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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)** |
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| **Queensland Greens Councillor (and Ward)**  Jonathan SRI (The Gabba) |
| **Independent Councillor (and Ward)**  Nicole JOHNSTON (Tennyson) |

## OPENING OF MEETING:

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

Chair: Please be seated. I declare the meeting open.

Are there any apologies? No apologies. Thank you, Councillors.

Confirmation of minutes, please.

## MINUTES:

**336/2021-22**

The Minutes of the 4666 meeting of Council held on 23 November 2021, copies of which had been forwarded to each Councillor, were presented, taken as read and confirmed on the motion of Councillor Sandy LANDERS, seconded by Councillor Sarah HUTTON.

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

Chair: Councillors, we have two public participants today.

I’d like to call on Dr Jodi Clyde-Smith, who will address the Chamber on investing in sporting infrastructure in the west-southwest corridor.

Thank you, Dr Clyde-Smith. Billy will show you to the chair. You can stand or sit according to your preference, and your five minutes starts when you turn on the microphone there.

Dr Jodi Clyde-Smith: Yes, thank you.

Chair: Thank you.

**Dr Jodi Clyde-Smith – Investing in sporting infrastructure in the west-southwest corridor**

Dr Jodi Clyde-Smith: Mr Chair, LORD MAYOR and Councillors, thank you very much for the opportunity to speak with you today. I am here with what I hope is going to be a value proposition, which is grow the synthetic turf facilities for field hockey in the south-west and western corridor of Brisbane, and with that, I hope also to suggest that we look to present a one-stop sporting complex for families in Brisbane—in this particular region. So, field hockey in Australia, there’s about 300,000 people playing hockey. It is gender equitable. It is family-friendly. There are players from the age of five to 85 playing hockey, and, of course, also the other thing that’s important is income spread. So people, despite incomes, can play hockey across all income ranges.

The important thing with hockey is that, as you develop in the sport, you need to be able to move onto synthetic turf infrastructure in order to be able to play serious competitive hockey, and, certainly, if you’re looking to play at the State, Commonwealth or Olympic sports. It is an Olympic sport, and, of course, as you probably know, we’ve got high-performance facilities training in Australia already over in Western Australia, although that’s relocating.

In Brisbane, we have 5,500 people playing hockey. We have four synthetic turf facilities in the Brisbane Local Government Area (LGA). We have a couple on either side of the LGA as well. Now, what we have is that these synthetic turf facilities are largely in the north and in the east. South West United Hockey Club, which is what I’m representing here today, is based in Graceville. So we’re in the south-west, and when we want to ask our players from the ages of 12 to 13 to think about playing competitive hockey at the higher levels, we have to ask families to travel from the south-west to the east of Brisbane to be able to train at the State Hockey Centre.

So, the consequences of that is that we will lose people. We will lose children playing hockey because families can’t commit or they can’t afford the time or they can’t afford the cost of the extra commute, or they stop playing hockey or they only play it in grass fields. The other one is that they end up playing in the Ipswich competitions, so we’re losing players from Brisbane to other LGAs. This is enormous opportunity for us to actually look at growing the sport in the south‑west corridor. If we’ve already got 5,500 players, we can certainly get more.

The other thing I would say, though, is that what we’re here today—or what I’m here for today is to actually look to ask Brisbane City Council to help us identify a site for a synthetic turf facility. Although I’m representing hockey, these fields can actually be used as dual purpose, so they’re used for soccer. They can be used to support AFL, rugby union, and lots of other different sports. They can be built on top of car parks, so you’re actually maximising the footprint of the land on which you’re basing something.

The other thing, too, is I am not talking about an Olympic facility. This is not a legacy infrastructure that I’m asking that we look to invest in. What I’m trying to find is a metro facility that we can actually grow this sport, we can look to invest in sports in the South East Queensland region, that we can look to use infrastructure to grow opportunities between other sporting associations in the south-east, the obvious example being Ipswich and Brisbane.

So, I believe the other thing that we need to be able to do to support families is not to ask them to have to travel all across Brisbane to support their kids during the week training sports. We should be able to offer them dual facilities, the one spot where they can go and they can watch their kids—their three kids trying to play for soccer, hockey and AFL in the one space. At the moment, we don’t do that, we travel everywhere. What I’d like to be able to suggest is that, if we invest in these sorts of things, we are promoting something that actually builds community cohesion, social inclusion and builds resilient, healthy families and communities that also leads to wellbeing.

So, we have been busy in this space already. We have spent some time talking with Councillors who’ve been enormously supportive of what we’re trying to achieve here, and what we’d like to be able to do is work with Brisbane City Council in partnership. We have no issues in finding the funding. I, myself, am a grants writer, I’m very good at it. We know there are funds for this, we know we can leverage. We’ve been speaking to State, we’re speaking to Federal, we’ve been speaking to the Brisbane City divisions.

So, we would hope that you’d be interested in supporting us in this opportunity, and we hope that you’re interested in being able to achieve a vision of greater sports opportunity, greater inclusion for the south-west and the western corridors of Brisbane. Thank you very much.

Chair: Thank you, Doctor. Your time has just expired, so well done. Thank you.

Councillor to respond?

Councillor DAVIS, Chair of Parks.

**Response by Councillor Tracy DAVIS, Civic Cabinet Chair of the Environment, Parks and Sustainability Committee**

Councillor DAVIS: Oh well, thank you very much, Chair, and thank you so much, Dr Clyde-Smith, for coming in. It is very clear you’re very passionate about your sport, and I can share with you that my husband John has been playing field hockey for about 40 years, so I understand your passion for the sport. I understand that you have seen—had a conversation with a number of our Councillors here, including Councillor HUTTON and Councillor ADERMANN, and I think from nodding over there, Councillor JOHNSTON on this matter.

When it comes to sporting facilities, under my portfolio area, which really looks after the park space, it’s a combination effort between, really, myself and Councillor HOWARD, where she looks after sporting facilities, but I really do appreciate you coming in with a plan and a vision for us to consider in the future. Although you spoke about this facility not being an Olympics facility, we’re all very excited about the Olympics here and providing opportunities for our up‑and‑coming future Olympians, but of course, that can go across all sports and, you know, competing interests for particular sports in particular areas.

When we normally start to identify areas or parkland for the future, it’s through the Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP), and what that looks at is the population growth of areas so that we can consider putting in infrastructure for those growing areas. So, that is very much a part of the consideration when we start to look at future parks, which may be—or include sporting facilities, but I really do want to thank you for providing us with your thoughts and your vision, and I look forward to maybe seeing you on the northside of Brisbane on one of the hockey fields that my husband’s hockey club plays on. Thank you so much for coming in. I appreciate it.

Chair: Thanks, Councillor DAVIS.

Your material is being placed on the desks of Councillors, Dr Clyde-Smith. Thank you very much. Billy will see you out.

We also have speaking today, Dr Ronald Gardiner, who is outside waiting to come in, who will address the Council—or the Chamber on the Brisbane Metro, and in particular, the Adelaide Street Tunnel Metro buses and Metro vehicles.

Thanks, Billy.

Thanks, Dr Gardiner. You’ll have five minutes once the microphone’s turned on.

Dr Ronald Gardiner: Yes.

Chair: Thank you very much.

**Dr Ronald Gardiner – Brisbane Metro, in particular, the Adelaide Street tunnel and Metro vehicles**

Dr Ronald Gardiner: Well, ladies and gentlemen, Councillors, thank you for giving me this opportunity. You will all have received from me in early November, a document—well, you won’t have printed it off, I’m sure, unless you’ve got lots of paper, but a 20-page document which was not only a criticism of the Brisbane Metro project, but outlined an alternative which I commend very strongly to the Council. I should mention that I have been not exactly friendly towards this project since its inception, as I’m sure some of the staff involved will be aware.

I guess most disappointingly—let’s put it that way, I attempted on two occasions earlier this year to get from the Project Director a summary of the arguments as to why putting a tunnel and its portal into Adelaide Street was a better solution to the problem. The problem doesn’t actually exist yet, but it will, but why is that a better solution than moving the tunnel downstream a little bit, putting it right beside the one that’s there already, namely the access tunnel to the Queensland underground busway station—Queen Street underground busway station, where it would consume, I’d guess, about 20 metres’ width of Reddacliff Place, which is not a particularly well-utilised space at the moment.

On two occasions, I have put this in writing to the Project Director. On both occasions, he declined to give me the rationale, as it were, for one of these options rather than the other. On the second occasion, he, more or less, put it to me that as far as he was concerned, he really didn’t want to discuss anything about Brisbane Metro with me anymore. He’d had enough. So, that was the end of the discussion, but I did attempt earlier this year to get the State Minister involved, the Minister for the Local Government, because I discovered, reading the relevant background, that he has the authority to overturn decisions of local authorities.

I asked him, specifically, would he overturn the decision to put this tunnel and this portal into Adelaide Street? Then the other one, which is closely linked to that, is to essentially exclude general traffic from a large chunk of North Quay, to being interrelated, those two ideas. Anyway, in due course, I got a letter back saying, no, basically, he wouldn’t do that. His advice was that he had—there were no grounds—I think was the term he used, no grounds for overturning these decisions, and that the advice he had received from his officers was that, in fact, these were matters for the City Council to determine, which I must say, I found rather laughable.

Anyway, I thought that they were very clearly planning decisions over which the State Government should have exercised some authority, as it did over the question of the underground busway station, the service at the Cultural Centre. State Government made its views very clear, it would seem, on that, but on this occasion, they weren’t prepared to intervene. I’m dismayed by that.

I feel that the State Council—the State Government has not done its duty, but I’m more concerned that representations that I have made to the Project Director to try and find out why, why is putting this hideous tunnel into the river end of Adelaide Street, why is that preferable to tucking it in beside the one that’s there now, which most people don’t even know exists? It’s really hardly got any profile at all. Installing it would be much, much easier than putting one into Adelaide Street, which is going to cause—well, an estimated two-and-a-half years of that happening.

Now, just one other point I want to make in my very limited time. I understand that the University of Queensland recently took exception to having something equivalent to something like three shipping containers of electrical engineering equipment dumped on its campus, this being the flash charging system to allow Metro vehicles to be—have their batteries recharged at the end of what is the line, if you like, one of the two lines that Brisbane Metro follows and terminates at the University of Queensland.

Not unsurprisingly, the University of Queensland decided they didn’t really want these, and so I understand that the solution to that that the Council has come up with is that the three containers’ worth of equipment will now go across the Eleanor Schonell Bridge somewhere into Dutton Park, do a certain amount of damage there, no doubt, but then they—

Chair: Dr Gardiner, I’m sorry, your time has expired at that point. Thank you very much.

