensuring that the industry is able to put back into the community. There’s various State Government programs as well that take proceeds from gambling and redirect it into the community. Those proceeds from gambling also pay significant taxes and levies to the State Government, which then get used to fund community services.

 So there’s definitely various ways in which the racing industry, whether people like it or not, is contributing back to our community. The Brisbane Racing Club has done a lot of that and they’re proposing to do a lot more.

Deputy Chair: Thank you, LORD MAYOR.

 I will now put the motion for the vote.

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 Nicole JOHNSTON and Peter CUMMING immediately rose and called for a division, which resulted in the motion being declared **carried.**

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 15 - The Right Honourable, the LORD MAYOR, Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER, and Councillors Greg ADERMANN, Lisa ATWOOD, Fiona CUNNINGHAM, Tracy DAVIS, Fiona HAMMOND, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Sarah HUTTON, Sandy LANDERS, James MACKAY, Peter MATIC, Ryan MURPHY, Steven TOOMEY and Andrew WINES.

NOES: 5 - The Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Jared CASSIDY, and Councillors Peter CUMMING, Charles STRUNK, Jonathan SRIRANGANATHAN and Nicole JOHNSTON.

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.

**PRESCRIBED CONFLICT OF INTERESTS/DECLARABLE CONFLICT OF INTERESTS**

*Clause A Councillors Adam Allan, Kim Marx and David McLachlan declared a declarable conflict of interest in Clause A and absented themselves from discussion and voting on this matter.*

#### A ASSIGNMENT OF LEASE FROM CRUSHERS LEAGUES CLUB LIMITED TO BRISBANE RACING CLUB LIMITED

 **112/445/302/102**

**152/2022-23**

1. The Divisional Manager, Lifestyle and Community Services, provided the information below.

2. On 11 June 2019, Council approved a new 20-year lease to Crushers Leagues Club Limited (ACN 061 454 680) (Crushers) for part of Gibson Park, Lease C on SP 306522 located within Lot 5 on SP 150610, more commonly known as 352 Stafford Road, Stafford (the premises).

3. On 15 June 2021, Council approved an amendment to the lease for the purposes of:

- clarifying the definition of ‘Turnover’ in relation to the calculation of community support contributions in years six to 20 of the lease

- updating the approved use of the premises to assist the organisation in securing funding through sport and recreation grant programs.

4. On 5 August 2022, Council received a request from Crushers to assign the current registered lease with dealing number 705863558 (the lease) to Brisbane Racing Club Limited (ACN 133 679 786) (BRC). Council subsequently received a letter from BRC with supporting lease application documents for Council’s consideration of the assignment request.

5. Crushers have been unable to resolve the transfer of previously held licences to the premises, which has impacted the ability of Crushers to feasibly operate and therefore they are requesting to assign the lease to BRC.

6. BRC estimates that the operation of this facility on the premises will create approximately 60 new employment opportunities in the local area and deliver a revitalised community hub to be used by locals, social members, and sporting clubs.

7. BRC accepts the conditions of the lease as approved by Council on 15 June 2021 and proposes to invest $7.5 million to refurbish the premises immediately, with construction to be completed prior to 1 April 2023 for operations to commence. BRC is committed to supporting local sporting organisations, Stafford District Cricket Club, Padua College Limited, Brothers Junior Rugby League Football Club Incorporated and the remaining members of the former Stafford Bowls Club, to access and use the premises for club functions, training, and meetings.

8. BRC has requested an extension of the lease for an additional three years, plus the inclusion of a further option term of 10 years. This is considering BRC’s significant initial capital investment in the premises, ongoing commitment to conduct maintenance of the premises to the value of $80,000 per annum, and to receive return on BRC’s investment through a long‑term lease.

9. BRC has also agreed to honour the community contributions in the lease to provide financial and in-kind support for the activities of Gibson Park Committee Inc (The Committee). The Committee exists to manage and improve the facilities at Gibson Park for the benefit of members and the broader public, and to encourage other organisations with similar goals to use Gibson Park.

10. The community contributions will see a minimum of $200,000 per annum provided to the local community for the first 20 years of the lease. The rent and community contributions will be renegotiated prior to the exercise of the further option term based on a market review at that time.

11. BRC’s delivery of capital works of $7.5 million will significantly improve this community facility and assist in reactivating local community interest and participation in sport and recreation. In addition, the ongoing community support contributions represents a significant benefit to the community of a minimum of $200,000 per annum.

12. The Divisional Manager provided the following recommendation and the Committee agreed.

13. **RECOMMENDATION:**

**THAT COUNCIL RESOLVE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE DRAFT RESOLUTION SET OUT IN ATTACHMENT A**, hereunder.

**Attachment A
Draft Resolution**

**DRAFT RESOLUTION TO ASSIGN REGISTERED LEASE (705863558) TO BRISBANE RACING CLUB LIMITED (ACN 133 679 786) FOR PART OF GIBSON PARK, 352 STAFFORD ROAD, STAFFORD**

As:

(i) Council is the registered proprietor of land described as Lot 5 on SP150610, 352 Stafford Road, Stafford

(ii) Crushers Leagues Club Limited has a registered lease for Lease C on SP306522 located within Lot 5 on SP150610, 352 Stafford Road, Stafford

(iii) Crushers Leagues Club Limited is not in breach of the lease

(iv) Brisbane Racing Club Limited is, in the reasonable opinion of the Council, a suitable entity to occupy the premises,

then Council:

(i) approves the assignment of the registered lease (705863558) to Brisbane Racing Club Limited ACN 133 679 786 in accordance with the lease terms, as set out in Attachment B (submitted on file) and otherwise on terms and conditions satisfactory to the Manager, Asset Management, Brisbane Infrastructure, and the Chief Legal Counsel, City Legal, City Administration and Governance

(ii) approves the amendment of the registered lease (705863558) in accordance with the lease terms, as set out in Attachment B (submitted on file), and otherwise on terms and conditions satisfactory to the Manager, Asset Management, Brisbane Infrastructure, and the Chief Legal Counsel, City Legal, City Administration and Governance.

**ADOPTED**

Deputy Chair: LORD MAYOR.

Establishment and Coordination Committee recommendations.

## CONSIDERATION OF *RECOMMENDATIONS* OF THE ESTABLISHMENT AND COORDINATION COMMITTEE DURING RECESS:

### ESTABLISHMENT AND COORDINATION COMMITTEE (Adoption report)

The Right Honourable, the LORD MAYOR (Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER), Chair of the Establishment and Coordination Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Sarah HUTTON, that the report setting out the *recommendations* of the Establishment and Coordination Committee during the Spring Recess 2022, on matters usually considered by that Committee, be adopted.

Deputy Chair: LORD MAYOR.

**Seriatim for debate and voting – Clause B**

|  |
| --- |
| At that time, the LORD MAYOR rose and requested that Clause B, STORES BOARD SUBMISSION – CITY REACH BOARDWALK REHABILITATION – DECK PANEL REPLACEMENT AT 443 QUEEN STREET, be taken seriatim for debating and voting purposes. |

**Declaration of Prescribed or Declarable Conflict of Interest in Clause B - STORES BOARD SUBMISSION – CITY REACH BOARDWALK REHABILITATION – DECK PANEL REPLACEMENT AT 443 QUEEN STREET – The LORD MAYOR, Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER**

LORD MAYOR: I also want to point out that I have a declarable conflict of interest in Clause B. As everyone knows, I’m a member of the Liberal National Party of Queensland Council team. Hutchinson Builders Pty Ltd has made donations in the past to the Liberal National Party of Queensland Council team totalling $25,000 within the relevant period.

Deputy Chair: Thank you LORD MAYOR.

Before other Councillors declare. Because we now have seriatim on item B and the LORD MAYOR is wishing to debate and vote on items A, C and D. For the convenience of the Chamber we will debate and vote on items A, C and D first. Then we will move to item B and any necessary declarations.

LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you. So moving then to items A, C and D. Item A is the Stores Board submission for the significant contracting plan (SCP) for Library Collection Services. This item seeks Council’s approval to go to tender for Council’s physical and digital library collections, which is obviously a core component of our library services.

 Council’s library collection has more than 1.7 million items which includes approximately half a million digital resources as well. There were more than 9.3 million loans or downloads from our libraries last year, including more than 3.7 million in-person visits. Library Services maintains a relatively stable size, age and condition of collections through ongoing acquisition of new items and the removal of content which is outdated, damaged, or in the case of digital, expired.

 The submission today is seeking Council approval to tender four separate categories of work. These include physical materials, print serials, specialist material and digital content. In total these categories cover the entirety of our library collection and include some of the following: all genres of books, CDs and DVDs, subscriptions to magazines and newspapers, books in languages other than English, eBooks, audio books, digital magazines and music. The tender will be released to the market, assuming approval of this item, later this week and will close in November.

 Item C is the Contracts and Tendering Report for August 2022. Two notable contracts in this particular report include the ferry terminal flood recovery package, particularly the repair to the Regatta and North Quay ferry terminals, including gangway repair, including new mesh panels, external panels and cladding repair, new balustrades, signage and electrical work.

 Also the Wadeville Street, Ritchie Road Upgrade, Stage 1A. This project is about making sure our suburbs have the upgraded infrastructure to cope with the growth that we’re experiencing. The project will particularly improve access to the Pallara State School. Work includes a right-turn facility at the school, a crossing point on Ritchie Road and a new bus stop near the school as well.

 Item D is a significant contracting plan for ICT (information and communications technology) Professional Services. This item seeks to allow Council to access the Queensland Government’s pre‑qualified supplier panel for ICT Services and Suppliers. So this panel was established in 2013 by the State Government. It does not expire and is regularly refreshed, most recently in July this year.

 Councillors, in the delivery phase of multiple large programs of work related to ICT investment that will transform and optimise service delivery, including the Enterprise Resource Planning digital program, or ERP digital program. The authority to use the State’s existing panel will allow us to access a larger pool of suppliers at a time when the IT (information technology) market is experiencing labour shortages. It will also help improve procurement efficiency with reduced tendering and contract development time and cost to Council. Thank you, Mr Chair.

Deputy Chair: Thank you, LORD MAYOR.

Further debate?

Councillor LANDERS.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

|  |
| --- |
| **153/2022-23**At that time, 3.01pm, 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:**

*At that time, 3.23pm, the Chair, Councillor David McLACHLAN, resumed the Chair.*

Chair: Thank you, Councillors.

We are in debate about E&C recommendations. The LORD MAYOR has spoken.

Is there any further debate?

Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Yes, thanks, Chair. On A, C and D?

Chair: Yes.

Councillor CASSIDY: That’s correct?

**Seriatim *en bloc* – Clauses C and D**

|  |
| --- |
| At that time, Councillor Jared CASSIDY rose and requested that Clause C, CONTRACTS AND TENDERING – REPORT OF CONTRACTS ACCEPTED BY DELEGATES OF COUNCIL FOR AUGUST 2022; and Clause D, STORES BOARD SUBMISSION – SIGNIFICANT CONTRACTING PLAN FOR ICT PROFESSIONAL SERVICES, be taken seriatim *en bloc* for voting purposes, |

Councillor CASSIDY: So, initially the significant contracting plan for library collections and services and we will be supporting this item before us. It’s pretty straightforward. There are some items in here that are commercial‑in‑confidence in terms of the dollar figures and amounts in there before that goes out to the market, but broadly speaking, we support this item in having our libraries have collections—digital, physical. So, yes, we’ll be supporting that item.

Item C, the contracts and tendering report before us today—my longstanding view—and this shouldn’t be any surprise to Councillors in here around the approach of this Administration is taking to suburban investment and contracting out as reflected in here—contract number 7, which is for $356,000, almost $357,000⎯is interesting. It’s the provision of disaster and emergency management systems and services. You would want that to be an improvement on what we have had.

We’ve heard the LORD MAYOR talk a lot today about emergency management, the systems⎯the warning system which Council runs. There’s not a lot of information in here about this item before us today. We certainly hope that it’s an improvement on Council’s systems before us today and perhaps it might have some training involved in it, or maybe the LORD MAYOR can undertake the training that had been offered to Councillors and their ward office staff in what level of government is responsible for what, because we know that in a pandemic and in a health disaster, it’s very clearly defined that the State Government is a lead agency.

But in a flood emergency, like we saw in February this year, Councils are the lead agencies in disaster recovery and disaster management while they are happening. They’re the lead agency and the LORD MAYOR should know that. So, we certainly hope that whatever this is before us today, this emergency management system and services, assists the LORD MAYOR in doing his very basic job when it comes to managing a disaster that our city may well face again in the coming months.

Item D, the—submission for the ICT Professional Services—we on this one remain once bitten, twice shy when it comes to contracting these services out to the private sector. Now, some services, when it comes to IT⎯when it comes to program licencing and specific services, are best delivered by the private sector and we accept that.

But when you have a situation where Council’s own capability is no longer there to properly plan around and deliver these contracts to the ratepayers of Brisbane, like we’ve seen in the past, like the TechnologyOne contract a couple of years ago, which initially blew out by tens of millions of dollars and then had to be cancelled⎯and then all of these IT systems that the residents of Brisbane were relying on without realising it in terms of the Contact Centre, in terms of workflow management, in terms of project management within Council and reporting of issues out in the community, whether they’re potholes or trees need trimming or broken footpaths were left to wither away with no solutions.

We’ve seen that continue to get worse under this Administration’s approach to contracting out basic services. So, when you don’t even have a fully staffed and fully capable ICT department in Council that is able to manage this work, we see that the political decisions then that this Administration makes end up landing—in terms of cost overruns and delays and then deferred and cancelled projects—on the laps of ratepayers. So, until this Administration can get Council’s own IT and ICT teams up to speed and properly staffed, then these projects are always going to face delays and cost blowouts and not deliver good value for money for the residents of Brisbane.

Chair: Thank you.

Further speakers? Any further speakers on items A, C or D?

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, thank you. I rise to speak on—yes, thank you. I rise to speak on items A, C and D, and I will start with item C. Like Councillor CASSIDY, I noticed funding flowing through the E&C report for some disaster management—and I think it’s probably the wrong word—but I want to start with a couple of the items. The first one is Contract 1, $267,000 is being allocated for provision of a volunteer management support solution. Now, that sounds like something to do with the Mud Army to me.

I might be wrong, but the LORD MAYOR’s not here, the DEPUTY MAYOR’s off on her junket for the Olympics and there’s nobody left here to explain what this item is before us today. So, I will presume that this is some sort of Mud Army-type report. I guess the questions that I’ve got is in the de Jersey review, recommendation 4.13 recommended that the Mud Army was reviewed by 31 August 2022. Now, that’s two months ago, essentially. We’ve heard nothing from the LORD MAYOR about the outcome of that review. Not a single thing.

I know it’s something that I wrote several pages on in my response to former Chief Justice Paul de Jersey but if this review has been done by Brisbane City Council, the outcome has not been provided to Councillors and no public discussion of it has taken place. Now, this contract was due to have started on 12 September and it’s supposed to run for three years and up to five years, so presumably, Council has now outsourced management of the Mud Army response to Rosterfy Proprietary Limited.

Now, if I’m wrong, I welcome someone standing up. Even the relevant Chairperson, Councillor CUNNINGHAM, is not here, so there’s not a single person—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: Oh, sorry, she’s over there, okay, yes. She’s at the back of the room, I see. Not in her seat, but she is over there, talking to Councillor WINES.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: So, maybe she’ll stand up and tell us what the outcome of the Mud Army review was that Paul de Jersey asked for. The LORD MAYOR stands up and says we’re doing all of those things but he doesn’t ever report on what they are. Maybe someone will stand up and tell us who Rosterfy Proprietary Limited are and what they’re going to do with their $267,000 over the next possibly five years, because it’s very odd. I don’t know. What I do know is that twice now, in 2011 and 2022, management of the Mud Army by Brisbane City Council under the leadership of Councillor Krista ADAMS, has been a complete failure and in 2011 for different reasons than in 2022.