Dr Ronald Gardiner: Okay, thank you.

Chair: Councillor MURPHY, Transport Chair, would you like to respond?

**Response by Councillor Ryan MURPHY, Civic Cabinet Chair of the Transport Committee**

Councillor MURPHY: Thank you, Mr Chair. I’d like to thank you, Professor Gardiner, for coming in today to speak with us about Brisbane Metro. I understand that you’re a Fellow of the Australian Institute of Physics and remain passionate about Brisbane’s transport future in retirement. I note that your critique of Brisbane Metro has been published on the Labor thinktank website, the TJ Ryan Foundation, which was established in 2014, by the then-Leader of the Opposition, Annastacia Palaszczuk, but we certainly appreciate the passion, your passion, because on this side of the Chamber, we understand that critical analysis of major infrastructure projects is really important.

It’s what challenges us to do better, and, ultimately, it allows us to deliver a better outcome. I’m very proud of this project’s journey because we’ve now landed on a cost-effective solution that will now offer a new transport option for Brisbane, and one that will have significant flow-on benefits for other travel networks across the city. The project is called Brisbane Metro to reflect the turn-up-and-go style of service that will be offered. Professor Gardiner, I appreciate that you believe articulated buses should be used instead of Metro’s trackless trams, but I remain certain that trackless trams will deliver the most benefit for our busways.

Trackless trams are, of course, an emerging technology around the world which allow cities to provide light rail-like performance at a fraction of the cost. HESS, one of a number of manufacturers which are now in this space, and when we tendered in 2019, provided the only vehicle which could meet our exacting specifications to work on the busway. We agree with you that articulated buses are indeed a great asset to our fleet. We already have 70 of them and we will continue to purchase more, but our trackless trams provide even better capacity for turn-up-and-go services, and if you put 60 trackless trams up against 60 articulated buses, the trackless trams are able to carry an additional 2,400 passengers.

We worked together closely with HESS to develop a highly sophisticated design which will feature a turning radius of just 23.8 metres wall-to-wall, which outperforms even our rigid buses. These vehicles are used in European cities, where ancient roads tend to be smaller and lighter, so we have no concerns with their manoeuvring on Brisbane’s busways whatsoever. We will certainly look to add more articulated buses to our most popular bus routes, but the true value of Brisbane Metro is that it gives us the capacity to move an additional 30.4 million passengers per year on the South East Busway, and without Metro, there are no opportunities to increase capacity.

While we would love the State Government to extend Brisbane’s busways, unfortunately, we seem to be the only ones that are providing any kind of investment in the busway network at present. We are proud to be working with HESS, in Switzerland, and Volgren, here in Brisbane on the trackless trams, and we will not be cancelling the pilot vehicle contract. We’re equally proud to be working with ACCIONA and Arup to deliver the major infrastructure components for the project.

Professor Gardiner, I appreciate your suggestion for Council to defer and to relocate construction of the Adelaide Street Tunnel. The Adelaide Street Tunnel will be a critical connection for both Metro and bus services between Victoria Bridge and King George Square station. It will free up congestion bottlenecks and it will reduce the number of buses travelling at surface level. If we were to use, for example, articulated buses without that dedicated connection under Adelaide Street, that would simply mean running more buses along CBD streets and through the Queen Street Busway station, which is already under a great deal of pressure and congestion.

While I understand that you believe a tunnel would be better located adjacent to the portal of the Queen Street bus station, this would impact on Reddacliff Place and we don’t support the loss of this important public space. We are also tunnelling underneath Adelaide Street because we miss hundreds of building footings and foundations that we would need to undermine at a much greater depth should we choose an alternative alignment. The Adelaide Street Tunnel provides a common-sense connection off Victoria Bridge and directly into King George Square Busway station. We’ve moved to the mining tunnelling methodology to reduce the construction impacts, but important to remember that we’re building much more than just a tunnel here.

Finally, Professor Gardiner, to your suggestion that Council redesigns the Cultural Centre station with two inner platforms between two outer platforms with a radio system in place, advising the driver which zone to stop at, it’s important to remember that Councill agreed to construct a surface solution at the Cultural Centre station to move the project forward with the State Government. That was actually a precondition of moving forward with them on the project. I’m sure that you can appreciate, this is a highly constrained environment with the bus station located at QPAC (Queensland Performing Arts Centre) between the—and the Queensland Museum, so extending platform lengths is the most achievable outcome.

We have modelled this very extensively and we do believe that we have a very good at-grade solution which addresses congestion at the station and enhances passenger experience. You’ll be pleased to know that we are procuring a Brisbane Metro management system to bring together all the IT components related to bus operations, infrastructure and vehicle scheduling in order to support efficient operations and provide an improved passenger experience as well. We worked very closely with stakeholders in the cultural precinct on the design of the station, and we look forward to construction starting next year.

Professor Gardiner, I thank you again for your time today and reassure you that through the development of this project, we have explored countless options and opportunities, and continue to re-evaluate and challenge our design and delivery approach at every step of the way. I assure you that our commitment to delivering world-class public transport—and I have full confidence that our highly skilled planners and engineers have delivered a solution for Brisbane Metro that will work for generations to come. As I’ve said on this project before, from the beginning, doing nothing is not an option. Thank you, Mr Gardiner.

Chair: Thanks, Councillor MURPHY.

Thank you, Dr Gardiner, for coming in today.

Councillors, we’ll move on to Question Time.

## QUESTION TIME:

Chair: Are there any questions of the LORD MAYOR or a City Cabinet Chair of any of the Standing Committees?

Councillor ADERMANN.

**Question 1**

Councillor ADERMANN: Yes, thank you, Chair. My question is for the LORD MAYOR. LORD MAYOR, this morning you announced that Brisbane commuters will receive free bus travel throughout the two weekends before Christmas. Can you outline for the Chamber how this initiative is not only a win for our public transport commuters, but also giving a Christmas boost to our retailers and restaurants?

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you to Councillor ADERMANN for the question, and it is good news, because we know that there are two critically important things at the moment. One of them is getting people out and about, supporting local business in the lead-up to Christmas and enjoying all the great activities that we’re putting on for people. Whether it’s the City Hall light show that’s on during December each evening every 15 minutes, whether it’s the Lord Mayor’s Christmas Carols or the many free or low-cost events that we’ve got, the Enchanted Gardens—Councillor DAVIS, and many other things that are happening, but also coming into the city to support local business.

They have been really struggling throughout this year with foot traffic down in the Queen Street Mall significantly. We’re still at 63% of the pre-COVID levels, although that number is rising, and certain people have told me that, on Friday evening, we saw a big boost to the foot traffic as a result of the combination of our Black Friday sales and the switching on of the Christmas tree, so we had a good lift in the foot traffic happening, but we want to see that grow even more. So, we were looking at opportunities to achieve a second aim as well, which is to encourage people back onto public transport.

We know that, at the moment, our bus usage is down by about 38% compared to pre-COVID levels. We’re seeing that flow through into congestion on the road network, so today, the RACQ talked about travel times on our road network. What was their suggestion about improving travel times on the road, the RACQ? This was an interesting one. We need to do everything we can to encourage more sustainable transport, practices like public transport, walking and cycling. Well, that’s good because that’s exactly what we’re doing.

So, this is exactly what we’re doing with the lead-up to Christmas as well, with Friday, Saturday and Sunday, two weekends in a row, festive or free festive bus fares for Christmas. So, we’ll see people travelling anywhere across the city on a Brisbane City Council bus, that includes all the blue and gold buses, plus the CityGliders as well. You can travel for free anywhere you want to go on Friday, Saturday and Sunday. This will cost approximately $900,000 and it is fully funded by Brisbane City Council.

Obviously, it would have been nice to get the State Government come to the party, but I don’t hold a lot of optimism these days that they’ll come to the party on anything at all, except if it’s some kind of political wedge. So, we’re seeing Council stepping up, doing the right thing to get people back on the buses and back into our retail areas, supporting local businesses at a critical time. It is critical that a lot of these traders have a good, strong Christmas to make up for what has been an appalling year in many ways, and we are keen to support them.

So, whether it’s the free festive fares or whether it’s the fantastic Brisbane App or whether it’s the Local Buy initiative, we are actively supporting our businesses across the city. We’re also investing in Village Precinct upgrades as well, in a number of locations across the city, and it’s just part of the overall agenda that we’ve got to make sure that Brisbane is Australia’s most small business-friendly council, but also our support of sustainable travel means, whether that is public transport or pedestrian and cycling through our green bridges and bikeway program, through our investment in the Brisbane Metro project, which is just a fantastic project, and other initiatives to encourage sustainable travel, and whether it is encouraging e-transport, such as e-bikes and e-scooters.

We are making sure that we target across these travel means to keep a lid on traffic congestion, to encourage people on public transport, and also to support our local businesses. Thank you, Mr Chair.

Chair: Thank you, LORD MAYOR.

Further questions?

Councillor CASSIDY.

**Question 2**

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair. My question is to the Chair of the Finance Committee, Councillor CUNNINGHAM. Councillor CUNNINGHAM, time and time again, we see this LNP Council wasting huge chunks of this city’s budget on cost blowouts. The Kingsford Smith Drive upgrade accrued a cost blowout of up to $194 million. The Indooroopilly roundabout has already blown out by $60 million before any work started. The Brisbane bendy-bus project blew out by $300 million before it even started.

That’s more than half a billion dollars in cost blowouts on just three projects. That’s enough to pay for 85 years’ worth of kerbside collection. Is this gross mismanagement of residents’ money the reason this LNP Mayor cuts basic suburban services and jacks up rates?

Chair: Councillor CUNNINGHAM.

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: Thank you, Mr Chair, and thank you to the Leader of the Opposition for the question. Mr Chair, I’m not about to be lectured on finances and how to manage a budget from the Labor Party, the same Labor Party who are renowned for their big government approach and big spending sprees. I absolutely reject the premise of his statement. I won’t even justify it by calling it a question, Mr Chair. Residents of Brisbane know this, that’s why they overwhelmingly trust us to manage a $3.6 billion budget of Australia’s largest local government, and we saw those results at the last election.

It’s because they have nothing to offer, Mr Chair, they have no real policy agenda. They resort to coming in here and creating fear and spreading smear. Responsible budgeting means we reinvest the dividends into providing infrastructure and services necessary to provide an even better Brisbane for the residents who have voted for us. Through the pandemic, we’ve been able to provide extra support to local businesses and community clubs while maintaining this record infrastructure investment, and I would point to the results from the QTC (Queensland Treasury Corporation) that show that we have a strong outlook.