But so far, in response to the complete failure of this Mud Army response—which is critical to help residents to recover from a flood—there has been absolute silence from the LORD MAYOR. Now, we find that he’s outsourcing this to some sort of unknown private company called Rosterfy. Well, who are they, what do they do, what’s the scope of the brief, what are we going to get for our money, what are the outcomes, what are the KPIs, how do we track whether they’re delivering? Is Councillor ADAMS involved? Because I should say, that should be a dealbreaker for anybody.

Councillor HOWARD: Point of order, Mr Chair.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor HOWARD.

Councillor HOWARD: Can I just say that the Mud Army I don’t think was mentioned anywhere and that just to answer Councillor JOHNSTON, it is not the Mud Army. So, just put that on—

Chair: Councillor HOWARD, you do have the opportunity to participate in this debate, where you could make that point.

Councillor JOHNSTON, you have the floor.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Amazing, isn’t it? The provision of a volunteer management solution. The provision of a volunteer management solution. Nothing to do with the Mud Army. That’s great to know. So, then that leaves the—of course, the relevant Chair couldn’t hop up and say and the LORD MAYOR couldn’t hop up and say, but yes, we got the lecture from Councillor HOWARD earlier, how she listens respectfully to people and doesn’t interject, but what did she just do? Exactly the same thing.

So, anyway, let me just move on to the next one, which is provision of disaster and emergency management system and services. Now, presumably that is related to the floods. Maybe Councillor HOWARD’s going to hop up again. Again, we’ve got another really unclear organisation here, Harvay Asia Pacific Limited, $274,500. Now, we don’t know what that’s for. We don’t know the scope of the works; we don’t know the outcome and there is a real problem with the fact that Council is not being transparent with this.

It may be some sort of software, because the $247,000—I don’t know if that’s per year for 15 years or whether that’s over the 15 years. It’s a bit hard to tell. Because the other bids are $13 million and $10 million from KPMG, but we’ve gone with Harvay Asia Pacific for $274,000 for a contract over 15 years. So, what’s that for? What’s that for? Now, the key outcome of the de Jersey report was to make sure that Councillors were included in the process of making sure we were part of the community response. Brisbane City Council has categorically failed over the last several months to communicate with Councillors.

I’ve had one Council officer—two of them came but one meeting—when I’ve asked for help, they’ve said no. I had the Divisional Manager, City Administration and Governance, and City Resilience Manager, City Administration and Governance, come out a few weeks ago and when I asked them to respond to two specific questions, they told me they would and they have not. These are the people who were responsible for the Council flood review, who sat in my office with me and my staff and looked me in the face—

Councillor WINES: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor WINES.

Councillor WINES: Point of order, Mr Chair. Look, while these matters may be relevant elsewhere, they are not relevant here. Can I just ask—the point of order is effectively relevance. Meetings about City Resilience are not relevant to the contract and tendering item before us.

Chair: Councillor WINES.

Councillor JOHNSTON, yes, can I bring you back to the item before us, specifically to the contract and tendering report, please?

Councillor JOHNSTON: Okay, Mr Chairman. Can you tell me what the provision of disaster and emergency management system and services is in Contract 7? Who’s responsible for that? Could it be the City Resilience Manager, City Administration and Governance, and the Divisional Manager, City Administration and Governance, who is the disaster coordinator for the City of Brisbane? I mean, do you think maybe that the provision of disaster emergency management systems and services might be relevant to the two most senior Council officers who are responsible for delivering it?

But that’s okay, Councillor WINES doesn’t think it’s relevant. You, Mr Chairman, don’t think it’s relevant. Well, I do. I do, Mr Chairman, and unless you can tell me what that item’s about—I’d be happy to defer if you know what it’s about, but as far as I know, it says it’s about running a disaster in that city and the two most senior Council officers responsible for that are the City Resilience Manager, City Administration and Governance, and the Divisional Manager, City Administration and Governance.

Councillor WINES: Point of order, Mr Chair. I feel like the Councillor’s ignoring your direction. There was a question about relevance and she’s continued to make statements in the same vein that she was earlier. Can I just ask that—today’s potentially going to be a very long meeting and we maintain our comments to the matters relevant to the paperwork in front of us?

Chair: Councillor WINES, you’re now debating the point of order.

Councillor JOHNSTON, there aren’t Council officers mentioned here specifically. You’ve made your point. I think, though, that you should get back to the debate about the contracts and tendering report, please.

Councillor JOHNSTON: So, the $274,500 contract is not actually going to be oversighted or managed by Council officers. That’s essentially what you’ve just said to me. It’s got nothing to do with Council officers. Is that right, Mr Chairman, that you don’t think Council officers in this place are responsible for managing Council contracts? Because that’s what this is. So, this is all a matter of accountability, accountability and transparency when it comes to flood recovery. The Administration over there just don’t get it and we can see from Councillor WINES, we can see from the Chairman himself, that they don’t want us talking about this.

What are these contracts, then? Why are they going out to these unusual groups? Why is there no discussion with us about what they’re about? How is it going to deliver on the de Jersey reviews? How is it going to improve things for the community on the ground? We don’t know and that is fundamentally the point. No amount of intervention by Councillor WINES and attempted clean-up on aisle 15 by the Chairman is going to fix the fact that this Council is not delivering on the de Jersey recommendations.

Now, briefly on the other two items. Obviously, I support our libraries and I welcome the investment in our library services. We should be investing more in our library services. I think that would be important. Item D, which is the ICT Professional Services contract. This appears to be another attempt by this Administration to outsource IT. That happened a few years ago and a lot of Council officers lost their jobs. It is a little bit unclear here.

Council’s openly admitting it does not have the capability to deliver on major IT contracts and we’re going to piggyback on the back of the State Government’s ICT Panel arrangements. My concern here is that this is outsourcing Council capacity and services. It’s critical that these are skills that we have inhouse and can respond. It is very concerning to read in here that we’re going to outsource the delivery of these ICT projects.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, your time has expired.

Any further speakers?

Councillor WINES.

Councillor WINES: Thank you, Mr Chair. I just rise to speak to the contracts and tendering report before us today. I just want to make some remarks regarding some of the comments that we’ve heard earlier today. As I said when I was raising the matters regarding relevance to the paperwork in front of us, these papers speak to contracts about items purchased to improve the service delivery of this Council. They do not include gratuitous tax on Council officers, and largely that’s what that was that we just heard. The two individuals named are professional and attentive Council officers who’ve devoted a lot of time and effort to making sure that this Council—

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: You’ve told me it’s irrelevant if I speak about them, so why is it suddenly relevant when Councillor WINES speaks about them, Mr Chairman, and are you going to apply the ruling the same way at Councillor WINES’ request?

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Let me make a ruling, Councillor WINES. Thank you.

Thank you to your point of order, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor WINES, can I bring you back to the report before us, please?

Councillor WINES: Thank you. As I say—of course, Mr Chair, and other than to say, my compliments to those officers and their work. There was an attack on a rostering program for the environmental habitat volunteer program where some Councillors in this place have accused it of being a Mud Army rostering service. It is a service to manage our habitat clean-up volunteers. Rosterfy is a relatively small contract but it’s about the provision of a volunteer management solution for our habitat centres, our environment centres and our creek clean-up teams.

So, it has nothing to do with the Mud Army. It has everything to do with the keen and committed volunteers who make sure that this city’s waterways and environmental habitats remain beautiful, attractive and clean places. Can I also commend all those people who take the time to do that? The other item that was unfairly criticised was the IT improvement to ensure that disaster response in the future improves. Now, the whole objective of the range of reports and documents, de Jersey report, FRAP (Flood Resilience Action Plan), is to make sure that we are better prepared in the future. So, we buy IT products that make sure that we are better in the future.

The de Jersey report identified that we had to have a review of the system completed I think in August, off the top of my head. The review’s been completed and now we’re buying software to ensure that the objectives of the review and that our own capacity are improved so that we can be more responsive in the future.

Now, there has also been a pretty disgusting mistruth being peddled by Councillor JOHNSTON that we have not been hitting our targets in the de Jersey review. That is out and out false. That accusation is false. We have hit every mark that we have sought to hit and we are implementing every recommendation we seek to implement and this is more evidence that we have taken the reports seriously, that we are reviewing our internal operational performance and ensuring we are better in the future.

So, I just want to make sure that all Councillors get it through their heads that we are hitting our marks on the de Jersey review. Right? Just understand that very simple statement. We are hitting our marks—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: —and we are hitting our marks on the Flood Resilience Action Plan, both of which work in cooperation to make sure we are more ready in the future. That’s what we’re seeking support for today in these items: that we be more ready in the future.

Chair: Further debate on items A, C and D? Any further debate? No?

 LORD MAYOR? No?

Okay, we have seriatim for all these items, if I understand correctly, C and D together and A separately, so we’ll go to the vote first on item A.

**Clause A put**

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

Chair: Item C and D together.

**Clauses C and D put**

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

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

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 19 - The Right Honourable, the LORD MAYOR, Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER, and Councillors Adam ALLAN, Greg ADERMANN, Lisa ATWOOD, Fiona CUNNINGHAM, Tracy DAVIS, Fiona HAMMOND, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Sarah HUTTON, Sandy LANDERS, James MACKAY, Peter MATIC, Kim MARX, David McLACHLAN, Ryan MURPHY, Steven TOOMEY, Andrew WINES and Nicole JOHNSTON.

NOES: 1 - Councillor Jonathan SRIRANGANATHAN.

ABSTENTIONS: 3 - The Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Jared CASSIDY, and Councillors Peter CUMMING and Charles STRUNK.

Chair: We move to item B.

Councillor LANDERS.

**Declaration of Prescribed or Declarable Conflict of Interest in Clause B - STORES BOARD SUBMISSION – CITY REACH BOARDWALK REHABILITATION – DECK PANEL REPLACEMENT AT 443 QUEEN STREET – Councillors Adam ALLAN, Greg ADERMANN, Lisa ATWOOD, Fiona CUNNINGHAM, Tracy DAVIS, Fiona HAMMOND, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Sarah HUTTON, Sandy LANDERS, James MACKAY, Peter MATIC, Kim MARX, David McLACHLAN, Ryan MURPHY, Steven TOOMEY and Andrew WINES**

Councillor LANDERS: Point of order, Chair. I have a declarable conflict of interest in Clause B. I am a member of the Liberal National Party of Queensland Council team. Hutchinson Builders Pty Ltd has made donations to the Liberal Party of Queensland Council team totalling $25,000 within the relevant period.

Chair: Thank you.

Point of order to you, Councillor HUTTON.

Councillor HUTTON: Point of order, Chair. I have a declarable conflict of interest in Clause B. I am a member of the Liberal National Party of Queensland Council team. Hutchinson Builders Pty Ltd has made donations to the Liberal National Party of Queensland Council team totalling $25,000 within the relevant period.

Chair: Thank you.

Councillor MACKAY.

Councillor MACKAY: Thank you, Chair. Point of order. I have a declarable conflict of interest in Clause B. I’m a member of the Liberal National Party of Queensland Council team. Hutchinson Builders Pty Ltd has made donations to the Liberal National Party of Queensland Council team totalling $25,000 within the relevant period.

Chair: Thank you.

Councillor HAMMOND.

Councillor HAMMOND: Point of order, Mr Chair. I have a declarable conflict of interest in Clause B. I’m a member of the Liberal National Party of Queensland Council team. Hutchinson Builders Pty Ltd has made donations to the Liberal National Party of Queensland Council team totalling $25,000 within the relevant period.

Chair: Thank you.

Councillor MATIC.

Councillor MATIC: Point of order, Chair. I have a declarable conflict of interest in Clause B. I’m a member of the Liberal National Party of Queensland Council team. Hutchinson Builders Pty Ltd has made donations to the Liberal National Party of Queensland Council team totalling $25,000 within the relevant period.

Chair: Thank you.

Councillor ADERMANN.

Councillor ADERMANN: Point of order, Chair. I have a declarable conflict of interest in Clause B. I’m a member of the Liberal National Party of Queensland Council team. Hutchinson Builders Pty Ltd has made donations to the Liberal National Party of Queensland Council team totalling $25,000 within the relevant period.

Chair: Thank you.

Councillor ATWOOD.

Councillor ATWOOD: Point of order, Chair. I have a declarable conflict of interest in Clause B. I’m a member of the Liberal National Party of Queensland Council team. Hutchinson Builders Pty Ltd has made donations to the Liberal National Party of Queensland Council team totalling $25,000 within the relevant period.

Chair: Thank you.

Councillor HUANG.

Councillor HUANG: Point of order, Chair. I have a declarable conflict of interest in Clause B. I’m a member of the Liberal National Party of Queensland Council team. Hutchinson Builders Pty Ltd has made donations to the Liberal National Party of Queensland Council team totalling $25,000 within the relevant period.

Chair: Thank you.

Councillor DAVIS.

Councillor DAVIS: Point of order, Chair. I have a declarable conflict of interest in Clause B. I’m a member of the Liberal National Party of Queensland Council team. Hutchinson Builders Pty Ltd has made donations to the Liberal National Party of Queensland Council team totalling $25,000 within the relevant period.

Chair: Thank you.

Councillor WINES.

Councillor WINES: Point of order, Mr Chair. I have a declarable conflict of interest in Clause B. I’m a member of the Liberal National Party of Queensland Council team. Hutchinson Builders Pty Ltd has made donations to the Liberal National Party of Queensland Council team totalling $25,000 within the relevant period.

Chair: Thank you.

Councillor MARX.

Councillor MARX: Yes, thank you. Point of order, Chair. I have a declarable conflict of interest in Clause B. I’m a member of the Liberal National Party of Queensland Council team. Hutchinson Builders Pty Ltd has made donations to the Liberal National Party of Queensland Council team totalling $25,000 within the relevant period.

Chair: Thank you.

Councillor MURPHY.

Councillor MURPHY: Point of order, Chair. I have a declarable conflict of interest in Clause B. I’m a member of the Liberal National Party of Queensland Council team. Hutchinson Builders Pty Ltd has made donations to the Liberal National Party of Queensland Council team totalling $25,000 within the relevant period.

Chair: Thank you.

Councillor ALLAN.

Councillor ALLAN: I have a declarable conflict of interest in Clause B. I’m a member of the Liberal National Party of Queensland Council team. Hutchinson Builders Pty Ltd has made donations to the Liberal National Party of Queensland Council team totalling $25,000 within the relevant period.

Chair: Thank you.

Councillor CUNNINGHAM.

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: Yes, thanks. Point of order, Mr Chair. I have a declarable conflict of interest in Clause B. I’m a member of the Liberal National Party of Queensland Council team. Hutchinson Builders Pty Ltd has made donations to the Liberal National Party of Queensland Council team totalling $25,000 within the relevant period.

Chair: Thank you.

Councillor HOWARD.

Councillor HOWARD: Point of order, Chair. I have a declarable conflict of interest in Clause B. I’m a member of the Liberal National Party of Queensland Council team. Hutchinson Builders Pty Ltd has made donations to the Liberal National Party of Queensland Council team totalling $25,000 within the relevant period.

Chair: Thank you.

Councillor TOOMEY.

Councillor TOOMEY: Thank you, Chair. Point of order. I also too make a declaration that I have a conflict of interest in Clause B. I’m a member of the Liberal National Party of Queensland Council team. Hutchinson Builders Pty Ltd has made donations to the Liberal Party of Queensland Council team totalling $25,000 within the relevant period.

Chair: Thank you.

LORD MAYOR, you made a declaration earlier.

I have a declarable conflict of interest in Clause B as well. I’m a member of the Liberal National Party of Queensland Council team. Hutchinson Builders Pty Ltd has made donations to the Liberal National Party of Queensland Council team totalling $25,000 within the relevant period.

Now, Councillor LANDERS—

Sorry, before we move on, are there any other declarations?

No further declarations. Thank you.

Councillor LANDERS.

**154/2022-23**

At that juncture, Councillor Sandy LANDERS moved, seconded by Councillor Sarah HUTTON, that as a majority of Councillors present have declared a conflict of interest in this matter, deciding this matter be delegated to the Chief Executive Officer in accordance with section 238 of the *City of Brisbane Act 2010*.