We can do all this by ensuring that Brisbane remains in the black, rather than foisting the costs and consequences onto the future generations of our city. We are the only team with experience to deliver for Brisbane residents.

Chair: Thank you.

Further questions?

Councillor MACKAY.

**Question 3**

Councillor MACKAY: Thanks, Chair. My question is to the Chair of the Transport Committee, Councillor MURPHY. Councillor MURPHY, Council has been undertaking a comprehensive review of the ferry network since May 2021. Can you please tell the Chamber about the new timetable and services improvements that will come into effect next month and make ferry travel in Brisbane even better.

Chair: Councillor MURPHY.

Councillor MURPHY: Thank you, Chair, and thank you, Councillor MACKAY, for the question. The Schrinner Council is investing record amounts in public transport, and as part of this commitment, we have just completed a review of Brisbane’s ferry network. Our goal is very simple, Chair, to make Brisbane’s ferry network even better, to make ferry travel easier and more enjoyable for more people. The network has seen some big changes over the last few years, with new terminals, new vessels, and changed services.

We know our River City has evolved with new nightlife precincts like Howard Smith Wharves, an expanded suite of lifestyle and leisure opportunities, and the exciting honour of becoming an Olympic City. The people of Brisbane have changed, too, as a community. We’re interested in more greener forms of transport. Now is the perfect time to make improvements to the ferry network, just before Christmas and in time for the opening of Howard Smith Wharves and South Bank terminals.

Now, the Ferry Network Review has been an enormous undertaking involving four rounds of community engagement and over 8,000 pieces of feedback from Brisbane residents. Through consultation, we asked how, when, where and why people were using our ferry network and what would make ferry services even better. We got some really positive feedback that indicated 57% of people were satisfied with existing ferry services, and 55% of people liked to hop onboard the CityCat or a ferry for leisure or sightseeing.

Frequency of services and quicker journeys were two of the strongest areas for improvement that came out of the feedback. Twenty-four per cent of respondents placed a higher priority on faster journeys with fewer stops, and 32% that would use a CityCat if it operated at higher frequencies later into the evening. We’ve listened to the community. I’m proud to say that the next month, we’ll be launching a new timetable with enhanced services to deliver the ferry network that Brisbane wants and needs. We’ve focused on delivering more services that operate later into the evening, so people can enjoy our city’s nightlife and leisure precincts, with the comfort that a ferry or a CityCat will get them home sooner and safer.

Chair, let’s talk about what’s changing for our CityCats, the icons of Brisbane that carry commuters to work each morning, and acquaint many travellers with our incredible River City. We’re delivering even more CityCat trips with 59 extra all‑stop services running Monday to Friday. The 15-minute frequency for weekday all-stop CityCat services will also be extended later into the evening, until around 9pm. In addition to improved all-stop services, eastern and western express services will be simplified and enhanced with the timetable better aligning to customer demand.

Express CityCat services in the east will run every 15 minutes from Apollo Road to Riverside, in peak times during the week, to provide a higher level of service for the many commuters that love to jump on a CityCat for work. On weekends, we’ll be extending the 15-minute frequency of CityCat services until midnight on Friday and Saturday nights. This is a 12-month trial of what we’re calling NightCats, to boost Brisbane’s nightlife and economy, supporting Brisbane residents and visitors to enjoy more of what the city has to offer later at night.

Our ferry services are getting just as much love in the revised network with the even better CityHopper and Cross River ferry services. Residents will now be able to make their way to Howard Smith Wharves on a KittyCat, either through catching a CityHopper or the Cross River service. The CityHopper route will now service North Quay, the upgraded South Bank terminal, Maritime Museum, Riverside, Holman Street, Howard Smith Wharves and Sydney Street, running at a 30-minute frequency.

We’ve added in Howard Smith Wharves as a third stop to the existing Riverside to Holman Street cross-river service, which will also run at a 30-minute frequency, which means Kangaroo Point residents will have KittyCats arriving every 15 minutes at Holman Street and will have access to the north side of the river for the first time. Now, we’re adding in Howard Smith Wharves as a—sorry, I should just say, Chair, just like the CityCats, we’ll be extending the hours of operation of the inner-city ferry services a bit later into the evening on Fridays and Saturdays so people can enjoy eating out and drinking into the evening at Howard Smith Wharves and Eagle Street.

The Bulimba to Teneriffe Cross River ferry service will also be enhanced with a simpler timetable so that residents can turn up with greater confidence of when the next ferry ride will pick them up and a regular frequency of services in the peak direction. The Bulimba to Teneriffe cross-river services will also be better integrated with the CityCat and the CityGlider bus service at Teneriffe. So, the Schrinner Council is proud to be implementing this new and improved network.

I have no doubt that we will have more people travelling by river and making the most of what Brisbane has to offer as we head into the silly season. The new timetables will come into effect on Monday 13 December. TransLink has published the revised timetables on their website so travellers can jump online and start planning their journeys now. the upgraded South Bank terminal will open for use on Monday 13 December, and the Howard Smith Wharves terminal will open around the middle of that same week, on approximately 15 December, weather permitting.

Mr Chair, in closing, I’d like to thank the thousands of residents who had their say through the network review process. Changes to public transport should aim to benefit as many people as possible, and this can only be achieved through the meaningful community consultation that the Schrinner Council has undertaken when it comes to the Ferry Network Review. Thank you, Chair.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor MURPHY.

Further questions?

Councillor SRI.

**Question 4**

Councillor SRI: Thanks, chair. The question—my question is to the LORD MAYOR. LORD MAYOR, you are no doubt aware that more and more cities around the world are adopting speed limits of 30 km/h in recognition of the fact that lower speed limits can improve safety and convenience for active and public transport users, and in turn, can help encourage a shift away from car dependence. Cities like Paris now, I think, have gone almost entirely to 30 km/h, with the exception of a few main roads.

I’m interested to understand, how supportive are you of 30 km/h speed limits in denser inner-city neighbourhoods, and what additional evidence or information would you want to see in order to consider supporting the trial of generalised 30 km/h speed limits for local and neighbourhood streets in The Gabba Ward or, for example, a suburb like West End?

Chair: Thank you.

LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Okay, so that is an interesting question because I was the Chair responsible for the introduction of the 40 km/h limit in the CBD when we were the lead city in Australia to introduce that limit. One of the things that we see here, though, is that nothing you do is ever enough for the Greens. It’s—you know, never mind that 40k’s has been incredibly successful in improving the safety of the CBD. We were seeing, before that time, people literally getting killed on CBD streets, and the safety record has improved significantly, but when you hear a push for 30, what you’re hearing—read between the lines, is they really hate motorists and they want to punish them, and they want them out of their cars, which is Green’s policy pretty much everywhere in the world.

So, whether it’s a socialist Mayor, like the socialist Mayor in Paris, or Greens councils elsewhere, it’s a classic sign you’ve got a Greens council when they go for 30k limits. Now, the interesting thing is, that was a Labor election policy at the last election, so what does that say? I don’t know. Socialism—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: They dabble with socialism, and I think we’ll see more of that in the lead-up to the next election. We’ll see the Labor-Green alliance coming out, but I do not support 30k limits in the CBD. The 40k limit is appropriate. It’s interesting because—

Councillor SRI: Point of order, Chair.

LORD MAYOR: —you see that—

Chair: Councillor SRI, you’re on your feet.

LORD MAYOR: You’ve asked the question—

Chair: LORD MAYOR, just a minute.

LORD MAYOR: —and I’m answering it.

Councillor SRI: Sorry, yes, it was more about the inner southside and suburbs like West End.

Chair: I believe the LORD MAYOR is answering the question, Councillor SRI.

LORD MAYOR: I do not support 30k limits in the CBD and I’d be interested to know why it’s okay for children to benefit from a 40k hour limit, but other places deserve a lower limit. Aren’t children our most vulnerable road users? 40k’s is an acceptable limit for school zones, and so 40k’s is an acceptable limit where you see areas of high pedestrian activity, but look, you know, if you really hate motorists, then you go for 30. So, I won’t be supporting 30. It’d really have to be a situation like Burnett Lane, where you’re actually having a shared zone where you’ve got pedestrians walking on the road and motorists driving through very slowly.

You’d have to see that type of limit, like a 20k limit through there or a 10k limit, but on the general road network, no, I won’t be supporting 30.

Chair: Thank you.

Further questions?

Councillor HUTTON.

**Question 5**

Councillor HUTTON: Thank you, Chair. My question is to the Chair of the Economic Development and the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games, Councillor ADAMS. DEPUTY MAYOR, last Friday night, the LORD MAYOR officially turned on Brisbane’s Christmas tree, kicking off Christmas festivities for 2021. Could you please update the Chamber on what festivities residents can expect over the next couple of weeks?

Chair: Councillor ADAMS.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair, and thank you, Councillor HUTTON, for the question. I know the presentation today was about Christmas in the city and I know it’s not the Olympics, but it is also very important for the economic development of our city, and that is why we had Julia from the Brisbane Economic Development Agency today to go through the Committee on all the exciting things that are coming up for Christmas in the city. That’s why I thought today, despite our gloomy weather, it was an important time to make everybody realise that it ‘tis the season and it’s time to start advertising what is going on in this fantastic city over the next months.

There is only 26 days until Santa drops by, and there is a lot of stuff jam-packed into the city over those 26 days. As the LORD MAYOR mentioned last week, a little bit of gridlock in the city as he officially turned on Brisbane’s Christmas tree to start festivities, lined up with the Black Friday retail event as well. We had around 2,500 to 3,000 people came into the city to watch the turning on of the tree. So that is a very welcome number after the difficulties of the last 18 months. Keeping with our clean, green and sustainable Administration, the tree is powered entirely by solar, the biggest solar-powered Christmas tree in the southern hemisphere.

This year, the tree was assembled by a local Brisbane company who had the opportunity to put the tree together for the very first time, another fantastic example of our Local Buy policy working for Brisbane businesses. These are the types of contracts that we want to see and we are seeing in the awarding of our tenders. With such an outstanding tree, there’s also some outstanding facts there, too. Six tonnes, 22 metres tall to the top of the star, solar-powered with three‑kilowatt panels installed on the roof of the King George Square deck. There’s over 130 decorations, including chrome baubles, gold stars, candy canes and red bows, 8,640 multicoloured LED lights to hang on it as well.

So if you haven’t been in to see it in the evening, we might get a time at six o’clock tonight. However, please tell your residents to come in and your constituents to come in and spend some time in the city, because as of tomorrow, the Enchanted Garden will be on show from Roma Street Parklands, from the first day of summer again, which looks like it’s going to be a bit gloomy, but that’s not going to make a difference for an evening showing of the Enchanted Garden. Sixty-two thousand tickets have already been sold, and this is an event that gains in popularity each and every year.

Eight thousand square metres of lighting throughout the gardens, in the trees, through the shrubs, all of the plants. It is absolutely a sight to behold and always features every heavily on Facebook and Instagram and other social media, which is exactly what we want to see. We want to be known for fantastic opportunities in the Christmas season to come and visit us, whether it is across our State borders after 17 December and internationally, if they see it for next year as well.

Our deconstructed parades are continuing this year, pop-up activations and Christmas theme events right across the Queen Street Mall and Edward Street from the 3rd to the 24th, everything from carollers, acrobats, stilt walkers, roving Christmas characters and elves. The annual light show, projected from the 10th to the 24th on City Hall by Gold Lotto once again, another beloved family tradition after nine years of this operating. This year, the Christmas classic is *The Night Before Christmas*, which will be narrated by Robin Bailey as the visuals are projected on the building every night from seven o’clock ‘til 11pm every 15 minutes.

Another major event is the Lord Mayor’s Christmas Carols, taking place on 11 December, and as you heard from the LORD MAYOR, a time to get on your free festive public transport and come in and see the Christmas Carols. I think tickets go on sale tomorrow. This year, it’s being produced by Naomi Price and the Little Red Company, an upcoming Brisbane events company, which we’re very glad to see the new look which is going to show a cast of local legends: Kate Miller-Heidke, Sheppard, Troy and Jem Cassar-Daley, and Marcus Corowa. A reflection of the performance quality this year is that Channel Nine is actually broadcasting the entire show on Sunday 19 December.

The Parklands are putting on a show as well, outdoor cinema at River Quay, the family cinema at six o’clock, the adult version at 8.15. There is so much to see and do, don’t miss out. Right now, the Queen Street Mall is getting busier and busier, which is what we want to see. Sixty-three per cent of pre-COVID levels, but as we said last Friday, a huge boost on the biggest retail event now of the year, bigger than Boxing Day as well. That is what it is all about. It is about making sure that our businesses in the CBD are being supported, that we are a place to encourage people to come and play, eat and shop, because we are the most small business-friendly Council in Australia.

Chair: Thank you, DEPUTY MAYOR.

Further questions?

Councillor CASSIDY.

**Question 6**

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair. My question is to the Chair of the Finance Committee, Councillor CUNNINGHAM. As we have just heard over three projects, Kingsford Smith Drive, the Brisbane bendy-bus project, and the Indooroopilly roundabout upgrade project, this LNP Council has racked up more than half a billion dollars in cost blowouts. That’s $554 million of residents’ money that was wasted because this LNP LORD MAYOR can’t manage a project properly. You could build 554 locally-made electric articulated buses for the same value of that cost blowout.

That money could have been used not only to boost the public transport network, but to create hundreds, if not thousands, of local jobs over that time, but instead, this LNP LORD MAYOR throws half a billion dollars down the drain in cost blowouts and orders these electric buses from China. So, Councillor CUNNINGHAM, will you apologise to Brisbane residents for wasting their money and jacking up their rates to fund your mistakes?

Chair: Councillor CUNNINGHAM.

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: Thank you, Mr Chair, and I have to start by thanking the Leader of the Opposition for all of the questions on finance today. I mean, he clearly has an interest in finance, and I am pleased to be able to talk about our proud record in this portfolio because it is this Administration that does have a proud record when it comes to financial management of this city. In fact, if you look at the Labor Party’s record for the management of finances in this city, you’ll see not one, but four rate rises of over six per cent.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: So, I’m not about to be lectured on—from the Leader of the Opposition about financial management. Now, when it—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: Yes, it was Jim.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: Now, when it comes to this so-called blowout of Kingsford Smith Drive—this so‑called blowout, perhaps Councillor CASSIDY doesn’t pay a rates bill. Perhaps Councillor CASSIDY doesn’t receive a rates bill because he clearly didn’t notice the $29 rebate for the underspend of the Kingsford Smith Drive project, the underspend of that project. So perhaps Councillor CASSIDY, I don’t know, doesn’t receive a rates bill, doesn’t read his rates bill, I don’t know, hasn’t been listening, who knows?

Regardless, this Administration has a proud track record for financial management of this city. Now, of course there are changing market conditions, but we’re up for the challenge, and you know why we’re up for the challenge, Mr Chair? Because we are the team with experience.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: The easy thing to do would be to build nothing and do nothing, just like our friends in George Street, but we have a record infrastructure spend—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor GRIFFITHS.

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: —this financial year, and that spend is in our suburbs.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: Mr Chair, I’m happy to talk all day about the financial management from this side of the Chamber, and I think the Opposition has a little bit to learn.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor CUNNINGHAM.

Further questions?

Councillor TOOMEY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Oh, Chair?

Councillor TOOMEY: Thank you, Chair. My question—

Chair: Excuse me, Councillor TOOMEY.

Councillor CASSIDY.

**337/2021-22**

At that juncture, Councillor Jared CASSIDY moved, seconded by Councillor Charles STRUNK, that the Standing Rules be suspended to allow the moving of the following motion, that⎯

*The Lord Mayor apologise to Brisbane residents on behalf of his LNP administration for the gross mismanagement of their money and projects.*

Chair: Thank you, Councillor CASSIDY. You have three minutes to establish urgency.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair. This is urgent because we’ve just heard, we’ve just heard from the Chair of the Finance Committee of this LNP Council that they refuse to apologise for costing residents more than half a billion dollars in cost blowouts on just three projects alone, and there’s plenty more to count and there’s plenty more to come. Every single year that this LNP Administration is in charge, rates are going up, but services are going down out in our suburbs. Residents are paying more and more and getting less and less back in return.

The Kingsford Smith Drive project—costs blew out on the Kingsford Smith Drive project by up to $194 million. The Indooroopilly roundabout upgrade hasn’t even started and it’s blown out by $60 million. The Brisbane bendy-bus project has blown out by $300 million. Chair, that’s over half a billion dollars in cost blowouts for one project alone, and this is urgent, Chair, because that $554 million could have been used to purchase 554 locally-manufactured electric articulated buses. This is urgent because that $554 million could have been used to put a footpath on every single street in Brisbane, and that $554 million—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: Councillor MURPHY just said, they don’t want it. Councillor MURPHY just said, they don’t want basic services in their suburbs.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: Yes, that’s right. They’re not getting it. They’re not getting it from this Administration, Chair.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: $554 million could fund kerbside collection for 85 years, but instead, what—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: —but instead, what we saw from this LORD MAYOR, Chair, were cuts to basic services because of these cost blowouts, because of his hideous advertising bill. Residents expect their rates to be spent on services in the suburbs, not wasted on cost blowouts and mismanaged projects, LORD MAYOR. Far too often, we see this LORD MAYOR botching projects and draining the budget to fix his failures. His gross mismanagement of their money has not gone unnoticed, and at the very least, at the very least, today, the residents of Brisbane deserve an apology from this LORD MAYOR. Residents won’t get value for money for their rates until Labor is back in charge in City Hall, but for now—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: —but for now, at least, but for now, at least, they deserve an apology. For now, at least they deserve an acknowledgement that this LNP Administration’s eyewatering mistakes are costing this city big time and they should be very sorry about that, Chair.

Chair: Thank you.

We have a motion for the suspension of standing orders to allow this urgency motion.

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

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

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 6 - The Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Jared CASSIDY, and Councillors Kara COOK, Peter CUMMING, Steve GRIFFITHS, Charles STRUNK and Nicole JOHNSTON.

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

ABSTENTIONS: 1 - Councillor Jonathan SRI.

Chair: Thank you. We continue with Question Time.

Councillor TOOMEY, you had the floor.

**Question 7**

Councillor TOOMEY: Thank you, Chair. My question is to the Chair of City Standards Committee, Councillor MARX. Councillor MARX, as a subtropical city, Brisbane is about to head into another warm and wet summer. Can you please update the Chamber on what work is being done right across Brisbane to prepare our city for the upcoming season?

Chair: Councillor MARX.

Councillor MARX: Thank you for the question, Councillor TOOMEY, and thank you, Chair. As I’m sure you have heard, Mr Chair, last week, the Bureau of Meteorology officially declared we are in *La Niña* conditions, so wet and warm weather brings lots of changes to our city. In City Standards, there’s plenty of work to be done in preparing Brisbane for the summer season. One of the most noticeable changes is the grass growth, and in your own backyard, you are probably noticing, like I am, that the grass seems to grow back as soon as you cut it. The same thing happens in grassed areas like parks and roadsides right across our city, which is why this Administration has committed $20 million to this important service.

Once we hit the peak growing season, we schedule our regular grass cuts every fortnight, weather permitting. The significant amount of rain we are currently experiencing has caused some delays to the current grass cutting schedule. Mr Chair, just as you cannot mow your own backyard in the wet, we also can’t get our mowing done in the rain, and regular downpours saturate the ground, making it too wet for mowing equipment to access grassed areas, keeping in mind the contractors drive much heavier equipment than what we use in our own backyard, much, much heavier.

The residents can rest assured the teams are out at every possible opportunity, mowing whenever they can, and the grass cutting schedule is now in peak delivery, with both parks and roadsides on back-to-back fortnightly servicing. As you can imagine, the heavy rain also takes a toll on our road network, causing potholes of all shapes and sizes to appear, so last financial year, we responded to almost 80,000 pothole repairs, which is a testament to the resources we have in place quickly and to get the repairs done.

If you see a dangerous pothole that could cause damage to vehicles or cyclists following the rainfall, make sure you report it to Council so we can restore our roads to a smooth and safe condition as soon as possible. If we don’t know about it, we can’t fix it. At this point, I want to thank the Council officers that are out there in this atrocious weather—we’re all sitting here nice and dry—doing this work for us. Severe storms can start to occur in this part of the year and last right through until March, so the Schrinner Council is committed to keeping the city prepared by these events through measures like trimming trees and maintaining stormwater drainage.

I’d also like to make special mention of the officers within City Standards who contribute to our city’s disaster response. We have officers who proactively plan for disasters such as severe storms or flooding following the principles of prevent, prepare, respond and recover, so that the city can bounce back as quickly as it can from severe events. It’s also crucial that residents stay alert and prepare their families and properties for wild weather. There are plenty of practical steps residents can take. The best place to start is by removing excess leaf litter in roofs, gutters and downpipes, and ensure that trees on your own property are trimmed.