Chair: Is there any debate?

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, I rise to—

Councillor WINES: Point of order, Mr Chair. Can I seek a ruling? This matter—a matter of referring a decision like this to the CEO is, in my view, a procedural matter and not an ordinary motion, therefore it really only requires a vote and a transfer because it is procedural nature and doesn’t require a substantive debate.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor WINES.

It has been past practice to allow debate on these motions in the past. I’ll allow it to continue this time as well.

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Here we go again. So, the motion we’re discussing here today is that all of the LNP Councillors have received donations from Hutchinson Builders, who are a big and very reputable Queensland construction and property company, but as a result of the donations being accepted by them and their political party, a matter of business for the City of Brisbane cannot be discussed and decided. That is the outcome of what has happened here today.

It actually is very problematic today because this decision means there will be no public scrutiny at all of the issue for the City Reach Boardwalk Rehabilitation Project deck panel replacement at 443 Queen Street because this was a decision decided without a tender by Council officers. Now, as a result of the LNP’s conflict of interest today, this matter is being delegated back to those same Council officers who will make a decision with zero independent scrutiny by any elected official of this Council. That is bad practice.

That is bad practice and what it shows is this Council is run at the whim of the LNP and who they take money from. That is bad for the governance of this city, it is bad for democracy in this city and it is bad for the transparency of very big decision-making processes in Brisbane. It is absolutely unacceptable, in my view, that there is no tender for this contract and then there is no scrutiny of it in E&C because they were all conflicted out and now there can be no scrutiny of it here because they’re all conflicted out.

There are still five Councillors in this place who could make a decision on this matter and I think that it is unacceptable that the LNP wants to prevent public scrutiny of this issue with the conflict of interest that they’ve got. I think that the LORD MAYOR has to take this up with the Local Government Minister to make sure that there are changes so that there is transparency and public scrutiny of decision-making when a majority of Councillors have conflicts of interest. Now, usually it’s only Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN and myself who are left in the Chamber.

It seems that Hutchies aren’t real keen on the ALP, so they’re all still in the Chamber, but there is an issue here that has to be addressed and that is, Council officers, without going to tender, should not be allowed to tick a project that’s had no other scrutiny by anybody else. That’s just unacceptable and that’s the outcome of what’s going on here today. I don’t—this is just wrong, wrong, wrong.

Chair: Mic on.

We now put the motion.

Upon being submitted to the Chamber, the motion was declared **carried** on the voices.

The report read as follows⎯

**DECLARABLE CONFLICT OF INTERESTS**

*Clause B The Lord Mayor (Councillor Adrian Schrinner), and Councillors Fiona Cunningham, Tracy Davis, Vicki Howard, Sarah Hutton, Kim Marx, Peter Matic and Ryan Murphy declared a declarable conflict of interest in Clause B. Clause B was then referred to Council pursuant to section 177R of the City of Brisbane Act 2010.*

#### A STORES BOARD SUBMISSION – SIGNIFICANT CONTRACTING PLAN FOR LIBRARY COLLECTIONS AND SERVICES

**165/830/179/908**

**155/2022-23**

1. The Chief Executive Officer provided the information below.

2. The Chief Executive Officer and the Stores Board considered the submission, as set out in Attachment A (submitted on file), on 26 September 2022.

3. The submission is recommended to Council as it is considered the most advantageous outcome for the provision of the required services.

4. Commercial-in-Confidence details have been removed from this report, highlighted in yellow and replaced with the word [Commercial-in-Confidence].

 Purpose

5. That the Stores Board recommends approval of the procurement strategy for:

Contract title: Library Collections and Services

Type of procurement: Establishing a Corporate Procurement Arrangement (CPA) in the form of a Preferred Supplier or Panel Arrangement

Categories/portions: Category 1 – Physical Materials

Category 2 – Print Serials

Category 3 – Specialist Materials

Category 4 – Digital Content

Market engagement strategy: Seek offers publicly

Contract duration: An initial term of three years with options to extend for additional periods of up to two years, for a maximum term of five years

Price basis: Schedule of rates.

 Background/business base

6. Council’s total library collection size is more than 1.7 million items which includes approximately 500,000 digital lending titles plus subscription-based resources. Library Services maintains a relatively stable size, age, and condition of collections through the ongoing acquisition of new and replacement items and the removal of content which is outdated, damaged or, in the case of digital, expired.

7. Under this arrangement, Council requires the provision of physical and digital library materials, digital lending content and services. This includes all maintenance and servicing functions associated with digital content and shelf-ready library materials delivery. The required services include:

- Full acquisitions service for the contracted range of published formats.

- Full shelf ready service including providing and uploading catalogue records into Council’s Library Services Library Management System (LMS) and the Australian National Bibliographic Database (currently Libraries Australia), end processing and delivery of physical materials to designated branches.

- Print serials subscription management, end processing, loading and delivery, and newspaper subscription management including publisher and delivery liaison.

- Digital content including the provision and maintenance of digital lending content, services and platforms.

8. Council spends approximately $7.49 million per annum under this arrangement; actual spend is subject to future Council budgets and Queensland Government State Library funding of approximately $4.66 million per annum. It is anticipated that the annual expenditure under the new CPA will be at a similar level. Library Services, Lifestyle and Community Services (LCS), is the key stakeholder and principal user of this contract.

9. In total, there are 15 suppliers under the current arrangement, broken down by category as follows:

- Category 1 – Physical Materials (four suppliers)

This category includes Books, (Adult, Young Adult and Junior Fiction, Graphic novels, Non‑Fiction and Reference titles and Literacy materials) as well as CDs and DVDs. The estimated annual expenditure under this category is $3.63 million.

- Category 2 – Print Serials (one supplier)

This category includes the management of subscriptions to magazines and Australian printed newspapers. The estimated annual expenditure under this category is $1.16 million.

- Category 3 – Specialist Materials (seven suppliers)

This category includes print books in Languages Other Than English (LOTE) and audiobooks and large print items. The estimated annual expenditure under this category is $665,000.

- Category 4 – Digital Content (eight suppliers)

This category includes eBooks, eAudiobooks, Digital Magazines, Digital Music and Digital Films. It also includes the maintenance of lending platforms. The estimated annual expenditure under this category is $2.03 million.

10. Analysis of the current arrangements indicates that the top four suppliers across all categories account for 86% of the total spend. A larger number of suppliers are required for categories three and four due to the specialist nature of the material and publisher restrictions.

11. The Request for Proposal (RFP) process will seek proposals from suppliers who have the capability and capacity to support Council’s requirements. Council will consider either a preferred supplier or panel arrangement for each category, whichever offers the most advantageous outcome for Council.

 Policy and other considerations

12. Is there an existing arrangement for these goods/services/works?

Yes, CPA 510811 for Library Collections and Services, which expires on 14 April 2023.

13. Could Council businesses provide the services/works?

No. Council does not have the capability to provide these goods/services.

14. What policy, or other issues, should the delegate be aware of?

Nil

15. Does this procurement exercise need to be managed under the PM2 Governance and Assurance Framework?

No

16. Does the proposed contract involve leasing?

No

 Market analysis

17. The market for Library Services is in the mature phase of its life cycle.

18. Public Library spending in Queensland is estimated to be $31.3 million per annum and Council’s spend of $7.49 million per annum represents an estimated 24% of the market share in Queensland. Council provides the largest Local Government Library Service in Australia.

19. The overall supplier base for Library Collections and Services in Australia is static. Major suppliers in the market are James Bennett, Peter Pal, Overdrive and Bolinda Digital who are all current Council suppliers. Other key suppliers in the market that Council does not have an existing contract with are: The Bookhouse (for physical stock, Books, CDs, and DVDs) and Bibliotheca for digital content.

 Procurement strategy

20.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Procurement objective: | To procure the goods/services/works in a way which complies with the Sound Contracting Principles set out in section 103(3) of the *City of Brisbane Act 2010* and provides the most advantageous outcome for Council.The achievement of the above procurement objective will be measured in the post-market submission.  |
| Title of contract: | Library Collections and Services |
| Type of procurement: | Establishing a Corporate Procurement Arrangement (CPA) in the form of a Preferred Supplier or Panel Arrangement. |
| Categories/portions: | Category 1 – Physical MaterialsCategory 2 – Print SerialsCategory 3 – Specialist MaterialsCategory 4 – Digital ContentThese categories have distinct requirements and suppliers often specialise in particular service categories. |
| Process to be used: | Request for Proposals (RFP) |
| Tendering standards to be used and any amendments: | Council’s corporate standards with no amendments. |
| Contract standard to be used including any amendments: | Goods/services – high risk – preferred supplier or panel arrangement. No changes have been made to the standard. |
| Market engagement: | Offers are to be sought publicly via Council’s supplier portal. |
| How tender documents are to be distributed: | Via Council’s supplier portal |
| How tenders/proposals are to be lodged: | Via Council’s supplier portal |
| Part offers: | Part offers within a category will be considered. |
| Contract duration:  | An initial term of three years with options to extend for additional periods of up to two years, for a maximum term of five years. |
| Insurance requirements: | Public and product liability of $20 million, and workers compensation insurance as per legislated requirements. |
| Price basis: | Pricing will be predominantly based on schedule of rates, along with annual subscription fees for certain items (such as digital content and platform access).  |
| Price adjustment: | To be nominated by tenderers. |
| Liquidated damages: | Not applicable |
| Security for the contract: | Not applicable |
| Defects liability/warranty period: | Not applicable |
| Other strategy elements: | A refresh mechanism will allow consideration of adding new suppliers during the term of the CPA (e.g., to incorporate new formats) Improved accuracy and consistency of reporting which will provide increased support for better spend analysis.  |
| Alternative strategies considered: | Select sourcing with existing suppliers. However, this would preclude other potential suppliers in the market from participating in the tender. |

 Anticipated schedule

21. Pre-market approval: 25 October 2022

Date of release to market: 28 October 2022

Tender closing: 25 November 2022

Evaluation completion (including formalised contract offer(s)): 30 January 2023

Post-market approval: 3 April 2023

Contract commencement: 15 April 2023

 Funding and budget considerations

22. Estimated expenditure:

Based on historical levels of activity, estimated expenditure is $37.4 million over the potential five-year term.

23. Sufficient approved budget to meet the total spend under this CPA?

Establishing the CPA will not commit Council to any purchases. Funding is only required when an appropriately delegated Council officer approves placing orders under the CPA.

24. Anticipated procurement benefits (if any):

To be established and reported in the post-market submission.

 Procurement risk

25. Is this contract listed as a ‘critical contract’ requiring the contractor to have in place a Business Continuity Plan approved by Council?

No

26. Summary of key risks associated with this procurement:

| **Procurement risk** | **Risk rating** | **Risk mitigation strategy** | **Risk allocation** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFP participation  | Low | Known companies will be contacted and actively encouraged to lodge a proposal. | Council |
| Competitive pricing  | Low | Issuing a publicly advertised RFP will allow key players to price competitively to gain or retain business. | Contractor and Council |
| Cybersecurity  | Low | The ICT Risk Security and Compliance team will be engaged to provide specialist advice as part of the evaluation process. | Council |
| Price variation methodology | Low | Price review methodology will be agreed between the parties and shall be evidence based, in line with published statistics. | Contractor and Council |
| Transition | Medium | Existing suppliers will fulfil their commitments that will extend past the contract end date.Ensure orders for stock are placed in advance to meet publishing deadlines. | Council |

 Tender evaluation

27. Evaluation criteria:

1. Mandatory/essential criteria:

Elements that integrate with a Library Management System must be able to integrate with Council’s current Library Management System, SirsiDynix Symphony.

1. Non-price weighted evaluation criteria:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Weighted evaluation criteria** | **Weighting (%)** |
| Capability and capacity | [Commercial-in-confidence] |
| Local benefits | 30 |
| Experience | [Commercial-in-confidence] |
| Account management, reporting and systems | [Commercial-in-confidence] |
| Total: | 100 |

1. Price model (to establish a comparative price):

Basket of commonly purchased good and services.

28. Evaluation methodology:

(a) Evaluation plan and shortlisting:

Council’s standard evaluation plan including the standard shortlisting methodology will be used.

(b) Negotiations:

Council’s structured negotiation process is anticipated to be undertaken.

(c) Value for Money (VFM):

Council’s standard VFM method. This is non-price score divided by price.

29. The Chief Executive Officer provided the following recommendation and the Committee agreed at the meeting of 10 October 2022.

30. **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Stores Board recommends approval of the procurement strategy for:

Title of contract: Library Collections and Services

Type of procurement: Establishing a Corporate Procurement Arrangement in the form of a Preferred Supplier or Panel Arrangement

Contract duration: An initial term of three years with options to extend for additional periods of up to two years, for a maximum term of five years

Price basis: Schedule of rates.

**ADOPTED**

#### C CONTRACTS AND TENDERING – REPORT OF CONTRACTS ACCEPTED BY DELEGATES OF COUNCIL FOR AUGUST 2022

**109/695/586/2-006**

**156/2022-23**

57. The Chief Executive Officer provided the information below.

58. Commercial-in-Confidence details have been removed from this report, highlighted in yellow and replaced with the word [Commercial-in-Confidence].

59. Sections 238 and 239 of the *City of Brisbane Act 2010* (the Act) provide that Council may delegate some of its powers. Those powers include the power to enter into contracts under section 242 of the Act.

60. Council has previously delegated some powers to make, vary or discharge contracts for the procurement of goods, services or works. Council made these delegations to the Establishment and Coordination Committee and Chief Executive Officer.

61. The *City of Brisbane Regulation 2012* (the Regulation) was made pursuant to the Act. Chapter 6, Part 4, section 227 of the Regulation provides that:

1. Council must, as soon as practicable after entering into a contract worth $200,000 or more (exclusive of GST), publish relevant details of the contract on Council’s website.
2. The relevant details must be published under subsection (1) for a period of at least 12 months.
3. Also, if a person asks Council to give relevant details of a contract, Council must allow the person to inspect the relevant details at Council’s public office. ‘Relevant details’ is defined in Chapter 6, Part 4, section 227 as including:
4. the person with whom Council has entered into the contract
5. the value of the contract; and

c. the purpose of the contract (e.g. the particular goods or services to be supplied under the contract).

62. The contracts detailed in Attachment A represent contractual arrangements that Council has already entered into. The purpose of this report is not to consider making decisions about the contracts, rather for transparency of the decisions made on contracts entered into with a value greater than the threshold.

63. The Divisional Manager provided the following recommendation and the Committee agreed at the meeting of 17 October 2022.