I’d also like to remind residents of our green waste recycling service, as now is a perfect time to make the most of the excess green waste produced by cleaning up your property. I have to say, my husband, particularly, enjoys every second week when it’s green bin because it means he has to mow the lawns the night before, and he does it every fortnight without fail. We have waived the establishment fee, making it easier to turn your property—to clean it up and to create valuable compost for gardens across the city. So, I’m so proud to be the Chair of this Committee, because as you can see, Mr Chair, City Standards is home of so many of the city’s core services, and it’s all about maintaining and enhancing Brisbane’s liveability.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor MARX.

Further questions?

Councillor COOK.

**Question 8**

Councillor COOK: Thank you, Mr Chair. My question is to the Chair of the Transport Committee, Councillor MURPHY. Councillor MURPHY, just last week, this LNP Administration released the findings of the Ferry Network Review. Despite repeated calls, petitions and submissions from Brisbane residents, the Norman Park ferry was not reinstated. This is the service that your LNP Council cut without any warning or community consultation. Today, we found out that Council officers were told specifically not to consider any submissions made about the reinstatement of the Norman Park ferry in the review.

Councillor MURPHY, who made this decision to exclude all submissions on the Norman Park ferry from the citywide ferry review? Was it you or the LORD MAYOR?

Chair: Councillor MURPHY.

Councillor MURPHY: Well, thank you, Chair, and I thank Councillor COOK for the question, but I don’t know how long Councillor COOK has been a Councillor in this place, but I’m pretty sure that the elected Administration of this city is able to make decisions about the ferry network and that is exactly what we did over a year ago when the Norman Park ferry was cancelled. We’ve been very clear. It was cancelled. It was used by one passenger per service, actually less than that. It was running between Norman Park and New Farm Park, more often than not carrying no passengers. It was one of the least patronised services in this city’s history.

In fact, Chair, it was cancelled on no fewer than two occasions by a previous Labor administration, who actually had the guts to make decisions about public transport spend in the interests of ratepayers at large. What do we have here and what have we seen over the last 12 months from Councillor COOK and Councillor CASSIDY on the Norman Park ferry? Absolute handwringing, absolute just dreadful scaremongering around the fact that we had taken away such a precious service from people who clearly, over more than a decade, were not using the service. We had this confected outrage and this fake campaign that continues to run around bringing back the Norman Park ferry.

Well, I can tell you, Chair, every dollar that we would invest in bringing back the Norman Park ferry is money that we would need to take away from reinvesting in services that Brisbane residents want to use. Councillor COOK, I have said in this place, and you have accused me of misleading people on it, that the Norman Park ferry would take anywhere between $5 million to $7 million to rebuild the terminal alone. That’s not including the operational costs, and yet the investment that we are making on an operational level to invest in the ferry network that we’ve just announced today, that the LORD MAYOR has just announced this week, is $2.6 million.

So, that is an investment that you would be asking us to take from the people of the City of Brisbane to invest in a service that was being used by less than one person per trip, and if that’s the kind of public transport platform that you want to stand up on and wave around as you head into the next election, Councillor COOK—

Chair: Excuse me, Councillor MURPHY.

Councillor MURPHY: —then go for it. I would be more than happy—

Chair: Excuse me, Councillor MURPHY.

Councillor COOK, you’ve got your hand up.

Councillor COOK: Thank you, Mr Chair. I’d appreciate if Councillor MURPHY would answer the question, who made that decision to exclude the Norman Park ferry, him or the LORD MAYOR?

Chair: It was a long question and Councillor MURPHY is answering the question.

Councillor MURPHY.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor MURPHY: Chair, I am answering the question, and the reality is that Council no longer operates a ferry between Norman Park and New Farm Park. The LORD MAYOR and I, when we announced that decision, were very clear that it was us who were making the decision based on advice from officers of the costs required to reinstate the terminal at the time and the extremely low level of patronage. Now, that was not an easy decision to make, but it was a decision that was based on patronage, not based on politics, and the decision will not change. It will not change. We cannot be more clearer than that. We do not run public transport—

Chair: Councillor MURPHY.

Councillor COOK—

Councillor MURPHY: —to make a profit, but it does need to have people using it for us to be able to support it, Chair.

Chair: Excuse me for a moment, Councillor MURPHY.

Councillor COOK, further—

Councillor COOK: Yes, Mr Chair. He still hasn’t answered the question. It’s not about when it was cut. We know that the entire LNP Administration is responsible for that. It was who made the decision to exclude the Norman Park ferry from the Ferry Network Review.

Chair: I believe Councillor MURPHY is answering the question.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor MURPHY: Chair, the reality was, terminals were excluded from the scope of the review right from the very outset. We always said that new terminals were excluded from the scope. We were looking at current services and how we could better augment them. The only new terminal that was coming into service that we already knew about was Howard Smith Wharves and the refurbished South Bank 1 and 2 terminals. So, Councillor COOK, if you’d bothered to make a submission on this, if you’d bothered to read the webpage that explains the scope of the review, you might have learnt that. That was literally on Council’s website.

When it comes to the Ferry Network Review, if you went to make a submission, you would have read, this is what’s in the scope, this is what’s outside the scope. So I’m disappointed, but I’m not surprised that you haven’t bothered to participate in the process again, and you’ve come in here and you’re asking questions and you’re making spurious points.

Chair: One—excuse me, Councillor MURPHY.

One last time, Councillor COOK.

Councillor COOK: Mr Chair, thank you, and I did make a submission, if Councillor MURPHY had bothered to look at the submissions around the Norman Park ferry, so I did do the consultation. So, I’m just concerned he’s misleading the Chamber there, but again, who made that decision around the terms of reference, him or the LORD MAYOR?

Chair: Councillor MURPHY, I think you have been answering the question. Do you want to add to your response?

Councillor MURPHY: Look, Chair, I can’t help that Councillor COOK doesn’t like the answer to the question, but I have provided the answer on many occasions. Councillor COOK, you are more than welcome to blame the LORD MAYOR and blame me for the decision, as you have done since the very start.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor MURPHY: It doesn’t matter. It doesn’t matter. It doesn’t really matter what I say in the Chamber, what, you know—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor MURPHY: So, Councillor COOK will say what she needs to say out there in the community. That was the case just the other week, Chair, when one of the ferries doing cross‑river services—

Chair: Councillor MURPHY, your time has expired.

Councillor MURPHY: Oh, thank you, Chair.

Chair: Further questions?

Councillor LANDERS.

**Question 9**

Councillor LANDERS: My question is to the Chair of the Community, Arts and Nighttime Economy Committee, Councillor HOWARD. Councillor HOWARD, late last week, we announced the new class of emerging musicians to undertake our popular music program, The QUBE Effect. Can you outline how our brightest musicians benefit from training and mentoring as part of this program?

Chair: Councillor HOWARD.

Councillor HOWARD: Well, thank you, Mr Chair, and through you, thank Councillor LANDERS for the question. I know that she has a keen interest in how the Schrinner Council supports our creative sector and our emerging artists. So, since 2015, Brisbane City Council has delivered The QUBE Effect, a contemporary youth music program that provides performance, promotional and professional development opportunities to emerging and professional young Brisbane musicians aged 12 to 25 years.

Now, in its eighth year, the program creates pathways for young artists and focuses on retaining talent within our city. It accomplishes this by providing real opportunities for young people to access Council programs, contribute to our city and achieve their future aspirations. The competition showcases and promotes Brisbane’s young and emerging musicians and builds sustainable partnerships between Council, the music industry and young and emerging artists.

Since its launch, The QUBE Effect has fostered a platform for Brisbane’s young artists to take their careers to the next level. This year, after assessing a pool of more than 60 qualified applicants, we have announced the finalists for The QUBE Effect 2022. Twenty-four Brisbane-based artists have been selected as finalists for the 2022 program, which will run over six months from December 2021, and enhance the skills and career opportunities of all those who are part of the program.

From indie pop and surf rock to folk, hip-hop and electronic, The QUBE Effect finalists for 2022 represent Brisbane’s diverse music scene and the incredible talent our city is famous for. When it comes to the training and mentoring opportunities, there are several ways in which The QUBE Effect finalists are supported. As part of being selected as a finalist for The QUBE Effect, the 24 finalists will receive one-on-one mentoring with some of Brisbane’s most talented and experienced music professionals, live performance coaching, recording studio time and coaching, experience filming a music video, and marketing, branding and public relations coaching.

These really are some invaluable ways that The QUBE Effect finalists are supported to develop their musical talents, helped in no small part to the dedication of the musical professionals that offer their time and support to Brisbane’s young and emerging artists. Industry experts and world-renowned musicians such as Powderfinger band members, Ian Haug and John Collins, will play a role this year in supporting The QUBE Effect finalists as expert panellists in the program.

In addition, The QUBE Effect alumni, Hope D, will also be a part of this year’s expert panel, after having completed the program herself in 2019. She’s an amazing artist, having recently taken home prizes in the 2021 Queensland Music Awards, and she speaks very highly about the positive impact The QUBE Effect has had on her musical career. When asked about The QUBE Effect, Hope D has said, the legacy of participating in this program is ongoing for me.

Through The QUBE Effect, I had the opportunity to meet so many industry people and participate in professional development that I otherwise would not have had access to. The mentoring and workshops helped me refine what my goals and priorities were and attain some practical knowledge on how to pursue them. Hearing such positive feedback, along with seeing the talented artists supported by The QUBE Effect program go on to national and international acclaim, is something that the Schrinner Council is tremendously proud of.

Another positive outcome of The QUBE Effect is seeing finalists perform at events and venues across Brisbane, and to have their creative talent recognised on a national level. While the past two years has been particularly challenging for the arts and creative industry, it’s very heart-warming to see and hear QUBE Effect alumni performing across a number of different platforms over the past 12 months. As an example, six QUBE Effect alumni performed as part of Brisbane Festival’s Street Serenades program this year, those being Beddy Rays, Evangie, Fresco Kyoto, Hello Jane, Luatè and MVP.

When the decision was made for the City of Brisbane to proudly host the 2032 Olympic Games, it was The QUBE Effect artists Oh Bailey, KAI-FI and Tripsitta performing for the crowd at South Bank. Now, regarding events in the heart of Brisbane’s entertainment precinct, Fortitude Valley, we’ve had a number of The QUBE Effect alumni perform at both BIGSOUND and Valley Fiesta over the years, always putting on new and exciting performances for the crowds.

In addition, a total of three QUBE Effect alumni placed on Triple J’s *Hottest 100* this year, often described as the world’s greatest music democracy. It’s always wonderful to hear about the successes of our QUBE Effect artists and the impact this program has on the lives and careers of all those involved.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor HOWARD. Your time has expired, and that ends Question Time.

LORD MAYOR, Establishment and Coordination Committee report, please.

## CONSIDERATION OF COMMITTEE REPORTS:

### ESTABLISHMENT AND COORDINATION COMMITTEE

The Right Honourable, the LORD MAYOR (Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER), Chair of the Establishment and Coordination Committee, moved, seconded by the DEPUTY MAYOR (Councillor Krista ADAMS), that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 22 November 2021, be adopted.

Chair: LORD MAYOR, any debate?

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

**Seriatim for debate and voting - Clause F**

|  |
| --- |
| At that time Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON rose and requested that Clause F, MEETINGS AMENDING LOCAL LAW 2021, be taken seriatim for debating and voting purposes. |

**Seriatim *en bloc* for debate and voting - Clauses C and D**

|  |
| --- |
| Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON requested that Clause C, TAILORED AMENDMENT TO *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014* – LONG TERM INFRASTRUCTURE PLANS AMENDMENT 1B; and Clause D, REVIEW AND AMENDMENT TO *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014* – LOCAL GOVERNMENT INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN – AMENDMENT 1B, be taken seriatim *en bloc* for debating and voting purposes. |

Chair: Thank you.

LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair. Before I move on to other items, I just wanted to make an interesting observation about the Question Time. Time and time again, we see the Leader of the Opposition making statements and not actually asking any questions, and time and time again, he gets owned by Councillor CUNNINGHAM, and owned—just like Councillor COOK got owned by Councillor MURPHY. I really—like, I really don’t see where they’re going with any of this.

To talk about imaginary cost blowouts, for example, Kingsford Smith Drive, where the project came in under budget by $15 million, yet just up the road in their own State Government, happening right now, we see things like a $1.2 billion increase in Cross River Rail, $1.2 billion increase. So, the cost overrun in Cross River Rail could fund pretty much the entire Brisbane Metro project. That’s just the cost overrun, and that’s what we know of right now.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: So, you know, that’s not the only thing that’s happening up the road. We discovered just in September that the Coomera Connector project blew out by $600 million, 600 million for one project. It’s interesting because when you hear what Labor says in this place, they claim that this is mismanagement, but what does Minister Bailey say about that? It says here in a local media article in the *Gold Coast Bulletin*, ‘the State Government blames increased costs on the construction boom which has spun out of the pandemic and has led to shortages of building materials, which is being blamed for the blowout’. It’s a quote from Mr Bailey. ‘We have been caught in the middle of an unprecedented boom in investment and infrastructure projects across Australia’.

So, if you ask the State Government why their projects are increasing in cost, oh, it’s just a big boom. It’s part of a big boom and we’re having supply issues. Building materials are hard to get. You know what? Those points made by Minister Bailey are actually legitimate points, but it seems that they’re not legitimate when it comes to Brisbane City Council. So, you can see the double standards and hypocrisy here, but the reality is, almost every single project large and small is under pressure at the moment. It sometimes comes down to the availability of really basic things. It might be the availability of timber. It might be the availability of steel. It might be the availability of tradies, which are incredibly hard to find at the moment.

So, all of these things are putting significant pressure on a range of projects at all three levels of government. So, the Opposition can try and play politics with this sort of stuff, but the reality is, every level of government is facing challenges, but I then go back to the Kingsford Smith Drive project, where the project was delivered under budget by 15 million, and yet Labor Party keeps saying again and again that it was over budget. It’s just wrong. It’s just plain wrong.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: It was a fixed price contract. We always made that clear, and it came in $15 million under our budget, but, you know, anyway, they’ll keep saying what they say, just like we see Councillor COOK continuing to say whatever she wants to say, regardless of what the actual facts of the matter are. Now, when it came to the issue of the Norman Park ferry, Councillor MURPHY answered the question three or four times. We’ve been very upfront with the people in that part of Brisbane, saying we’re sorry, but the Norman Park ferry is not coming back.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: We’ve been very, very clear. It’s not coming back. I mean, I don’t know how clear we could be about this. We made a decision. We stand by that decision. It was the right decision, and as Councillor MURPHY pointed out, the decision was based on the people of Norman Park voting with their feet and not using the service that they had. It was as simple as that. Less than one person per trip. So now, to suggest that there’s somehow been a change of our position, no. Nothing’s changed.

We haven’t changed our position, we made it clear, but what we’ve been able to do is, because we’re not putting good money after bad in a service that nobody uses to upgrade a ferry terminal that nobody would use, we’re able to invest more money into the network, $2.6 million into extra services per annum that we’ve just announced. So, we’ve been able to do that in the areas where people actually use the services, to boost services, an extra 45 regular services a week, the new NightCats.

We have seen a new terminal that will come online in Howard Smith Wharves and be connected into the ferry network. We’re seeing the upgraded terminal at South Bank nearing completion as well. So, two new terminals coming online, new services, extra services, better frequency, all based on the feedback of the people of Brisbane. So, we will continue to make the sometimes-challenging decisions that we need to make to get a better outcome for the people of Brisbane.

That also includes stepping up when the State Government fails, and that is in areas like the public transport free bus travel initiative. They could have done that themselves, but they didn’t. So we’re happy to step up and lead the way on these sorts of things, just like we’re happy to step up on Brisbane Metro and lead the way and we’re happy to step up on the ferry network and lead the way. So, we do have a very clear position which is to continue to increase public transport services, to continue to invest more in sustainable travel options like new green bridges and bikeway connections and e-mobility, and all of those things which the people of Brisbane are jumping onboard with.

At the same time, we’ll continue to upgrade to make sure our road network is safter. The Indooroopilly roundabout upgrade is one of those examples, and then the flow on Indooroopilly—sorry, Moggill Road corridor upgrade, a big benefit of that upgrade is increased safety for motorists and pedestrians and cyclists. So, that will help deliver a better outcome, not just in terms of the capacity of the network, but also the safety of the network.

So we will continue to be focused, in a laser-like way, on improving things or making things better, and that’s the essence of what we continue to do. Yet, we see Labor as an Opposition floundering around with no direction, making statements rather than asking questions, and we see them continuing to say things that are just not backed up by the facts, things like—about what they say on the Kingsford Smith Drive project, which is just plain wrong, but guess what? The people of Brisbane know it’s wrong, too, because they got the discount on their rates. I’ve got to say, the feedback about Kingsford Smith Drive has been wonderful, wonderful.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Councillor McLACHLAN, I know you had some challenging times during construction, but the reality is, it’s been a fantastic outcome. Wouldn’t you believe, it wouldn’t be possible to have the Olympic Village at Hamilton Northshore if we hadn’t upgraded Kingsford Smith Drive. So, that was a project that showed foresight and has enabled an amazing opportunity for that part of Brisbane, but also serves as a wonderful gateway into the city.

Moving on to the lighting of Council assets, this Wednesday we’re lighting up City Hall in red and green for—what’s the colours of red and green? Christmas, the festive season.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: So—maybe that too, maybe that too. By the way, that offer to join the LNP still stands, Councillor CUMMING. Now, has someone got a membership form handy? We can print one off now. I think we’ll let that offer go for the last two meetings of Council as a good standing offer. Councillor CUMMING, it’s for the festive season and maybe also for your local club, so we’ll be lighting up the city assets tomorrow night, City Hall in red and green for the festive season.

Wednesday also marks World AIDS Day, and this day aims to raise awareness in the Queensland community about HIV/AIDS, including the need for support and understanding of people living with HIV/AIDS as well as education and prevention initiatives. Story Bridge and Victoria Bridge, Reddacliff Place sculptures and Tropical Dome at Mt Coot-tha will be lit up in red on Wednesday to show our support.

Friday is International Day for People with Disability, and that’s held on 3 December each year and it’s a day aimed at increasing public awareness and understanding and acceptance of people with a disability. This year’s theme is seeing the ability in disability, and it aims to challenge the perceptions and common stereotypes of Australians living with disability. To show our support, we’re lighting up the Tropical Dome, Victoria Bridge, Story Bridge and Reddacliff Place sculptures in blue, green and orange on Friday.

Chair: LORD MAYOR, your time has expired.

**338/2021-22**

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

Chair: LORD MAYOR, a further 10 minutes.

LORD MAYOR: Now, moving to the items in front of me. So, I can deal with item A, B, E. That’s correct, Mr Chair?

Chair: Yes.

LORD MAYOR: A, B and E, okay. Item A relates to the SCP (significant contracting plan) for grass cutting. This Administration continues to invest record amounts into grass cutting to make sure we provide a higher standard of service for the people of Brisbane, and in fact, it was over successive budgets that our side of politics increased the level of grass cutting across our city. Now, the only way or the best way to see how that standard exceeds other standards is to go and see what it’s like on a State Government‑controlled road.

You will see the clear difference in the standard of service between what we provide and what the State Government provides on their roads, and there are certain parts of Brisbane where that’s very, very clear. What we’re doing now is making sure we go out for a contracting plan to maintain more than 73,000 hectares of land across the city. That includes both parkland and roadsides as well. This financial year alone, we’ve committed more than $20 million to making sure we keep the grass cut in our much-loved public spaces and roadsides.

This SCP will seek a panel of suppliers for the maintenance of grass right across our city and, as I said, both in parks and across roads, we have an incredible amount of greenspace across the city and more than 2,100 parks, and also 5,700 kilometres of roadway across the city. The tenderer will seek submissions from both commercial operators and social enterprises to make sure we’re supporting a range of suppliers in our community. The other thing that’s interesting and new in this particular submission is the opportunity to gear up electric grass cutting equipment and electric mowing equipment. I know that Councillor MARX will speak about that a little bit more—

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Will the LORD MAYOR take a question?

Chair: The LORD MAYOR, will you take a question?

LORD MAYOR: No.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: So, with the development of electric grass cutting technology, you know, we see more and more people using electric mowers in their own backyards, and there’s also emerging and improving technology when it comes to the more commercial types of grass cutting equipment that are electric. There’s some benefits there. There’s some benefits in terms of lower noise levels and there’s also some benefits in terms of the level of pollution at source that is caused by this equipment. We know that certain types of grass cutting equipment can put out some emissions, in terms of both noise and pollution, and the electric equipment is a good alternative. We’re looking at exploring those opportunities, particularly in some of the inner‑city areas where there’s more of a sensitivity to noise-related issues.

So, we have a tender process that will be completed in two stages. Open market assessment, to gauge suppliers who may be interested in submitting a tender and nominating their capabilities, and then tenderers will be shortlisted in this process, but not required to agree yet to contract conditions. The second phase will be that the shortlisted respondents will be asked to submit a formal tender, which includes firm pricing and methodology. The estimated expenditure is up to 84 million over the potential five-year period.