64. **RECOMMENDATION:**

**THAT COUNCIL NOTES THE REPORT OF CONTRACTS ACCEPTED BY DELEGATES OF COUNCIL FOR AUGUST 2022, AS SET OUT IN ATTACHMENT A,** hereunder**.**

 **Attachment A**

|  **Report of Contracts Accepted by Delegates of Council for August 2022**  |
| --- |
| **Contract number/contract purpose/successful tenderer/comparative tender price/value for money (VFM) index achieved** | **Nature of arrangement/ estimate maximum expenditure** | **Unsuccessful tenderers/VFM achieved** | **Comparative tender price/s** | **Delegate/****approval date/start date/term** |
| **BRISBANE INFRASTRUCTURE** |
| **1. Contract No. 511751****PROVISION OF A VOLUNTEER MANAGEMENT SOLUTION****Rosterfy Pty Ltd – $267,600**Achieved VFM of 25.70 | Corporate Procurement Arrangement (CPA)Preferred Supplier ArrangementLump sum and schedule of rates**$295,000** | *Non-conforming offers*Better Impact Pty LtdVolunteer Centre of Western Australia (Inc.) | Not applicable(N/A)N/A | **Delegate**CPO**Approved**31.08.2022**Start**12.09.2022**Term**Initial term of three years with a maximum term of five years. |
| **2. Contract No. 511833****DESILTING THE KEITH BODEN WETLANDS SEDIMENT BASIN, WAVELL HEIGHTS****Desilting Solutions Pty Ltd – $293,949**Achieved the highest VFM of 28.50 | Lump sum**$293,949** | GCE Contractors Pty. Ltd.Achieved VFM of 14.24 | $497,000 | **Delegate**CPO**Approved**11.08.2022**Start**15.08.2022**Term**13 weeks |
| **3. Contract No. 511846****MICRO TUNNELLING DRAINAGE WORKS AT SEVENTEEN MILE ROCKS ROAD, SEVENTEEN MILE ROCKS****GCE Contractors Pty. Ltd. – $745,361** (Offer 2) Achieved the highest VFM of 10.8 | Lump sum**$745,361** | *Shortlisted offers not recommended*GCE Contractors Pty. Ltd. (Offer 1) Achieved VFM of 8.3Veolia Environmental Services (Australia) Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 7.9Bothar Boring and Tunnelling (Australia) Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 7.1 | $1,016,139$905,288$1,171,385 | **Delegate**CPO**Approved**25.08.2022**Start**31.08.2022**Term**22 weeks |
| **4. Contract No. 520545****SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF SAND FOR EAGLE FARM AND RIVERVIEW ASPHALT PLANTS****Kingscliff Sands Pty Ltd – $138,500\****\*VFM not calculated as only the successful tenderer was able to supply the required volumes.* | Schedule of rates**$200,000** | Pacific Silica Pty Ltd trading as Southern Pacific Sands Pty Ltd\* | $156,667 | **Delegate**EM**Approved**11.08.2022**Start**12.08.2022**Term**Six weeks |
| **5. Contract No. 533475****FERRY TERMINAL FLOOD RECOVERY 2022 – FLOOD RECOVERY PROGRAM MAKE GOOD – PACKAGE TWO****Fitzgerald Constructions Australia Pty Ltd – $3,930,447**Achieved VFM of 19.3 | Lump sum and cost-plus items**$3,930,447** | One offer received. | N/A | **Delegate**CEO**Approved**11.08.2022**Start**12.08.2022**Term**22 weeks |
| **6. Contract No. 533440****WADEVILLE STREET AND RITCHIE ROAD CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS – STAGE 1A (PALLARA)****Doval Constructions (QLD.) Ltd – $925,226\***Achieved the highest VFM of 9.1*\*Comparative tender price normalised for possible delay costs, overhead margins to potential variations and day work rates claimable by the contractor.* | Schedule of rates**$832,426** | HEH Civil Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 7.2 | $897,980\* | **Delegate**CPO**Approved**24.08.2022**Start**01.09.2022**Term**12 weeks |
| **CITY ADMINISTRATION AND GOVERNANCE** |
| **7. Contract No. 511656****PROVISION OF DISASTER AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AND SERVICES****Juvare Asia Pacific Limited – $274,500\***Achieved the highest VFM of 26.28*\*Comparative tender price includes flexible licensing and support model (i.e. only when Local Disaster Coordination Centre is stood up).* | CPA (Preferred Supplier Arrangement)Schedule of rates**$356,950** | *Shortlisted offers not recommended*Datalink Internet Systems Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 3.92QIT Plus Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 2.30*Offers not recommended*Swiftworks Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 2.32Noggin Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 2.26KPMGAchieved VFM of 0.45Empired Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 0.41*^Comparative tender price includes year-round licensing and support model.* | $1,317,500^$2,936,000^$1,912,500^$2,856,020^$10,470,144^$13,080,148^ | **Delegate**CPO**Approved**11.08.2022**Start**29.08.2022**Term**Initial term of three years with a maximum term of 15 years. |
| **CITY PLANNING AND SUSTAINABILITY** |
| Nil |  |  |  |  |
| **LIFESTYLE AND COMMUNITY SERVICES** |
| **8. Contract No. 511690****INTEGRATED CEMETERIES MANAGEMENT SOLUTION** **Plotbox Pty Limited – $1,425,153**Achieved the highest VFM of 3.8 | CPA (Preferred Supplier Arrangement)Lump sum and schedule of rates**$1,430,000** | *Shortlisted offer not recommended*OpusXenta Pty LimitedAchieved VFM of 2.9*Offer not recommended*Titan ICT Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 0.4 | $1,424,570$6,016,470 | **Delegate**CPO**Approved**03.08.2022**Start**08.08.2022**Term**Initial term of three years with a maximum term of seven years. |
| **ORGANISATIONAL SERVICES** |
| **9. Contract No. 511051****SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF TRUCKS****Class 220 and 340 – Up to 4.5 tonne GVM (Gross Vehicle Mass)***Preferred Supplier***Hino Motor Sales Australia Pty. Ltd. –**[Commercial-in-confidence](Automatic Transmission) *Alternate Suppliers***Optima Financial Services Pty. Ltd. as Trustee for Optima Trading Trust trading as Brisbane Isuzu –** [Commercial-in-confidence](Automated manual transmission)**Zupps Southside Pty. Ltd. trading as Daimler Trucks Brisbane –** [Commercial-in-confidence](Automated manual transmission)**Class 221 – 4.51 tonne to 6.5 tonne GVM***Preferred Supplier***Hino Motor Sales Australia Pty. Ltd. –** [Commercial-in-confidence](Automatic Transmission) *Alternate Suppliers***Optima Financial Services Pty. Ltd. as Trustee for Optima Trading Trust trading as Brisbane Isuzu –** [Commercial-in-confidence](Automated manual transmission)**Zupps Southside Pty. Ltd. trading as Daimler Trucks Brisbane –** [Commercial-in-confidence](Automated manual transmission)**Class 23 – 6.51 tonne to 8 tonne GVM***Preferred Supplier***Hino Motor Sales Australia Pty. Ltd. –** [Commercial-in-confidence](Automatic Transmission) *Alternate Supplier***Optima Financial Services Pty. Ltd. as Trustee for Optima Trading Trust trading as Brisbane Isuzu –** [Commercial-in-confidence](Automated manual transmission)**Class 24 – 8.01 tonne to 13 tonne GVM***Preferred Supplier***Optima Financial Services Pty. Ltd. as Trustee for Optima Trading Trust trading as Brisbane Isuzu –** [Commercial-in-confidence](Automatic transmission)*Alternate Supplier***Hino Motor Sales Australia Pty. Ltd. –** [Commercial-in-confidence](Automatic Transmission)**Class 25 – 13.01 tonne to 18 tonne GVM***Preferred Supplier***Optima Financial Services Pty. Ltd. as Trustee for Optima Trading Trust trading as Brisbane Isuzu –** [Commercial-in-confidence](Automatic transmission)*Alternate Supplier***Hino Motor Sales Australia Pty. Ltd. –** [Commercial-in-confidence](Automatic Transmission)**Class 270 – 18.01 tonne to 25 tonne GVM***Preferred Supplier***Optima Financial Services Pty. Ltd. as Trustee for Optima Trading Trust trading as Brisbane Isuzu –** [Commercial-in-confidence](Automatic transmission)*Alternate Supplier***Hino Motor Sales Australia Pty. Ltd. –** [Commercial-in-confidence](Automatic Transmission)**Class 275 – 25.01 tonne to 35 tonne GVM***Preferred Supplier***Optima Financial Services Pty. Ltd. as Trustee for Optima Trading Trust trading as Brisbane Isuzu –** [Commercial-in-confidence](Automatic transmission)*Alternate Supplier***Hino Motor Sales Australia Pty. Ltd. –** [Commercial-in-confidence](Automatic Transmission)**Hybrid****Hino Motor Sales Australia Pty. Ltd. –** [Commercial-in-confidence]Class 221 (4.51 tonne to 6.5 tonne) (Automated Manual Transmission)**Hino Motor Sales Australia Pty. Ltd. –** [Commercial-in-confidence]Class 23 (6.51 tonne to 9 tonne) (single cab) (Automated Manual Transmission)**Hino Motor Sales Australia Pty. Ltd. –** [Commercial-in-confidence]Class 23 (6.51 tonne to 9 tonne) (single cab, long wheelbase) (Automated Manual Transmission) | CPA (Preferred and Alternate Supplier Arrangements)Schedule of rates**$21,000,000** | **Class 220 and 340 – Up to 4.5 tonne GVM**No other offers received.**Class 221 – 4.51 tonne to 6.5 tonne GVM**No other offers received.**Class 23 – 6.51 tonne to 8 tonne GVM**Zupps Southside Pty. Ltd. trading as Daimler Trucks Brisbane (Manual transmission)**Class 24 – 8.01 tonne to 13 tonne GVM**Zupps Southside Pty. Ltd. trading as Daimler Trucks Brisbane (Automated manual transmission)**Class 25 – 13.01 tonne to 18 tonne GVM**Zupps Southside Pty. Ltd. trading as Daimler Trucks Brisbane (Automated manual transmission)**Class 270 – 18.01 tonne to 25 tonne GVM**Zupps Southside Pty. Ltd. trading as Daimler Trucks Brisbane (Automated manual transmission)**Class 275 – 25.01 tonne to 35 tonne GVM**Zupps Southside Pty. Ltd. trading as Daimler Trucks Brisbane (Automated manual transmission)**Hybrid**No other offers received.*\*Comparative price not calculated as no automatic transmission option was available and the purchase price of truck cab‑chassis in this class were uncompetitive.* | N/AN/A[Commercial-in-confidence]N/A\*N/A\*N/A\*N/A\*N/A | **Delegate**CEO**Approved**25.08.2022**Start**01.09.2022**Term**Three years |
| **TRANSPORT FOR BRISBANE** |
| Nil |  |  |  |  |

**ADOPTED**

#### D STORES BOARD SUBMISSION – SIGNIFICANT CONTRACTING PLAN FOR ICT PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

 **165/830/179/811**

**157/2022-23**

65. The Chief Executive Officer provided the information below.

66. The Chief Executive Officer and the Stores Board considered the submission, as set out in Attachment A, on 26 September 2022.

67. The submission is recommended to Council as it is considered the most advantageous outcome for the provision of the required services.

 Purpose

68. That the Stores Board recommends approval of the procurement strategy for:

Contract title: ICT Professional Services

Type of procurement: Orders placed under the Queensland Government ICT Services Pre‑qualified Supplier Arrangement ICTSS.1303 (ICTSS.1303)

Categories/portions:  Tranche 1: Program and Project

- Gated Assurance Services

Tranche 2: ICT Services

- Strategy and Architecture

- Business Change

- Solution Development and Implementation

- Service Management

- Procurement and Management Support

- Client Interfaces

Market engagement strategy: Exemption 4 of Council’s *SP103 Procurement Policy and Plan 2022‑23* to access a contract made by another government entity.

Contract duration: Up to three years

Price basis: Schedule of rates

 Background/business case

69. In alignment with the Corporate Plan, Information Services, Organisational Services, is in the delivery phase of multiple programs and related ICT investment that will improve the customer and employee experience across Council, by transforming and optimising service delivery and advancing automation and information management to inform good decision making. Such programs and projects include but are not limited to:

- the Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Digital Program

- the expansion and support of the Microsoft Dynamics Business Platform.

70. The initial phases of delivery for these programs are scheduled across the next three years. As a result, the ICT program of work is experiencing increasing demand for ICT professional services to support and augment Council’s project teams to allow delivery of initiatives in a timely manner.

71. Council has several existing Corporate Procurement Arrangements (CPAs) for the delivery of both generic and specialist ICT services, that will continue to be used. Council’s ability to be an agile organisation able to adapt, adjust and capitalise on opportunities, can be demonstrated through leveraging Queensland Government arrangements to:

- ensure access to the scope of services needed to support major ICT programs

- allow access to a larger pool of suppliers while the IT market is experiencing labour shortages, to ensure that appropriately skilled capacity and capability can be sourced in a timely manner

- improve procurement efficiency by reducing the time and effort to engage suppliers

- support Council’s procurement objectives such as the use of local suppliers, indigenous suppliers and social enterprises

- support contestability and value for money outcomes.

72. Established in 2013, ICTSS.1303 does not expire and is regularly refreshed, most recently in July 2022. The pre-qualified supplier panel is divided into two tranches and suppliers on the panel are arranged into seven categories based on their ability to deliver specific business outcomes. The industry-defined categories are built from the Skills Framework for the Information Age (SFIA) and include:

- Tranche A – Program and Project Gated Assurance Services

 - Program and project gated assurance

- Tranche B – ICT Services.

 - Strategy and architecture

- Business change

- Solution development and implementation

- Service management

- Procurement and management support

- Client Interfaces.

73. The ICT Services provided under ICTSS.1303 do not include contingent labour and Council has neither the capacity nor capability to deliver the services. The ICT Services provided under the arrangement require a clearly defined and measurable outcome based ICT service. The terms and conditions as well as the capacity and capability of the suppliers on the arrangement have been assessed and will meet Council’s operational needs.

 Policy and other considerations

74. Is there an existing arrangement for these goods/services/works?

 No

75. Could Council businesses provide the services/works?

 No. Council does not have the capability to provide these services.

76. What policy, or other issues, should the delegate be aware of?

This arrangement is exempt from tendering requirements in accordance with Exemption 4 of Council’s *SP103 Procurement Policy and Plan 2022-23*. The basis of this exemption is that the Queensland Government allows for entities such as Council to also procure services under ICTSS.1303.

77. The Queensland Government has engaged in an open tender process, applying appropriate principles and probity to assess supplier capacity and capability, as well as to identify local, indigenous and social enterprises.

78. The arrangement allows access to 530 pre-qualified suppliers including:

- 204 local (Brisbane-based) suppliers, 63 of which are small to medium enterprises (businesses with 20 to 200 employees)

- 53 Queensland-based suppliers

- nine indigenous suppliers (two of which are local)

- one local social enterprise.

79. Does this procurement exercise need to be managed under the PM2 Governance and Assurance Framework?

 No

80. Does the proposed contract involve leasing?

 No

 Exemption applicability and rationale

81. Exemption applicability:

| **Exemption 4 of SP103** | **Explanation, limitations, responsibilities and approvals** |
| --- | --- |
| A contract made with, or a purchase from a contract made by, another government entity, government-owned entity or Local Buy. | Where VFM outcomes can be obtained, this general exemption allows engagements with another government entity or government owned entity. For example:a. the Australian Government, the Queensland Government, or another local government; orb. an entity owned by the Australian Government, or the Queensland Government, or another local government.Contracts and arrangements established by another government entity, local authority or Local Buy have been sourced by reputable entities that apply appropriate principles and probity and can be expected to deliver reasonable VFM for Council. |

82. Rationale for this procurement meeting exemption applicability:

1. ICTSS.1303 allows easy access to a broad range of relevant quality ICT services and large number of suppliers.
2. The arrangement has pre-qualified all suppliers under the Government Information Technology Contracting GITC framework, establishing minimum standards, terms and conditions, reducing contracting risk and negotiation timeframes.
3. The resultant outcome-based contracts allow suppliers the flexibility to use the latest products and processes, and grant users the ability to nominate customer-specific commercial and contractual terms.
4. The use of this arrangement will avoid the duplication of significant effort, expenditure and impact to the market were Council to seek to establish a similar arrangement.

83. It is therefore considered that establishing the authority to order under ICTSS.1303 for the provision of ICT Professional Services, complies with the Sound Contracting Principles set out in section 103(3) of the *City of Brisbane Act 2010* and provides the most advantageous outcome for Council.

 Procurement strategy

84.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of contract: | ICT Professional Services |
| Type of procurement and how it will be operated: | Orders placed under the Queensland Government ICT Services Pre-qualified Supplier Arrangement ICTSS.1303 (ICTSS.1303).Quotes may be sought and orders placed by the Information Services project or business area seeking services. Quoting and ordering for outcomes-based contracts will be in accordance with Council’s *SP200 Sourcing and Disposal Procedures* and per the process detailed in the Contract User Pack. The maximum contract value allowable under the arrangement is capped at $5 million. Orders are subject to approval by an appropriately delegated Council officer, in accordance with Council’s post-market delegation limits for ordering under a CPA. |
| Process to be used: | Exemption 4 of Council’s *SP103 Policy and Plan 2022‑23* to access a contract made by another government entity. |
| Market engagement: | Exemption 4 of Council’s *SP103 Policy and Plan 2022‑23* to access a contract made by another government entity. |
| Contract standard to be used including any amendments: | GITC framework. Orders placed under ICTSS.1303 will be on the terms and conditions agreed between the Queensland Government and the supplier. |
| Contract duration: | Up to three years from date of approval. |
| Insurance requirements, Liability and Indemnity Caps: | Minimum insurance requirements:* Public Liability Insurance: as defined in each supplier’s Deed of Agreement. Minimum of $5 million.
* Professional Indemnity Insurance: as defined in each supplier’s Deed of Agreement.
* Workers’ Compensation Insurance: as required by law.

Liability caps:Liability under each Customer Contract established is capped in the aggregate at three times the monies paid by Council to the supplier under the Customer Contract. |
| Price basis:  | Schedule of rates |
| Price adjustment: | Not applicable |
| Liquidated damages: | Not applicable |
| Security for the contract: | Not applicable |
| Defects liability/warranty period: | Not applicable |
| Other strategy elements: | Council’s Contract User Pack, aligned to *SP200 Sourcing and Disposal Procedures*, details the requirements for meeting Council’s procurement objectives by ensuring preference for local, social and indigenous suppliers. The Contract User Pack describes the process for seeking quotes and approvals and placing orders. |
| Alternative strategies considered: | Council could seek to establish a similar but smaller panel arrangement for delivery of ICT Professional Services, focused only on local suppliers. Such a tender would likely attract approximately 200 submissions. This duplication of effort represents significant effort, expenditure and impact to the market. |

 Funding and budget considerations

85. Estimated [expenditure](file:///%5C%5Cad.bcc.qld.gov.au%5CGroups%5COLMCEO%5COCEO%5CCESGS%5C137%20GOVERN%5C520%20Meetings%5CE_C%20General%5CE%20%26amp%3B%20C%20Administration%5CE%26amp%3BC%202022%5CSubs%5CWord%20Copies%5C20221017%5C20221017_E%26amp%3BC_02%20-%20Stores%20Board%20Submission%20-%20Significant%20Contracting%20Plan%20for%20ICT%20Professional%20Services.DOCX#ScreenTip_Note):

Based on estimated resourcing, implementation and support requirements, it is anticipated that Council will place orders for an estimated expenditure of $90 million over the potential maximum term until 30 October 2025.

86. Sufficient approved budget to meet the total spend under this arrangement?

Establishing the authority to order under ICTSS.1303 will not commit Council to any purchases. Expenditure is only committed, and funding is only required when an appropriately delegated Council officer approves placing an order under ICTSS.1303.

87. Anticipated procurement benefits (if any):

Use of ICTSS.1303 will deliver procurement process efficiencies including:

- avoiding the need to seek individual exemptions each time a quoting process using the arrangement is required

- reduced tendering and contract development costs, reduced time to engage, and increased agility in project delivery.

88. Indicative program and supporting information:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Program: | Program 8 – City Governance  |
| Outcome: | 8.3 – Enabling and Enhancing Council  |
| Strategy: | 8.3.1 – Talented, Capable and Efficient Council  |
| Service: | 8.3.1.3 – Digital and Information Technology  |
| Operating/Projects: | As required |

 Procurement risk

89. Is this contract listed as a ‘critical contract’ requiring the contractor to have in place a Business Continuity Plan approved by Council?

No

90. Summary of key risks associated with this procurement:

There are no material risks associated with the use of ICTSS.1303.

91. The Chief Executive Officer provided the following recommendation and the Committee agreed at the meeting of 17 October 2022.

92. **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Stores Board recommends approval of the procurement strategy for:

Title of contract: ICT Professional Services

Type of procurement: Orders placed under the Queensland Government ICT Services Pre‑qualified Supplier Arrangement ICTSS.1303

Categories/portions: Tranche 1: Program and Project

Gated Assurance Services

 Tranche 2: ICT Services

Strategy and Architecture

Business Change

Solution Development and Implementation

Service Management

Procurement and Management Support

Client Interfaces

Market engagement: Exemption 4 of Council’s *SP103 Procurement Policy and Plan 2022‑23* to access a contract made by another government entity.

Contract duration: Up to three years

Price basis: Schedule of rates.

**ADOPTED**

Chair: Okay. Councillors, we now move on to the next item before us, which is E&C Committee Recess for Information Report.

LORD MAYOR, E&C Committee decisions made in recess.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair. Just finding the right spot. Here we go.

## NOTATION OF *DECISIONS* OF THE ESTABLISHMENT AND COORDINATION COMMITTEE AS DELEGATE OF COUNCIL:

### ESTABLISHMENT AND COORDINATION COMMITTEE (Information report)

The Right Honourable, the LORD MAYOR (Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER), Chair of the Establishment and Coordination Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Sarah HUTTON, that the report setting out the *decisions* of the Establishment and Coordination Committee as delegate of the Council during the Spring Recess 2022, on matters usually considered by that Committee, be noted.

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair. Before I deal with the item in front of us, I just wanted to point out that the BoM, the Bureau, issued a thunderstorm warning alert at 3.39pm and within minutes, our Severe Weather Alert system had started sending out messages to people. Councillors in this room started receiving those messages literally two minutes later. Mine was delayed somewhat. It came five minutes later, but the reality is, this just goes to show in action today with a notice that had been set up at 3.39, people are already receiving messages immediately.

It proves what I’ve been saying, which is our system is a good system. It’s working, as opposed to the Emergency Alert system, which, in a best case scenario, would take six hours for the whole of Brisbane to receive a message. So, once again, an example of why people should be signing up for the Brisbane Severe Weather Alerts, if they’re not already, because it provides very quick notification of any weather alerts, flood warnings and other related messages.

Item A in front of us, the significant contracting plan for the provision of information technology services, management solution and services. The sole item in this information report is this SCP. This refers to activities including management of incidents, requests for technical support, knowledge and configuration management and reporting that supports continuous improvement. Council deployed BMC’s IT service management solution, known as Remedy On Demand, back in 2014. BMC Remedy was recently upgraded to the latest version that is known as Helix.

BMC is the proprietary owner of the Helix software. The Helix solution is critical for the effective operation and management of Council software, hardware and technology infrastructure. In addition, Helix is used as a service management tool for human resources, procurement and payroll functions as well. While BMC has a network of resellers who can supply solutions and support, the benefits of dealing directly with the original equipment manufacturer include consistency in product, service and quality, as well as lowering licencing costs, effectively cutting out the middle person.

With Council’s existing contract expiring in December 2022, renegotiation presented an opportunity to refresh Council’s contract with the result being a number of favourable outcomes for Council. So, we recommend the supporting of this SCP or we recommend the noting of this SCP. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you.

Any further debate?

Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: This item is only for noting or for information purposes. The decision’s already been made by the Establishment and Coordination Committee, the same Committee in Council—Civic Cabinet that decided to sack Council’s in-house IT workforce, outsource that to HCL and then watch that company engage in a whole lot of wage theft. It wasn’t until The Services Union stepped in to rectify that work—this is also the same Civic Cabinet that decided to engage in a contracting out exercise with Tech One which ultimately cost the ratepayers of Brisbane tens of millions of dollars and then delivered nothing, so we just really don’t have any faith in this Administration’s ability to manage these projects, given the amount of hollowing out they’ve done in terms of Council’s own capability in IT.

Chair: Thank you.

Any further debate?

Councillor CUNNINGHAM.

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: Thanks, Mr Chair. I rise just to speak very briefly on the significant contracting plan for the provision of information technology service management solution services. As the LORD MAYOR said, Council deployed BMC’s IT service management solution in 2014. The Helix solution, as it now is known, enables the management and automation of IT service management processes, leveraging best practice workflows for service delivery and adopting a process approach that focuses on the customer needs and the services, rather than the systems.

The renegotiation of this, Mr Chair, has achieved a number of better outcomes for Council and as a result, for our ratepayers and residents. These include access to new functionality that improve user experiences, a flexible licencing model and access to Brisbane-based training services. There’s also been a number of cost efficiencies achieved through this process and I will commend it to the Chamber.

Chair: Thank you.

Any further debate? LORD MAYOR?

Now I will put this motion for the vote.

Upon being submitted to the Chamber, the motion was declared **carried** on the voices.

The report read as follows⎯

#### A STORES BOARD SUBMISSION – SIGNIFICANT CONTRACTING PLAN FOR THE PROVISION OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SERVICE MANAGEMENT SOLUTION AND SERVICES

**165/210/179/4442**

**158/2022-23**

1. The Chief Executive Officer provided the information below.

2. The Chief Executive Officer and the Stores Board considered the submission, as set out in Attachment A (submitted on file), on 12 September 2022.

3. The submission is recommended to E&C, as delegate of Council during recess, as it is considered the most advantageous outcome for the provision of the required services.

4. Commercial-in-Confidence details have been removed from this report, highlighted in yellow and replaced with the word [Commercial-in-Confidence].

 Purpose

5. That the Stores Board recommends approval of the procurement strategy for:

Contract title: Provision of Information Technology Service Management (ITSM) Solution and Services

Type of procurement: Directly entering into a contract to establish a Corporate Procurement Arrangement (CPA) in the form of a Preferred Supplier Arrangement (PSA)

Categories/portions: Not applicable

Market engagement strategy: Exemption 15 of Council’s *SP103 Procurement Policy and Plan 2022-23* (SP103) which allows for exemption from tendering where the marketplace is restricted by statement of licence or third‑party ownership of an asset (excluding public utility plant (PUP))

Contractor name: BMC Software (Australia) Pty Ltd (BCM)

Contract duration: An initial term of three years with options to extend for additional periods of up to five years, for a maximum term of eight years

Price basis: Schedule of rates.

 Background/business case

6. In July 2014, on completion of a Request for Proposal (RFP) process, the ICT Procurement Board approved entering into CPA 510052 in the form of a PSA with BMC for the provision of the Remedy on Demand ITSM solution for a maximum term of seven years. The ITSM was recently upgraded to the latest version, known as Helix. In 2021 the contract was extended for an additional year and is due to expire in December 2022.

7. On 7 December 2020, the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) (through the Stores Board) approved a pre‑market submission for the refresh or replacement of Council’s ITSM solution through an open market RFP. The tender process was undertaken but ultimately terminated prior to completion in October 2021 due to a lack of sufficient funding and emergent enterprise-wide transformation business requirements that were not included in the tender scope. The tender termination was supported by the Chief Procurement Officer and approved by the CEO (through the Stores Board).

8. At the time of the tender termination, the alternative strategy considered was to continue the support and maintenance of the existing ITSM product while approaching the expansion of functionality and enhancements to improve customer experience in alignment with a holistic enterprise approach.

9. The Helix ITSM tool is a software-as-a-service solution that enables the management and automation of IT service management processes. A key feature is that it is modelled around the IT Infrastructure Library (ITIL). ITIL is a set of industry standard concepts and policies for managing IT infrastructure, development and operations. The Helix ITSM tool leverages the latest version, ITIL 4, ensuring best practice workflows for service delivery, adopting a process approach that focuses on customer needs and services rather than systems, and emphasising continual improvement.

10. Information Services branch (ISB) uses ITSM in support of customer experience and service quality, providing ITSM activities through the ISB service desk including management of incidents, requests for technical support, changes, service levels, knowledge and configuration management, and reporting that allows for continuous improvement.

11. Current volumes of IT support requests across Council are significant, with the ITSM solution being critical for the effective operation of Council’s software, hardware and technology infrastructure. In addition, the current ITSM solution is used as a service management tool for Council’s human resource, procurement and payroll functions.

12. With Council’s existing contract expiring in December 2022, renegotiation presented an opportunity to refresh Council’s contract. Key negotiation outcomes are summarised in section 6.3.

 Policy and other considerations

13. Is there an existing arrangement for these goods/services/works?

Yes, CPA 510052 for provision of an ITSM Solution which expires on 30 December 2022.

14. Could Council businesses provide the services/works?

No. Council does not have the capability to provide these goods/services.

15. What policy, or other issues, should the delegate be aware of?

Nil

16. Does this procurement exercise need to be managed under the PM2 Governance and Assurance Framework?

No

17. Does the proposed contract involve leasing?

No

 Exemption applicability and rationale

18. Exemption applicability:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Exemption 15 from SP103** | **Explanation, limitations, responsibilities and approvals** |
| Marketplace is restricted by statement of licence or third‑party ownership of an asset (excluding PUP). | This exemption applies if the goods, services or works can only be supplied by a single supplier or a restricted group due to a statement of licence or third-party ownership of an asset.This exemption applies where there is technical alignment with existing infrastructure or existing enterprise platforms are established and continue to meet the organisation’s needs, as well as deliver continuous high quality of service.Where possible, competitive quotes are to be obtained in line with the requirements of section B.3.4 of SP103. |

19. Rationale for this procurement meeting exemption applicability:

(a) Council requires the ongoing provision of an ITSM solution.

(b) BMC is the proprietary owner of the Helix ITSM software. While BMC has a network of resellers who can supply solutions and support, the benefits of dealing directly with the original equipment manufacturer include consistency in product and service quality and lower licensing costs.

(c) Remedy on Demand was implemented in 2014, configured to meet Council’s requirements and upgraded recently to the Helix version to expand functionality and licensing. Council is satisfied with the performance of both the supplier and the solution. The supplier is responsive to Council’s needs, providing consistent support and meeting key performance indicators.

(d) The Gartner 2021 “Magic Quadrant for IT Service Management Tools” evaluated 11 vendors and identified two vendors as market leaders for delivery of ITSM software. These vendors, BMC (Helix ITSM tool) and ServiceNow (ServiceNow ITSM tool) have the greatest level of market share and global customer support capability. Both solutions provide tailored, robust functionality suitable for complex organisations, such as government agencies, health departments and large private organisations.

(e) Indicative pricing for the ServiceNow subscription licensing (a similar sized enterprise solution) is approximately [Commercial-in-confidence] per annum in comparison to [Commercial-in-confidence] per annum for BMC’s product, indicating that negotiations have achieved a value for money outcome.

20. It is therefore considered that entering into a contract with BMC for the provision of ITSM Solution and Services in a way which complies with the Sound Contracting Principles set out in section 103(3) of the *City of Brisbane Act 2010* provides the most advantageous outcome for Council.

 Contract proposed

21.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Legal name, and registered address of recommended supplier and ABN and ACN: | BMC Software (Australia) Pty Ltd Level 13, 383 Kent Street Sydney, NSW 2000 ABN: 12 007 280 088 ACN: 007 280 088 Company has a relevant local office? No  |
| Type of procurement: | Establishing a CPA in the form of a PSA.  |
| If establishing a new CPA, how will it be operated? | Contract management will be undertaken by the ICT Service Operations Manager, ISB, Organisational Services (OS). Orders for additional services or licensing may be approved by an appropriately delegated Council officer, subject to approved funding availability. Contract administration will be overseen by the Category Manager, Strategic Procurement Office (SPO), OS.  |
| Contract standard to be used: | Queensland Information Technology Contracting (QITC) Framework – Comprehensive Contract Conditions.  |
| Amendments to standards: | Nil |
| All non-compliances with contract conditions and specifications resolved? | Yes |
| Insurance requirements | Public and product liability of $20 million, professional indemnity of $10 million and workers compensation insurance as per legislated requirements.  |
| Is liability and indemnity of the contractor to be to be capped? | Yes. Liability is capped at $1,000,000 per occurrence and in the aggregate for all occurrences to a total of $2,000,000.  |
| Has the proposed contractor(s) signed the contract to formalise their offer? | Yes |
| Anticipated date of signing of contract variation by Council: | 14 October 2022  |
| Commencement date of services: | 17 October 2022  |
| Term/period of contract: | An initial term of three years with options to extend for additional periods of up to five years, for a maximum term of eight years.  |
| Price basis: | Schedule of rates |
| Variation for rise and fall in cost: | Prices will be fixed for the duration of the initial term of the contract. Price reviews for optional extension periods will be subject to negotiation.  |
| Security for the contract: | Not applicable |
| Defects liability period/warranty period? | Not applicable |
| Liquidated damages: | Nil |
| Software component? | Yes. Subscription licensing is provided on a per user per month basis.  |
| Records Manager (RM) document reference number(s) for the finalised contract:  | CD22/7695  |
| Contract preparation: | ICT Sourcing Specialist, Information Services (ISB), OS  |

 Funding and budget considerations

22. Estimated expenditure:

Based on historical activity levels and anticipated capability expansion requirements, estimated expenditure is $12.4 million over the potential maximum eight-year term. This comprises the following services and accommodates for growth of solution licensing and additional optional services on a schedule of rates basis:

- Subscription licensing and storage services: $9.4 million

- Ad hoc professional services: $3 million.