Item B is the annual credit review of Brisbane City Council undertaken by the Queensland Treasury Corporation, and once again, we continue to have a strong credit rating from the QTC, which has been an ongoing thing and something we should all be proud of, because there’s a couple of things you should know. Not only do we have, if not the strongest amongst the strongest ratings of any council, we are one of the few Councils that actually puts our credit review on the record. If you ask other Councils to show you their credit review, you’ll have real trouble finding where that document exists in the public realm.

So, we will continue to practise the principles of responsible financial management and to make sure that we’re using our balance sheet effectively to invest in the future of our city by building infrastructure, but also by investing record amounts in the suburbs. This year alone, more than 80% or 86% of our budget was spent in the suburbs of Brisbane. So, we’re proud of that, and we will continue to do that and responsibly manage our city’s finances as we have continued to do consistently. The next item was E, was it, Mr Chair?

Chair: Yes, item E.

LORD MAYOR: That’s right. This one is the update to the Health, Safety and Amenity Local Law, commonly known as HSALL. So, this is the version which is the 2021 version and replaces the 2009 version of the local law. Now, when HSALL was first introduced, it was delving into areas that Council previously hadn’t before, and they were very much about giving Council a little bit more oomph when it came to dealing with suburban amenity issues. This was based on clear feedback from the community that there were issues in their local neighbourhood that, under the previous laws, Council didn’t have the ability to address.

So, in 2009, with the first Health, Safety and Amenity Local Law, we got the ability to deal with some more of those suburban amenity issues on a proactive basis. So, that’s been a positive thing, but this is about some further tweaks to the legislation in order to be responsive to the needs of the community. In the new law, there are several key changes that are designed to help make our city cleaner, safer and more liveable. The new law will help us get to work cleaning up our city by bringing in provisions for abandoned shopping trolleys, graffiti removal and the distribution of when people are putting print materials onto the footpath, rather than into the letterbox, which obviously is a form of littering.

We’ve also expanded the list of unsightly objects, materials and vegetation, not only to uphold the amenity of our city, but to make sure it’s safe for all residents. New requirements around the construction of electric fences will also contribute to the safety of our city as well as the provisions for camping on roads, maintenance of swimming pools, wading pools and ponds. We’ve also removed the regulatory framework around abandoned vehicles from another local law, as these requirements contribute to keeping our city clean and safe, and are much better in line with the aim of the HSALL.

So requirements have been moved from another local law into the HSALL, so just to clarify what’s happened there. We also have listened to the people of Brisbane when it comes to their desire to fire up the braziers and firepits at home, particularly during winter, and after a trial that started last year, has continued on. We’ve allowed that to continue going, obviously, putting some requirements around it in terms of safety, smoke nuisance and having clear requirements that if you’re going to take advantage of the opportunity to have a firepit or brazier in your backyard or on your property, that you need to do so in a way that doesn’t cause a nuisance to those around you.

If you are causing a nuisance, then this is where the HSALL law kicks in. There’s provisions to make sure that those things are dealt with. The commencement date on this new local law is 1 February 2022. Public consultation was held between 17 June and 7 July. Seventy-two submissions were received, 60 of those were on firepits, and 11 were on camping on roads, 9 State Government submissions were also received. So, I commend these three items to the Chamber.

Chair: Thank you, LORD MAYOR.

Further debate on items A, B and E?

Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks, Chair.

**Seriatim - Clause A**

|  |
| --- |
| Councillor Jared CASSIDY requested that Clause A, STORES BOARD SUBMISSION – SIGNIFICANT CONTRACTING PLAN FOR GRASS CUTTING SERVICES, be taken seriatim for voting purposes. |

Councillor CASSIDY: Yes, thanks. So, just starting on A, the SCP for grass cutting services—

Chair: Thank you, Google.

Councillor CASSIDY: How responsive. So, Chair—

Chair: Sorry, Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: So, Chair, this work should and could be done more in-house. This is an $84 million contract over the next five years, and cutting grass in public places, whether that’s parks or on footpaths for those that need it most, is one of the most basic and ongoing services that a Council can provide out in the suburbs. Having this kind of work done through an arrangement of secure, in-house work would create hundreds of permanent in-house Council jobs and would give hundreds of families a secure income for years to come, but again, we see this LNP Mayor wanting to contract out these basic services to the lowest bidder, casualising Brisbane’s workforce even more. This leads to insecure employment, poor working conditions, and increased risks for workers here in Brisbane.

Speaking of risks, when you look at this contract, it is plagued with them. There’s a high risk the tenderers won’t have the right mowers or equipment. Does that sound familiar to anyone in this Chamber?

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: The LNP have a track record on awarding contracts to contractors that don’t own any mowers, and then have to sub out that work to other subcontractors, and making their work more insecure and making those outcomes worse for the people of Brisbane and those workers, of course. There’s a significant risk of unsustainability pricing and even a risk that there will be a poor quality of service. That’s a no-brainer, given this LNP Administration’s track record on these contracts.

All this could be avoided, Chair, if this work was brought in-house and Council hired permanent employees to complete this work. Given we know this is ongoing, given we know that there is a schedule for grass cutting in every public park and in every suburb, this is something that can be planned for and managed internally.

Queensland Treasury Corporation’s credit review. This is, of course, a credit review that is based on information that Council tells the Treasury Corporation. So, this LNP Administration provides certain information to the Queensland Treasury Corporation, and they provide a review on that information that is provided to them by this LNP Administration. The positive outlook that the LORD MAYOR talks about is based on this LNP Council’s ability to jack up rates and cover the enormous waste of ratepayers’ and residents’ money. Now, we know that this LNP Administration has a track record of jacking up rates year on year to cover their mismanagement, and that’s why the Treasury knows they are capable of doing it.

They have a track record of doing it, therefore the Treasury says you have a proven track record of increasing rates to cover your debt, to cover cost blowouts on projects as they come. They know there are cost blowouts coming and they know that they have the ability and the track record to jack up rates to cover it. It does mention there that Council has a large and diverse ratepayer base, and that is the favourable factor in its credit rating. So, all this—I thought that was an interjection for me, but Councillor OWEN was giving Councillor CUNNINGHAM some notes to speak later, yes?

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: You have the floor, Councillor CASSIDY. Please use it.

Councillor CASSIDY: So all Councillor SCHRINNER sees when he sends out rates bills, Chair, are the dollar signs for more self-promotion at residents’ expenses.

Councillor WINES: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor WINES.

Councillor WINES: Just for my own understanding, I was of the understanding that item B was being taken seriatim?

Chair: No.

Councillor WINES: It wasn’t seriatim?

Chair: A, B and E together.

Councillor WINES: B and C seriatim for debate and vote?

Chair: A, B and E together for debate—

Councillor WINES: Thank you.

Chair: —A for seriatim for voting.

Councillor WINES: I misheard. Thank you.

Chair: Yes.

Councillor CASSIDY: Despite this so-called strong credit rating, Chair, the LNP Mayor didn’t offer any financial support to the people of Brisbane, as they navigated the worst of this pandemic. In fact, he did the very opposite. He froze the wages of Council workers. He cut grants to community funds, and he refused our calls on this side, Labor’s calls to support small businesses through repeated lockdowns this year, and cut basic community services like kerbside collection. So, it’s all well and good to have a so-called shining credit rating based on information that you provide the QTC yourself, but if you’re not willing to use it when the chips are down and the people of this city need help, then what kind of leader is this LORD MAYOR, Chair?

On Clause E, the Health, Safety and Amenity Local Law, this local law includes changes to various things, but mainly, apparently, it’s about the introduction of firepits. This is a local law that this LORD MAYOR Adrian SCHRINNER wrote on the back of a napkin and introduced, initially without any prior thought or consultation, and we are led to believe that the initial consultation was done in the form of a Facebook poll. So, this LNP Mayor’s idea of genuine community consultation is a Facebook poll, and it’s interesting to note that, when I went and looked at the file, I would expect it would be an extensive file about changing a local law. There is nothing about that Facebook poll on file whatsoever.

So, the official reason for introducing the local law remains an official mystery. So, the record for time immemorial now, going forward, for the reason for these changes to the local law, particularly around firepits initially—and the consultation around them does not exist on file. So, the LORD MAYOR went out and said he had done initial consultation and he had listened to the people of Brisbane through a Facebook poll, but that is nowhere to be seen.

That does not exist anymore, Chair, which is an unacceptable, unprofessional and disrespectful way to treat the people of Brisbane, I think, but then again, what have we come to expect from this LNP Administration who ignores, berates and threatens residents who speak out against their rulings in here? Of the 59 properly made submissions regarding firepits, 59 were against the local law to allow them, and some of the peak health organisations who have weighed in included the Lung Foundation of Australia, the Centre for Air Quality, Energy and Health Research, Clean Air Wynnum, which we heard from, I think it was last week, Environmental Health Australia, Clean Air Australia, and Asthma Australia.

Asthma Australia stated they had numerous members of the public contact them about increased asthma symptoms due to the relaxation of enforcement on firepits and braziers last year, and that local law hurts the most vulnerable in our community who are already dealing with the effects of COVID-19. The Lung Foundation said firepits and braziers create an unacceptable public health risk, and the proposed local law fails to comply with the stated objective to protect the standards of community health and safety.

There have been a number of submissions made directly from residents, as well, that are on file and in the papers we have before us today. Some are concerned about the inability to regulate the types of materials that people are burning and how the effects of smoke may be exacerbated in densely populated areas, and others worry about their children’s chronic health issues being made worse by smoke. Residents with asthma and other lung conditions are seriously worried, as well, in their submissions.

So it’s all very well to introduce firepits into this local law off the back of a Facebook poll, but what we want to know and the assurances we are seeking is how does Council intend to regulate these backyard fires in the real world? In the real world, not just in the comments that the LORD MAYOR says in this Chamber today and says that there are regulations in place in this local law, but how will this actually be regulated in the real world? So, how will a Council officer investigate a smoke complaint and deem it to be okay or not in the real world on the day that they attend a backyard fire?

What is the minimal flame height and how do Council officers expect to be measuring that? What are they being given in terms of those tools? How will the smoke nuisance be defined in a way that can be quantified and measured by compliance officers? Council officers can’t control the way in which the wind blows, of course. Will Council officers run around putting out fires if the next‑door neighbour suffers from a lung condition? These are genuine questions. How will the complaints system work? Complaints for lighting fires and backyard burning increased by 30% in the 2019-20 financial year of this trial. How were those complaints addressed? We are—that’s not clear yet.