23. Sufficient approved budget to meet the total spend under this CPA?

Establishing the CPA will not commit Council to any purchases. Funding is only required when an appropriately delegated Council officer approves placing orders under the CPA. The minimum estimated commitment over the initial term of three years is $3.8 million.

24. Anticipated procurement benefits (if any):

Negotiation achieved the following outcomes:

- access to new functionality including expanded self-service capability that will improve the customer experience and subsequently allow for better cost management

- a flexible licensing model and improved scalability through use of modern cloud technologies

- access to global knowledge and information forums

- access to Brisbane-based training services.

- cost avoidance of $4 million has been achieved in the negotiations.

- the cost avoidance associated with the ICT project required to support transition between suppliers and solutions, organisational change management and user training.

25. Indicative program and supporting information:

Program: Program 8 – City Governance

Outcome: 8.3 Enabling and Enhancing Council

Strategy: 8.3.1 Talented, Capable and Efficient Council

Service: 8.3.1.3 Digital and Information Technology

Projects: Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Digital Program

 Procurement risk

26. Is this contract listed as a ‘critical contract’ requiring the contractor to have in place a Business Continuity Plan approved by Council?

Yes

27. Summary of key risks associated with this procurement:

There are no material risks are associated with this contract.

28. The Chief Executive Officer provided the following recommendation and the Committee agreed at the meeting of 10 October 2022.

29. **DECISION:**

That the Stores Board recommends approval of the procurement strategy for:

Contract title: Provision of Information Technology Service Management Solution and Services

Type of procurement: Directly entering into a contract to establish a Corporate Procurement Arrangement in the form of a Preferred Supplier Arrangement.

Categories/portions: Not applicable

Market engagement strategy: Exemption 15 of Councils *SP103 Procurement Policy and Plan 2022-23* which allows for exemption from tendering where the marketplace is restricted by statement of licence or third-party ownership of an asset (excluding PUP).

Contractor name: BMC Software (Australia) Pty Ltd

Contract duration: An initial term of three years with options to extend for additional periods of up to five years, for a maximum term of eight years.

Price basis: Schedule of rates

Person to manage: Chief Information Officer, Information Services, Organisational Services

Extension authority: Chief Procurement Officer, Strategic Procurement Office, Organisational Services

**NOTED**

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

## NOTATION OF *DECISIONS* OF THE ESTABLISHMENT AND COORDINATION COMMITTEE AS DELEGATE OF COUNCIL:

### CITY PLANNING AND SUBURBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE

Councillor Adam ALLAN, Civic Cabinet Chair of the City Planning and Suburban Renewal Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Sarah HUTTON, that the report setting out the *decisions* of the Establishment and Coordination Committee as delegate of the Council during the Spring Recess 2022, on matters usually considered by the City Planning and Suburban Renewal Committee, be noted.

Chair: Councillor ALLAN.

Councillor ALLAN: Thank you, Mr Chair. There was one item considered during recess. Item 8 is a petition requesting Council block any planned demolition of Monaise at 299 Bowen Terrace, New Farm and identify the building as local heritage. The property at 299 Bowen Terrace is zoned medium density residential and is included in the medium density living precinct in the New Farm and Teneriffe Hill neighbourhood plan. Council takes the significance of heritage buildings and houses very seriously. As such, Council’s strategic planning team reviewed the nominations for local heritage place listing and assessed the cultural heritage significance of the building against the criteria for cultural heritage significance as outlined in the heritage planning scheme policy within Brisbane City Plan 2014.

As a result of this assessment, the building did not satisfy the criteria for listing as a local heritage place. Specifically the building did not have any special association to a person or social or community group and due to early changes to the building’s intactness, the style of the residence is neither a rare nor distinct example of its type when assessed against the criteria. Finally, it is noted that there are other interwar flats that are identified and protected in City Plan’s Heritage overlay that satisfy the criteria and represent the story of the emergence of this style of multiple dwellings in inner Brisbane, especially in New Farm.

I can also confirm that a private certifier issued a building approval to demolish the building on 17 June 2021 and a subsequent approval extended the approval period for the demolition until 30 November 2022. A development application for multiple dwellings at 299 Bowen Terrace was also received by Council on 13 December 2021. I have been advised that the development application was approved by Council on 29 September 2022 after being assessed by Council’s Development Services team against the requirements. Council’s delegate took all assessment matters into account including the issues raised by submitters and concluded that the application was in accordance with the requirements of City Plan. On this particular item, I’ll leave further debate to the Chamber.

But I did want to take the opportunity to provide a quick update on some of the statistics that are being generated out of Development Services. It would be fair to say that in the context of high-level development applications our volumes are off a little bit compared to the previous two years. We have seen a slight deterioration in application volumes. But nonetheless, during July we approved 309 development applications followed by 366 in August and then 376 in December. I’ll leave further debate to the Chamber.

Chair: Is there any further debate? No further debate?

We move to the vote on this.

Upon being submitted to the Chamber, the motion was declared **carried** on the voices.

The report read as follows⎯

#### A PETITION – REQUESTING COUNCIL BLOCK ANY PLANNED DEMOLITION OF MONAISE, 299 BOWEN TERRACE, NEW FARM, AND IDENTIFY THE BUILDING AS A LOCAL HERITAGE PLACE

 **137/220/594/146**

**159/2022-23**

1. A petition requesting that Council block any planned demolition of *Monaise*, 299 Bowen Terrace, New Farm, and identify the building as a Local heritage place, was received during the Spring Recess 2022.

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

3. The petition contains 51 signatures.

4. The petitioners request formal recognition of the building and site as a Local heritage place and advise that the listing would not only protect *Monaise* but also ensure continued protection of the adjoining Local heritage places, *Hampton Court* and *Edgecliffe Court*. A number of nominations proposing heritage listing of the building were received following advice to building tenants of its proposed demolition.

5. The site at 299 Bowen Terrace is zoned Medium density residential and is included in the Medium density living precinct in the New Farm and Teneriffe Hill neighbourhood plan. The site is included in the area adjoining heritage sub-category in the Heritage overlay as it adjoins two Local heritage places.

6. A private certifier issued a building approval to demolish the building on 17 June 2021 and a subsequent approval extended the approval period for the demolition until 30 November 2022. A development application for multiple dwellings at 299 Bowen Terrace was received by Council on 13 December 2021 and is now in the decision phase under the *Planning Act 2016*.

7. Council’s City Architecture and Heritage team has reviewed the nominations for Local heritage place listing and assessed the cultural heritage significance of the building against the criteria for cultural heritage significance as outlined in the heritage planning scheme policy within *Brisbane City Plan 2014* (City Plan).The building did not satisfy the criteria for listing as a Local heritage place.

8. As a 1920s timber flats/guest house, the building does not have special association to a person or particular social or community group. Due to early changes to the building’s intactness, the style of the residence is neither a rare nor distinctive example of its type when assessed against the criteria. There is no evidence of historical or scientific values. In addition, there are currently several interwar flats identified and protected in City Plan’s Heritage overlay that satisfy the criteria and represent the story of the emergence of this style of multiple dwellings in inner Brisbane, especially New Farm.

Consultation

9. Councillor Vicki Howard, Councillor for Central Ward, has been consulted and supports the recommendation.

Customer impact

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

11. The Divisional Manager recommended as follows and the Committee agreed at its meeting held on 26 September 2022.

12. **DECISION:**

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

**Attachment A**

**Draft Response**

**Petition Reference:** 137/220/594/146

Thank you for your petition requesting that Council block any planned demolition of *Monaise*, 299 Bowen Terrace, New Farm, and to identify the building as a Local heritage place.

Council’s City Architecture and Heritage team has assessed the cultural heritage significance of the building against the criteria for cultural heritage significance outlined in the Heritage Planning Scheme Policy within *Brisbane City Plan 2014* (City Plan)*.* The building did not satisfy the criteria for listing as a Local heritage place.

As a 1920s timber flats/guest house, the building does not have special association to a person or particular social or community group. Due to early changes to the building’s intactness, the style of the residence is neither a rare nor distinctive example of its type when assessed against the criteria. There is no evidence of historical or scientific values. In addition, there are currently several interwar flats identified and protected in City Plan’s Heritage overlay that satisfy the criteria and represent the story of the emergence of this style of multiple dwellings in inner Brisbane, especially New Farm.

Council can confirm that an application to redevelop 299 Bowen Terrace was received by Council on 13 December 2021 and is now in the decision phase under the *Planning Act 2016*. A private certifier lawfully issued a building approval to demolish the building on 17 June 2021 and a subsequent approval extended the approval period for the demolition until 30 November 2022.

Council appreciates the time you have taken in preparing your petition and would like to thank you for your interest in protecting Brisbane’s heritage.

Please let the other petitioners know of this information.

Should you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact Dr Ross Mahoney, Senior Historian, City Architecture and Heritage Team, City Planning and Economic Development, City Planning and Sustainability, on (07) 3178 8021.

Thank you for contacting Council regarding this matter.

**NOTED**

Chair: Councillor HOWARD, Community, Arts and Nighttime Economy Committee decisions please.

### COMMUNITY, ARTS AND NIGHTTIME ECONOMY COMMITTEE

Councillor Vicki HOWARD, Civic Cabinet Chair of the Community, Arts and Nighttime Economy Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Sandy LANDERS, that the report setting out the *decisions* of the Establishment and Coordination Committee as delegate of Council during the Spring Recess 2022, on matters usually considered by the Community, Arts and Nighttime Economy Committee, be noted.

Chair: Councillor HOWARD.

Councillor HOWARD: Thank you, Mr Chair. There was one item that was considered which was a petition 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. Council is committed to ensuring Annerley Library remains the vibrant facility for the community and a regular maintenance program for the library is in place. Any additional maintenance works are undertaken as required to ensure the library remains a welcoming, safe and comfortable facility. Council will continue to explore further enhancement opportunities for Annerley Hall to ensure the facility is a modern, functional facility for the community to utilise.

In terms of the Village Precinct Project, we are looking at—considering that as part of a future development of the Village Precinct Project and program budget. Council’s budget for the Village Precinct Project delivery has been allocated in full for the 2020-2024 program. So that information has been forwarded to the petitioners. I’ll leave debate to the Chamber.

Chair: Is there any debate?

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, I rise to speak on item A. It just shows how mean-spirited the LNP Administration is, that they secretly decided on this petition during the recess. They actually released the response a couple of weeks ago publicly, prior to it even coming for debate in this place. They don’t care about this place as the governance and accountability place for the City of Brisbane. They made a decision. They don’t care what the local Councillors who represent this area think. Neither of us supported this petition response. They just released it prior to it coming here. So it just shows you how much disregard that the LNP Administration has for the people of Annerley. It’s really, really sad to see.

Annerley Library by any measure is out of date for its purpose. It is too small, way too small. There is no place or space in that library for any kind of event. You’ve literally got to move bookshelves out of the way so that you can have the Gold Star program in there. It is way, way, way, way too small. This is for one of the biggest suburbs in Brisbane. There’s 5,600 households in Brisbane. You know, Fairfield Library is down the road—yes it’s a big suburb, a very big suburb—Fairfield Library down the road also doesn’t have function space. Then just up the road in West End, they don’t even have a toilet. So the three closest libraries to here, they’re all too small. None of them are getting any investment from Council. They’re ignoring the needs of a very large part of the southern suburbs of Brisbane.

The toilet is Third World standard. It’s not because the library staff don’t do their best. It is because the facility is ancient and the toilet is not fit‑for‑purpose anymore. This has been raised—I’m not the Councillor in this area any longer—but when I was it got raised all the time. I know that it is an issue that comes up with Councillor GRIFFITHS as well. So it is just very sad to see the LNP Administration secretly, behind closed doors, making a decision that says to the people of Annerley, yes, no we’re not going to do anything for your library. We think it’s a vibrant facility. It’s vibrant because of the people who work in there. But it’s definitely not a vibrant or suitable space for the work that they do. That is where this Administration is letting the people of Annerley down.

The other issue of course is the hall. Well, good for you Councillor HOWARD, it’s had a lick of paint. That’s just excellent. Thank you so much for that. We know however, when it comes to the Village Precinct Projects—now I think it’s about five years ago they started. They were announced in the budget to replace the SCIPs (Suburban Centre Improvement Projects) but only the LNP Councillors knew that they were being announced in the budget. So LNP projects got funded. I think maybe one in Inala got funded as well. So I did a petition straight away because Annerley Junction is desperate—desperate for a Village Precinct Project—or as a SCIP as it was then. It has been in my local budget submission for 14 years, every year since I’ve been a Councillor.

It has been four years since the petition was considered in this place and the Annerley Village Precinct Project was added to the capital works list. Are we actually seeing any action from this Council at all? None. Councillor GRIFFITHS got a couple hundred metres of footpath through Annerley Junction. But the side of the road I represent still got the same old uneven dangerous footpath. Meanwhile, Council wants to put more buses into a spot—actually it’s fascinating because when the bus people did finally come out and talk to me, they basically talked about how Annerley Junction was going to be getting all these extra buses from the improved frequency of the 100—and I think the 124 and the 125 from memory⎯and some others. They went on to talk about how they were upgrading all the platforms at the Cultural Centre and other places to increase their capacity.

I said, oh well what are you doing in the suburban places like Annerley Junction to upgrade the footpaths so that you’ve got a safe place for buses to pull up? What do you mean Councillor? I’m like, we’ll you’re going to be putting in dozens more buses a day down Ipswich Road, so how are you improving the bus infrastructure where all these buses are going to pull up? Oh, that’s not part of the scope of the project Councillor. I’m like, this is what this Administration doesn’t get. This environment in Annerley is a hugely busy one. It carries through traffic. It carries local traffic. We need our community facilities to be upgraded. It is just so disappointing that the usual response by the LNP is too bad, so sad. We’re not going to do it.

There’s no investment in the future of village precincts projects in this area. I think that in recognition of what Council says it wants to do with its own bus network review, investing in a village precinct project here to support the intensified bus interchange for Annerley that’s going to happen at this site for the 100 route⎯and by interchange I mean there’s going to be about six or eight different routes coming through here⎯it would be great to see some sort of investment into the community facilities. The fact that this Council can’t see that that is needed in a suburb that is divided by one of the most dangerous roads in Brisbane is really disappointing. So this is a do-nothing response by this Administration.

I know that Councillor GRIFFITHS feels the same way about this. You know, 650 residents signed this petition. I can tell you every single day they are asking for improvements in Annerley and every single day Councillor GRIFFITHS and I have to say to them, the LORD MAYOR refuses to fund works in Annerley. It is so disappointing to see everywhere else in Brisbane—I recently was over in Ashgrove and the shiny footpaths up in Ashgrove as part of their village was just astonishing. You walk into Annerley and it looks like it’s from a Third World country. We don’t have decent toilets for the library. The library doesn’t even have any kind of meeting space. The footpaths look like they’re 50, 60 years old, which they probably are. So, it’s just so disappointing to see this Administration—

Councillor TOOMEY: Point of order, Mr Chair.

Chair: Point of order to you Councillor TOOMEY.

Councillor TOOMEY: Just to correct Councillor JOHNSTON: the concrete footpaths in Ashgrove are red. That’s not shiny.

Chair: That’s not a point of order Councillor TOOMEY.

Sorry. Go on, please.

Councillor JOHNSTON: I’m pretty sure Councillor HOWARD will want to jump up and say how disrespectful Councillor TOOMEY is going to be. I’ll just see if she wants to do that.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor TOOMEY, please, come on.

Councillor JOHNSTON: No? Nothing from Councillor HOWARD about how disrespectful Councillor TOOMEY is?

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON please. I’ve given you the floor.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Just checking. I mean I know Councillor HOWARD has made a big deal about it today.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON are you going to continue to debate or not?

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: I do. I do, don’t I? Councillor HOWARD says that I interrupt people but when the LNP do it it’s perfectly acceptable. So look I will finish here. It is just unacceptable that Council will do nothing in this part of Annerley. A lick of paint on the hall is really not good enough for a community that has been neglected for 14 years that I’ve represented it and longer for Councillor GRIFFITHS. It is time that this LORD MAYOR goes. He does not represent the views of all the people of Brisbane. He certainly does not represent and support the views of Annerley residents. Council’s appalling response to this petition today demonstrates that the LNP have forgotten the people of Annerley. I think it’s to the great shame that they are failing to invest in just fundamental improvements to community life in this grand, historic suburb of Brisbane.

Chair: Further debate? No further debate?

Councillor HOWARD, summing up.

Councillor HOWARD: Thank you, Mr Chair. Well both Councillors JOHNSTON and GRIFFITHS are well aware of the significance of the Annerley Library as a local heritage place, as recognised by the *Brisbane City Plan 2014* and included within the Heritage overlay. Designed in 1956, it is the only remaining functional purpose-built library and landscape setting designed by the distinguished Brisbane City Council architect, James Birrell. We remain dedicated to ensuring the ongoing protection of Annerley Library as an important part of Brisbane’s heritage. Just to be clear, Mr Chair, Labor’s policy is to demolish libraries. Our policy is to build and protect libraries.

Chair: Thank you Councillor HOWARD.

We now move to the vote on this report.

Upon being submitted to the Chamber, the motion was declared **carried** on the voices.

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

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 18 - The Right Honourable, the LORD MAYOR, Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER, and Councillors Adam ALLAN, Greg ADERMANN, Lisa ATWOOD, Fiona CUNNINGHAM, Tracy DAVIS, Fiona HAMMOND, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Sarah HUTTON, Sandy LANDERS, James MACKAY, Peter MATIC, Kim MARX, David McLACHLAN, Ryan MURPHY, Steven TOOMEY and Andrew WINES.

NOES: 5 - The Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Jared CASSIDY, and Councillors Peter CUMMING, Charles STRUNK, Nicole JOHNSTON and Jonathan SRIRANGANATHAN.

The report read as follows⎯

#### A PETITIONS – 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

 **137/220/594/78 and 137/220/594/84**

**160/2022-23**

1. Two petitions 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, was presented to the meeting of Council held on 22 March 2022, by Councillor Nicole Johnston, and received.

2. The Divisional Manager, Lifestyle and Community Services, provided the following information.

3. The petitions contain a total of 647 signatures.

4. Council is committed to ensuring Annerley Library remains a vibrant facility for the community. A regular maintenance program for the library is in place. Any additional maintenance works are undertaken as required to ensure the library remains a welcoming, safe and comfortable facility.

5. Annerley Library is recognised within the *Brisbane City Plan 2014* as a local heritage place and included within the heritage overlay. Designed in 1956, it is the only remaining, functional, purpose-built library and landscape setting designed by the distinguished Brisbane City Council architect James Birrell. Council remains dedicated to ensuring the ongoing protection of Annerley Library as an important part of Brisbane’s heritage.

6. The Annerley Hall internal and external paint refresh was completed in May 2021. In March 2022, further refurbishment works commenced at the hall, including the removal of some internal walls within the main hall and the conversion of several smaller rooms to larger, more welcoming and user-friendly rooms. From 20 April 2022, the hall was reopened and available for hire following the completion of these works. In addition, new vinyl flooring is scheduled to be installed in the coming months as part of Council’s regular maintenance program.

7. Council will continue to explore future enhancement opportunities for Annerley Hall to ensure the facility is a modern, functional facility for the community to utilise.

8. Regarding the request to undertake a Village Precinct Project to revitalise the Annerley Junction shopping precinct, allocation of funds for project investigation, potentially including site surveys, utilities mapping and initial high-level concept designs and costings, may be considered as part of the development of a future Village Precinct Projects program budget. Council’s budget for Village Precinct Project delivery has been allocated in full for the 2020‑24 program.

Consultation

9. Councillor Nicole Johnston, Councillor for Tennyson Ward, has been consulted and does not support the recommendation.

10. Councillor Steve Griffiths, Councillor for Moorooka Ward, has been consulted and does not support the recommendation.

Customer impact

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

12. The Divisional Manager recommended as follows and the Committee agreed at its meeting held on 26 September 2022.

13. **DECISION:**

 **THAT THE INFORMATION IN THIS SUBMISSION BE NOTED AND THE DRAFT RESPONSE, AS SET IN ATTACHMENT A,** hereunder**, BE SENT TO THE HEAD PETITIONER.**

**Attachment A**

**Draft Response**

**Petition References:** 137/220/594/78 and 137/220/594/84

Thank you for your petitions 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.

Council is committed to ensuring Annerley Library remains a vibrant facility for the community. A regular maintenance program for the library is in place. Any additional maintenance works are undertaken as required to ensure the library remains a welcoming, safe and comfortable facility.

Annerley Library is recognised within the *Brisbane City Plan 2014* as a local heritage place and included within the heritage overlay. Designed in 1956, it is the only remaining, functional, purpose-built library and landscape setting designed by the distinguished Brisbane City Council architect James Birrell. Council remains dedicated to ensuring the ongoing protection of Annerley Library as an important part of Brisbane’s heritage.

The Annerley Hall internal and external paint refresh was completed in May 2021. In March 2022, further refurbishment works commenced at the hall, including the removal of some internal walls within the main hall and the conversion of several smaller rooms to larger, more welcoming and user-friendly rooms. From 20 April 2022, the hall was reopened and available for hire following the completion of these works. In addition, new vinyl flooring is scheduled to be installed in the coming months as part of Council’s regular maintenance program.

Council will continue to explore future enhancement opportunities for Annerley Hall to ensure the facility is a modern, functional facility for the community to utilise.

Regarding the request to undertake a Village Precinct Project to revitalise the Annerley Junction shopping precinct, allocation of funds for project investigation, potentially including site surveys, utilities mapping and initial high-level concept designs and costings, may be considered as part of the development of a future Village Precinct Projects program budget. Council’s budget for Village Precinct Project delivery has been allocated in full for the 2020‑24 program.

Please let the other petitioners know of this information.

If you have any further questions regarding the request to:

- upgrade Annerley Library, please contact Ms Nina Sprake, Manager, Library Services, Lifestyle and Community Services, on (07) 3403 4127

- undertake a Village Precinct Project for Annerley Junction shopping precinct, please contact Mr Omar Barragan, Design Brisbane Manager, City Planning and Economic Development, City Planning and Sustainability, on (07) 3178 0588

- revitalise Annerley Hall, please contact Mr Neville Wilmott, City and Community Hall Manager, Community Facilities, Lifestyle and Community Services, on (07) 3178 5807.

Thank you for raising this matter.

**NOTED**

Chair: Councillors please return to your seats.

Councillors I draw to your attention the Notice of Motion at item 8 on the agenda.

Councillor HUTTON will you please move the motion.

## CONSIDERATION OF NOTIFIED MOTION:

*(Notified motions are printed as supplied and are not edited)*

**161/2022-23**

The Chair of Council (Councillor David McLACHLAN) then drew the Councillors’ attention to the notified motion listed on the agenda, and called on Councillor Sarah HUTTON to move the motion. Accordingly, Councillor Sarah HUTTON moved, seconded by Councillor Steven HUANG—

*That Council change the commencement time of the ordinary Council meeting to be held on 1 November 2022 from 1pm to 2.30pm.*

Chair: Is there any debate?

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNTON: Just give that several LNP Councillors declared a conflict of interest earlier with respect to the racing industry, given that this is about—the reason that you’re doing this is because of racing—should those Councillors be declaring a conflict of interest and abstaining themselves now?

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, that’s a frivolous point of order. It’s not a point of order.

Councillor HUTTON.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor HUTTON: Thank you, Chair.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor HUTTON: Shall I wait, Chair? Chair, this is a fairly straightforward motion which requests the support of the Councillors in this Chamber to start the meeting next week at 2.30pm, delaying the Council meeting to allow the Council Chamber members to observe the Melbourne Cup, a long-standing tradition which we intend to keep alive.

Chair: Thank you.

Is there further debate?

Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks, Chair. In recent years when these motions have come it’s been delaying the start of the meeting by half an hour. But the LORD MAYOR changed the timings of our Committee meetings and of our Council meeting to make them more family-friendly, to make the start time of the meeting at 1pm to reduce the time—the lateness of meetings to potentially go. So given that’s the case I don’t think now it is appropriate that Council is delayed for an hour and a half so Councillors may choose if they want—there’s no function as far as I’m aware for Councillors to go to. I suppose if they can find a TV in the LORD MAYOR’s office or go to a bar or pub or something or a screen somewhere in the mall maybe, to go and watch a five-minute race, it’s really not appropriate anymore that Council would be delayed an hour and a half.

What the Administration could do—they’ve got the numbers, they’re going to pass this today, but they could always adjourn the meeting for 15 minutes. We could start at 1pm, get through most of that, adjourn for 15 minutes. They could go into the LORD MAYOR’s office, watch—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: Yes, we could that. We could do the afternoon tea break at the time. There are more appropriate ways of doing it than delaying the start time of the democratically elected body—the decision-making body of the residents of Brisbane by an hour and a half. It’s a bit of a stretch these days. We have in the past support the delay by half an hour. But given the serious issues that this city is facing I just don’t think it’s appropriate that a Council meeting is delayed for an hour and a half just for a horse race to be watched.

Chair: Thank you.

Any further debate?

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, thank you, Mr Chairman. Through you to Councillor HUTTON, no, you don’t have my support for this. It is appalling that Council wants to delay the Council meeting by an hour and a half. There is absolutely no reason for this to happen because of the changes to the meetings times that were brought in by the LNP. We could absolutely undertake the meeting. If you miss the Melbourne Cup you can watch it back later when you get home in your own time. But we have statutory obligations and we should be here to participate in the meeting wherever we can. It is just appalling that the LNP are putting having a good time—probably some sort of boozy lunch in the LORD MAYOR’s office—over doing their job in the Council Chamber.

I would just say that, like Councillor CASSIDY, there was clearly another solution here if they did want to do this, which is to move afternoon tea at a time when you could watch the race. That would mean we could save money on no catering for afternoon tea. You could watch the race for 15 or 20 minutes which is the afternoon tea break—because what’s going to happen when we come back? 2.30pm the meeting starts, what, are we going to have a cup of tea at 3pm Councillor HUTTON? Then are we going to meet for two and a half hours and then go to the dinner break at 6pm? If we haven’t actually got through all our work? Are we going to have an hour off between 6pm and 7pm?

Do you think that maybe doing this is a problem because it’s going to disrupt the running of the meeting? It means things are longer, more complicated for the staff. They have to stay later if there are complex matters on the agenda. I think the selfishness of the LNP in doing this and forcing their views about what should happen onto the Council Chamber just so they can watch this horse race is not good enough. They are out of touch. The LORD MAYOR has to go. The LNP has stopped governing the city. They are running this place to suit themselves.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Just on relevance I think you’re starting to stray a little bit from the subject of the motion.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: I’m allowing the debate to continue, Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Councillors please.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Well Councillor SRI, have you changed your views on the evil racing club have you? Are you really supportive now of the evil racing club that you just stood up and had a go at for the last 10 minutes? So yes, thanks so much for your contribution.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Councillors, order please.

Councillor JOHNSTON: But I want to be very clear that I—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: I know. I mean I’m surprised Councillor HOWARD is not on her feet again saying it’s outrageous that Councillor JOHNSTON is not being listened to in silence. I mean surely Councillor McLACHLAN you want to make sure Councillor HOWARD can be heard. I mean she’s very quick to criticise me, but when people do exactly what she says about me, to me she doesn’t say anything.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, come on.

Councillor MURPHY: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Councillor MURPHY.

Councillor JOHNSTON: That’s called hypocrisy.

Chair: Point of order.

Councillor MURPHY: I know Councillor JOHNSTON was carrying on about selfishness before. I know she wouldn’t want to be selfish by consuming 10 times more time in this meeting than anyone else who has spoken today. So can she please conclude her remarks and we can vote on this item.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor MURPHY.

Councillor JOHNSTON you still have the floor. Please conclude.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes I do, and I’ve got seven minutes to go Councillor MURPHY and I’m going to use every seven minutes of it now. So thank you so much for your contribution here today. You’re not hopping up and saying you think this is a good idea. Why don’t you go on the record and share with your constituents why you think you should start work later? Look I just don’t think this is a good idea. The LNP have got this wrong. Clearly, Councillor SRI is going to vote for it. So that’s interesting.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: But—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: Sorry, SRIRANGANATHAN. I don’t support this. I don’t support what the LNP is doing. It is just so representative of the fact that they don’t care how this Council runs anymore. They do what they want, not what is in the best interests of this city. Taking an hour and a half off your job to go and watch a race, a horse race, is completely unnecessary, particularly, when we’ll come back; there will be an afternoon tea break and a dinner break and that just disrupts everything. It’s just not appropriate. I just want to thank the Chair very much for making sure all those people who interjected all the way through my speech—all the way through there—were called up and told not to do it. Because I know that the Chair of Council today has made an effort to reprimand me for interjecting here and there. But I do note that he’s on the record now of not doing the same when I am repeatedly interrupted.

Chair: Is there any further debate?

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Thank you, Chair. Just really briefly to say once again I think it’s contemptible that the Council Administration is delaying the meeting to watch a horse race. This is a form of animal abuse. It’s morally bankrupt. I think the people of Brisbane are right to be disappointed that their elected representatives are wasting time on something like this. I also share the concerns of other Councillors in this Chamber that the shift in schedule of Council meetings means that this is going to make for a very interrupted afternoon. I would much prefer that the Council at the very least just start the meeting at the normal time and then adjourn briefly. This is quite ridiculous that we are expected to delay by a solid 90 minutes. So I’ll leave it at that, but I won’t be supporting this motion.

Chair: Thank you.

Any further debate?

Councillor HUTTON, summing up? No?

We now move to the vote on this motion.

Upon being submitted to the Chamber, the motion was declared **carried** on the voices.

## PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS:

Chair: Councillors, petitions, are there any petitions?

Councillor CUNNINGHAM.

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: Thanks, Mr Chair. I have two petitions, one requesting a parcel of land at Coorparoo be named ‘Pat Clark-Ryan Park’ and the other requesting a section of Coorparoo Creek Park be named ‘Wallace Place’.

Chair: Thank you.

Councillor HAMMOND.

Councillor HAMMOND: Thank you, Mr Chair. I have a petition requesting traffic calming.

Chair: Thank you.

Further petitions? Any further petitions?

Councillor MURPHY.

Councillor MURPHY: Thanks, Chair. I have a petition requesting Council build traffic calming in the form of a road hump on Lorinya Street, Mansfield, to reduce the speed frequency and noise level of traffic using this street, signed by 38 petitioners.

Chair: Thank you.

Any further petitions from the floor?

Oh yes, Councillor LANDERS were you about to move the motion?

Councillor LANDERS: Yes.

Chair: I have a petition to present first. Petition in relation to a development application at 44 Wooloowin Avenue. Thank you.

Councillor LANDERS.

**162/2022-23**

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 |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 137/220/594/160 | Fiona Cunningham | Requesting Council name Kanumbra Street Park, Coorparoo, as ‘Pat Clark-Ryan Park’. |
| 137/220/594/161 | Fiona Cunningham | Requesting Council name a section of Coorparoo Creek Park at 226 Old Cleveland Road, Coorparoo, as ‘Wallace Place’. |
| 137/220/594/158 | Fiona Hammond | Requesting Council install traffic calming measures along Swan Street, Gordon Park, to improve safety for residents and pedestrians, and deter through traffic between Stafford Road and Lutwyche Road. |
| 137/220/594/159 | Ryan Murphy | Requesting Council install traffic calming measures on Lorinya Street, Mansfield, to reduce the speed, frequency and traffic noise. |
| 137/220/594/157 | David McLachlan | Requesting Council adhere to *Brisbane City Plan 2014* guidelines in relation to the assessment of the development application at 44 Wooloowin Avenue, Wooloowin (A006110526). |

## 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 standing.

Are there any matters of General Business?

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I rise to speak briefly on the 2022 floods and the question I asked the LORD MAYOR earlier today. It’s very apparent to me, from the statements the LORD MAYOR has made since the floods, even up until today, that he takes no understanding from his role as the lead in the disaster coordination and management for Brisbane City. He failed catastrophically together with Brisbane City Council, to recognise that a flood had occurred—and now he is leaving the Chamber—to recognise that a flood had occurred, to recognise that a disaster was unfolding and then failed to communicate that to the residents of Brisbane in a timely way.

Now, that’s not anyone else’s fault other than the people who are responsible, which is the LORD MAYOR and the local disaster management group and the LDCC. Now there are other agencies involved in how we respond to disasters without question. There is fault at many levels. I am not elected to the State Parliament and it’s not my responsibility to hold the State Parliament to account for their inaction. Others will be doing that. It is my job in this place, on behalf of the 3,000 plus residents that were flooded, most of whom are still not back in their homes now, to hold this Administration to account for its failures during the 2022 flood. Now, from 10.49am on Saturday 26 February, I was reporting to the LDCC that houses were flooded right around my ward.

It was very clear to me on Saturday morning that a fairly significant event was unfolding. As per our responsibilities in the Council disaster plan, it’s our job to report information to the LDCC so that they can take action. I did that. There are 22 emails that I tabled earlier today including an email to the LORD MAYOR at 3pm that afternoon telling him houses were flooded—personally—personally telling him houses were flooded in Oxley. There are 21 other emails for multiple suburbs—Oxley, Corinda, Sherwood, Fairfield, Graceville, Yeronga. I don’t know what the LDCC did in response in respect of most of those emails.

I have taken the opportunity to raise them directly with the head of Council’s disaster team. That is the City Resilience Manager, City Administration and Governance. Accompanying him in my office was the Divisional Manager, City Administration and Governance, the divisional services manager. Both of them sat in my office with my staff and I and undertook—about a month ago now—to get back to me with answers to my questions. Firstly, on Monday night I reported an islanded community in Corinda where urgent evacuations were needed. There was just literally no response from Council, none at all. On the Monday, I also asked for an emergency access gate to be unlocked so that people in Oxley could get out of an islanded and flooded community. There was literally no response from Council and the gate was never unlocked. Now I must have sent hundreds of emails to the LDCC, as I’m sure other Councillors did.

I didn’t expect all of them to be responded to, but I have raised two specific issues with the two more senior disaster managers in this Council and neither of them have had the courtesy to respond to me in the way that they said they would do. Now that’s about a month ago. I think it’s pretty off when we have a review undertaken by Paul de Jersey that says that Council needs to be working more closely with Councillors. You know what’s happened? A couple of managers from the LDCC came out. I talked to them about what I did in the community during the floods. They didn’t even know about local community centres in my area—didn’t even know. It’s been an eye-opening thing for them.

Then second, the only other contact we’ve had is the two officers who came to give me the training with the out-of-date manual that still said—I think it was on Page 7—that Council undertook flood buybacks. That’s how out of date the manual was that Council brought to my office to give me training on, that it was out of date because it still was referring to programs that Brisbane City Council has cancelled. That is what Councillor WINES has stood up here today and said, we’re delivering on all our recommendations. I can tell you we are not. Brisbane City Council is supposed to have opened up—one of the recommendations from the de Jersey review was to open up the Flood Resilient Homes Program to all suburbs of Brisbane. So I duly wrote—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, it was.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, it did. I duly wrote to Council asking them to consider a property in Yeerongpilly that suffers from really ongoing overland flow. Guess what I got back? This program is by invitation only. Invitation to who? Inala residents? Paddington residents? But not people who live in other parts of Brisbane. There are two recommendations in the de Jersey review that indicate that this program should be opened up to all of Brisbane. That is clearly the spirit and intention of those recommendations, clearly. This Council is not doing that. This Council has not reinstated its flood buyback scheme. It has not done it. Not a single cent is going to be invested in flood buyback by this Council. The de Jersey review is supposed to be undertaking consultation with local Councillors to support their development of community centres as flood recovery hubs.

Once, one Council officer came to speak to me. When I asked her for help for a little bit of funding—not much—she said, no, I’m sorry, we can’t. That’s the response by this Administration. There’s only a few Councillors in this place who have really catastrophically-flooded wards on a regular basis and I am one of them. I am not seeing support on the ground. Do you know how I found out that I would not be getting a flood-free office as recommended by Paul de Jersey? I heard Councillor WINES on the radio. I heard him on the radio. An ABC (Australian Broadcasting Corporation) journalist asked him about it and he waffled on for five minutes and then he goes, no that Councillor won’t be getting an office. I thought, how nice of Council to write to me and tell me what’s happening to my request.

Because I had written to them several weeks earlier and asked what’s happening. Nothing. We’re not only not getting a flood-free office, we’re going to have to use some sort of pop-up facility at the South Regional Business Centre which, as it happens, didn’t flood in 2022, but the site did flood in 2011. I’m not sure any of my staff could even get there because of the way the roads are cut off in the ward. This Administration is failing the residents of Brisbane. Today, in this Chamber, we can see why. The head is rotting. The LORD MAYOR cannot even accept his responsibility for managing a disaster in this city. He cannot even say, yes the LDCC knew it was flooding. Yes I knew it was flooding. We should have done better. I am sorry. That’s where this should be going.

Not the LORD MAYOR standing up here and saying, oh the State Government is politicising the floods. The only person politicising the floods that I can see is the LORD MAYOR. He’s blamed the BoM, he blames the State Government, he blames the early warning alert system. I mean he blames everybody—I’m surprised he hasn’t blamed me. But he blames everybody when he is the person responsible. Not only is this Council not learning from what it did, the same people who have run the flood disaster responses in this city the whole time I’ve been here, are still the same people running the flood responses now. If you keep doing the same thing you are not going to get a better outcome. You’re not going to get a different outcome.

I don’t understand why this Council is not being more consultative. Where is the operational review that this Council has done? You know the other thing that happened? I got sent a few weeks ago—obviously waste was a big problem. The waste bins didn’t go out. They were in the wrong locations. We spent days trying to get waste bins. It even got raised on the call with the CEO. Do you know what I got two weeks ago? I got the same wrong list that was sent to me that first week back in March, sent out to me again two weeks ago. I did my na-na. Yesterday, a lovely young lady from waste came out and asked me where I wanted the waste bins. But let me be clear, they sent me the same wrong places from seven months ago. There’s no Frederick Street in Tennyson. Do you know how many times I wrote to Council to tell them?

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON your time has expired.

Councillor JOHNSTON: You’re not listening.

Chair: Is there further General Business?

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Thanks, Chair. I just wanted to speak about a couple of issues. I’ll start with the City Centre Master Plan and this whole redesign that includes Mary Street. I’m going to try and keep my comments concise, but I do hope that Councillor MURPHY and Councillor ALLAN in particular will attend to this. As you are aware, consultation started about the Mary Street vision which includes the wider footpaths and obviously Space for Cycling is concerned about the absence of dedicated bike lanes along that corridor. I just wanted to highlight that the bus network review is also proposing a significantly larger volume of buses to travel along Mary Street as well. So there is an issue here that I’m concerned the different parts of the Administration aren’t necessarily talking to each other closely enough.

Because the dominant approach for the Mary Street vision is that pedestrians and slow-moving e-scooters will use the footpaths and cyclists are expected to use the road. That seems to be the thrust of the Mary Street vision. But if the Administration is saying that cyclists are going to use the road on Mary Street, that means that they’re riding in the path of those buses. It’s not going to work, just as a matter of common sense, if you have cyclists riding down a major busway corridor. We see the issues on Adelaide Street at the moment which carries a lot of buses. If there’s one or two bikes riding down the road, they slow down all the buses. It’s dangerous for the cyclists. It’s inconvenient and stressful for the bus drivers. That’s the current situation. We don’t want to replicate that on Mary Street.

So I don’t want to labour the point, but I think the cycling advocacy groups are right to say that we do need separated bike lanes for e-scooters and bikes on Mary Street. I hope that the Chair of City Planning and the Chair of Transport will take that issue seriously and look into that more closely. I appreciate that at least there is some level of consultation and forward planning and there’s an attempt to engage the community. But it was quite surprising to me, in particular, to see that there’s a lot of extra space being freed up by taking away the street parking, but the Council is not using that opportunity to create separated bike lanes. As a matter of common sense, if a road is needed for cars to access local destinations then that road is also going to be used by cyclists and e-scooters to access local destinations. So I think we do need separated bike lanes along there.

I also just wanted to speak again about the Grey Street Park, which is being delivered as part of the Brisbane Metro project. I wanted to thank Councillor MURPHY for allowing his officers to come out and brief me on that—sorry it’s damning you with feigned praise? Is that the concern? Anyway, it was good to be able to talk to the officers and unpack what I think should happen with that site. I understand there will be conversations between the NEWS (Natural Environment, Water and Sustainability) team and Councillor Davies’ staff and then the Metro project. Sorry I missed that interjection.

*Councillor interjecting*

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Oh thank you, sorry Councillor DAVIS. The concern I have is that the Brisbane Metro team’s brief has basically been to conceptualise that park space as a transition space. No one is going to stop there and hang out there. It’s just a stopover pocket park between the train station and the Metro Cultural Centre station. But actually that’s about—we’re talking like 700 square metres or 800 square metres—really 1,000 square metres, but I’ll say 800 square metres, because there’s an easement for Queensland Rail. But we’re talking about 800 square metres of land right at South Bank, right across from the Cultural Centre. So that block of land is worth millions and millions of dollars.

I’m sure Councillor MURPHY would agree with me that if we own a block of land that’s worth millions and millions of dollars right there in the centre of South Bank we don’t want it to just be a transitionary space that people move through. It’s not an efficient use of inner city land to just have a couple of bench seats and say, oh people are just going to stop here briefly to check their phone while they wait for the train or whatever. We want that space to be usable and activated. That’s why I’m increasingly firm in my view that that is a good space for a skate park. This is the site at 125 Grey Street, right next to Melbourne Street.

I think that there’s a lot of interest from the local community for a skate park in that area given it’s right next to the train station and not as close to residential homes, that’s probably the best spot we could find for a skate park in the area. It’s got good casual surveillance which I know the Administration is a bit preoccupied with. It’s not going to be a noise issue because it’s right next to the very noisy train station. So I have asked the Council officers to seriously look into that, but I know it’s going to come back to NEWS eventually. The NEWS team is going to have some arbitrary rules like, well we only have skate parks in large recreation parks or in sports parks or whatever. If they go by the default city planning codes, they’re going to say, oh this probably isn’t suitable for a skate park.

But actually in the inner city this is exactly the sort of space we want for a skate park. It doesn’t matter that it’s only a 1,000 square metre park without off-street parking. It doesn’t matter that a skate park in South Bank doesn’t have parking spaces because people won’t be driving to use that skate park. They’ll be walking or riding their skateboards to get there. So the usual arguments that the Council officers might be inclined to mount against a skate park at this location are not compelling and don’t apply. But I am just worried that when the Brisbane Metro team and Councillor MURPHY’s officers refer this over to the NEWS team and Councillor DAVIS’ team, that they’re going to say, oh no, no, we don’t want a skate park there, and it will just sort of get knocked on the head.

But I do hope that the relevant officers will be encouraged to look at that proposal seriously. Like I said, it’s a big enough footprint for a small skate park. There’s a really strong need for one in the area. It’s a suitable location because it’s close to other noisy uses and not too close to residential homes. Frankly, I can’t think of how else that park is going to be activated because it’s 100 metres from South Bank so no one is going to sit at the corner of Grey Street and Melbourne Street for a picnic when they could just walk over the road to South Bank. I don’t really think we want it to be used as a basketball court because there’s going to be risks of basketballs flying onto the road and that sort of stuff.

So it’s really going to come down to a choice between a no-place, a place that just has a couple of bench seats and a couple of trees and nothing else, or a space that does have some trees and come canopy cover and some seating, but also has a facility that can anchor that corner and can help activate that part of the precinct. So I hope the idea is taken seriously. I’m going to directly approach some of the stakeholders like South Bank Corporation myself as well to explain and advocate for that idea. Because I appreciate that the Administration is going to want to be coming up with a proposal that satisfies some of the other stakeholders in the neighbourhood. But at the end of the day, the biggest stakeholder is the residents of that community.

It would be a mistake for the Brisbane Metro team to let the design of this park be shaped exclusively by QPAC (Queensland Performing Arts Centre) or exclusively by Queensland Rail and whatever the stationmaster at the station wants to happen there. It’s not for the Queensland Rail stationmaster to decide how a Brisbane City Council park is designed. It should be for the people of the city to decide. I’m hearing from a lot of residents in South Bank, South Brisbane, West End area, who really want a skate park and who think this would be a suitable location for it. So I hope the Administration will work constructively with me on that. I’m not trying to be difficult. I’m approaching this in good faith.

But I am worried based on past experiences that the parks officers will look at their standard codes for a skate park and say, no we only put skate parks in major metropolitan and district parks and we only put skate parks where there’s off-street car parking, et cetera, et cetera, and will simply dismiss the idea because it doesn’t meet the standard criteria. I think that would be a great shame and a missed opportunity. So I look forward to further conversations with the relevant Chairs about that.

Chair: Thank you.

Any further General Business? No further General Business?

I declare this meeting closed.

## 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 20 October 2022)**

Q1. In relation to the Lord Mayor’s 2022-23 budget announcement of the new Sun Safe Program, please provide details of how much funding has been expended on the new Program to date?

Q2. Please provide details of the parks that have had shade sails installed under the new Sun Safe Program this financial year:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Park Name** | **Location** | **Ward** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Q3. Please provide details of the parks that are listed to have shade sails installed under the Sun Safe Program this financial year:

| **Park Name** | **Location** | **Ward** |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Q4. How many people were signed up to Council’s Brisbane Severe Weather Alert Service as of 1 February 2022?

Q5. How many people were signed up to Council’s Brisbane Severe Weather Alert Service as of 21 October 2022?

Q6. How many sandbag machines does Brisbane City Council own and where are each of them located?

Q7. How many sandbags have been made at Council depots as of 21 October 2022?

Q8. How many community evacuation hubs have been approved in addition to existing evacuation centres?

Q9. How many of the 12 solar powered automated flood warning signs have been installed?

Q10. On what date did Council approve additional funding for the significant contracting plan for the Nudgee Recreation Reserve project, including works for the BMX Track, Dog Off-Leash Area, Fitness Path and Playground?

Q11. How many Qantas Club memberships did Council purchase in the 2021/2022 financial year, and what was the total cost of these memberships?

Q12. How many Qantas Club memberships has Council purchased so far in the 2022/2023 financial year, and what is the total cost of these memberships?

Q13. What is the total number of trips and total value spent on cab charges and ride share trips by Councillors?

Q14. What is the total number of trips and total value spent on cab charges and ride share trips by Council officers?

Q15. Please provide the breakdown of the amount, cost and distribution of the ‘Brisbane Remembers Queen Elizabeth II’ flyer.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **How many printed** | **Total cost of printing** | **How many distributed** |
|  |  |  |
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