So, there are many, many unanswered questions around the practical applicability of a local law like this going forward. We understand firepits are popular and their use has exploded, but the regulation does need to be tight and the parameters in which our Council officers work need to be very clear for their benefit and for the benefit of residents right around Brisbane, so we see time and time again this LNP Mayor and his Administration are very arrogant around so many things like rushing out to announce something new to get publicity without actually doing the homework to ensure that the right decision is made for the people of Brisbane, and we saw that yesterday.

This LNP Mayor put up a Facebook post confirming that the local law change had happened yesterday before it even came to Council for a vote or any debate here in this Chamber, Chair.

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY, your time has expired.

**339/2021-22**

At that point, Councillor Jared CASSIDY was granted an extension of time on the motion of Councillor Steve GRIFFITHS, seconded by Councillor Charles STRUNK.

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY, a further 10 minutes.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair. So, to rush out and announce something like that publicly is indeed a very arrogant way, and it worries you to think that this was all concocted to get the LORD MAYOR some attention and some publicity, because at the time that people sort of realised, you know, during 2020 that these things weren’t legal and they weren’t regulated, the LORD MAYOR thought he saw an opportunity to get some publicity out of this, so jumped all over it. He’s done it again yesterday, without following the proper processes through here in City Hall.

So that just confirms, Chair, I think, that the LORD MAYOR doesn’t care much about the democratic process of Council when it comes to these things. It’s just like—there’s countless examples of that, rushing out e-scooters, the bendy bus project, the green bridges. The list goes on in announcing these things before they are properly thought out and before they are properly planned. So, this new local law needs to be subject to constant reviews to make sure it stays in line with community expectations, particularly around regulating something that can cause harm and danger to people.

I understand the intent and I’m sure that the City Legal Office and Council officers who have drafted this law would certainly have tried to take that into account, but as these things evolve and as the effects of firepits and their use in an ongoing way, that needs to be constantly reviewed and not in the timeframe that we’ve seen previously from 2009 through to 2021. This needs to be done with much more regularity.

So, that is, I suppose, the parameters in which we will be supporting this local law and putting all that on record, that this is a big change in Council regulating something that can be harmful and dangerous, and that needs to be subject to genuine feedback from the community in an ongoing way and constant reviews of that, as well. We do see in this local law, as well, the regulation finally of electric fences in public places, and we all remember—I think it was last year, this is the clean up that mess from Councillor OWEN section of the local law, where that electric fence out in that community there zapped that little girl, and the response we saw from the local LNP Councillor—could have been killed.

That person could have been killed, and the response we saw from that local LNP Councillor and this Administration was arrogance once again, to blame everyone else, to blame people for coming into contact with those dangerous devices that should never have been allowed, should never have been allowed to be bordering a public park. So Council, you know, continues to ignore these problems, continues to neglect the suburbs, and then has to come in and mop these things up after the fact, and much after the fact. So, that’s—it’s good that that’s finally being tidied up. It certainly shouldn’t have taken some bad press and some almost fatal outcomes to make sure that that was tidied up in this local law, as well.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor CASSIDY.

Further debate on items A, B and E?

Councillor DAVIS.

Councillor DAVIS: Oh, well, thank you very much, Mr Chair, and I rise to speak on item E, the proposed Health, Safety and Amenity Local Law 2021, and specifically to the amendments relating to firepits and braziers. Can I start by assuring the Chamber that our Council officers are quite capable of doing their job? A toolkit is currently being developed, noting of course that this local law doesn’t come into effect until 1 February, so they’ll be quite able to go out if there are complaints received through the call centre and be able to deal with those issues.

Mr Chair, the Schrinner Council is committed to making Brisbane’s suburbs even better, and last year, during the COVID lockdown, residents were looking for more things to see and do closer to home, and in this case, literally in their own backyard. The LORD MAYOR understood this, and we as an Administration understood this, and that’s why we’ve decided to take a more common-sense approach to the use of firepits as part of a three-month trial in 2020. After the trial concluded, we reviewed an enormous amount of feedback. We had 6,000 responses on Facebook, over 1,000 letters and emails, and nearly 2,000 petition signatures.

Mr Chair, the feedback was overwhelmingly in favour of allowing backyard firepits and braziers to continue. We received over 96% support for allowing firepits from over 7,000 respondents on Facebook. We had nearly 2,000 signatures on Council petitions, both for and against firepits, and nearly 95% of the signatures were in favour. Even in the emails and letters, of which there were over 1,000, over two-thirds of those received were in favour.

So, following that strong support for the trial, we announced that the relaxed restrictions would remain in place until the review of this local law had been completed. Under the previous local law, backyard burning of any kind, apart from the specific purpose of cooking food, was not legally permitted except in rural areas. Under this amendment, residents in suburban areas may have small, safe fires in a firepit or brazier, raised off the ground, for purposes of heating or, of course, for social gatherings.

The local law also does not permit the use of unsuitable containers such as reused chemical drums for backyard fires or for the fire to have direct contact with the ground. Through the public consultation, Council also received submissions from residents and organisations in regard to the impacts of smoke. Council has made it very clear in the local law that, where smoke is causing an impact to residents, Council will investigate and take the appropriate action. To reduce smoke, residents are encouraged to use dry, clean, untreated wood or smokeless fuels such as gas, ethanol or charcoal.

Council will continue to monitor any smoke complaints as received in accordance with the *Environmental Protection Act 1994*. Importantly, as we head into summer, firepits and braziers must never be used when a fire ban has been announced by Queensland Fire and Emergency Services. Council’s website features tips on how to maintain a safe fire with minimal smoke impacts and a good neighbour letter to assist residents in talking to their neighbours about fire and smoke. Council also encourages constant adult supervision of fires, and that all fires be extinguished with water to protect children.

I was very pleased that Council was able to work with Kidsafe Queensland to co‑produce a video to provide residents tips to keep children safe around outdoor fires. We’ve also included child safety advice in fact sheets, also available on our website. Mr Chair, we’ve worked hard to strike the right balance with this local law, and we look forward to residents being able to use their firepits and braziers without causing effect and nuisance to others. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor DAVIS.

Further debate on items A, B and E?

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes. I was hoping that Councillor MARX was going to stand up and speak to this item. She—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, well, she said she was going to earlier, but hasn’t done so yet. Now, I’d like to speak on items A, B and E, and I’ll start with item A. The LORD MAYOR has left the Chamber, so he’s not here for debate on the own portfolio responsibilities, and that is a regular occurrence in this place. He can’t even be bothered to stay in the Chamber for the first part of the meeting. He refused to answer a question earlier today, and the question that I have—

DEPUTY MAYOR: Point of order, Mr Chair.

Chair: Yes, DEPUTY MAYOR.

DEPUTY MAYOR: To the items A, B and E before—

Chair: Yes. Councillor JOHNSTON, can you return to the agenda items before us, please?

Councillor JOHNSTON: The agenda items are that the LORD MAYOR of this city has presented a report and then abandoned it. That’s what’s happened.

Chair: That’s not on the agenda, Councillor JOHNSTON. You know the rules.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Well, technically, it is.

Chair: Please talk to the—talk to the—what’s on the agenda, please.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, well, it does say that in here, and the LORD MAYOR did move the motion, so, you know, it’s my understanding—you think he’s irrelevant, perhaps—

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Anyway, the LORD MAYOR stood up earlier today and refused to take a question, and I actually have, I think, a pretty genuine question about item A. It’s a very unusual thing, and it has been in previous mowing contracts, but why are mowing contracts let by ward? Why are they let by ward? What’s the point? We don’t operate by ward in terms of how this Council is managed. Councillor MARX has gone to great effort to completely dismantle how this city operates in terms of its operational services across the city, and yet, for some reason, this Council is selecting mowing contractors on the basis of ward, not region, not suburb, not district, not geographic features, but by ward.

So, it’s a genuine question. Why is that the case? I know this is problematic because, in my ward, we have very difficult areas to mow, and we don’t get a lot of tenders coming forward to mow those areas. I think it was the last time that mowing—this is about the fourth or fifth lot of mowing contracts that have come through since I started as a Councillor—that we don’t get many bidders to mow in my ward. That’s a noted risk in this contract. It’s actually—this is a medium risk in this contract, that we may not get tenderers to come forward and mow.

So, my question to the LORD MAYOR is, why aren’t we putting forward geographic areas that are related to each other that make sense in terms of the areas that need to be managed as part of the tender? Why are we offering up wards? So, you know, in some areas, that means that there might be a mowing contractor on the eastern side of Ipswich Road in Annerley, but it’s a different mowing contractor on the western side of Ipswich Road, Annerley. Many others—Oxley is divided into four, into four different Councillors. Councillor HUTTON, Councillor GRIFFITHS, Councillor STRUNK, and myself.

Now, Councillors can’t direct the mowing contractors on what to do, so again, the legitimate question is, why are mowing contracts being let by ward? It’s an irrelevant delivery mechanism from a Council point of view. It’s a genuine question. I would really like someone to tell me. Why is it not suburb? Why is it not area? I mean, we’ve even abolished the areas. There’s no north, south, east, west, and central anymore, so they’re gone.

There’s only north and south, so why aren’t there mowing contractors on the northside and mowing contractors on the southside? I’m very interested in why this parameter has been chosen, and my fundamental concern—which is a concern that is identified in the procurement process here—is that this leads to some mowing contractors picking and choosing wards that are easier to mow because they’re flatter, they have less complex mowing needs, and the wards with really difficult and complex mowing needs don’t get the support that they need. That’s a very genuine problem that’s happened over many years in this place.

So, the LORD MAYOR’s absent. He wasn’t willing to take a question earlier. I think it’s a very genuine and relevant one. I doubt anybody else here knows. I doubt he knows, anyway, but I’m going to put on the record—there’s Council officers listening up at Brisbane Square—I’m not allowed to direct a Council mower on what to do, so why is the mowing contract being let by ward? Perhaps Councillor MARX will attempt to answer when she stands up. I don’t have any confidence that Council will get this right. The big problem with how Council has been managing mowing contracts over the last few years is reducing the price. That does not lead to a good outcome here.

Now, I appreciate that Councillor MARX has been listening over the last couple of years to the concerns that I have raised, and I thank her for that, but for the 14 years that I’ve been here, the single biggest ongoing problem at Council is its failure to maintain roadside mowing and parks to a decent standard and a common standard around the city. It is a fight every time to get areas properly maintained, and that includes managing weeds that then expand out in an area, and then the mowers don’t mow because there are weeds, and then Council doesn’t remove the weeds and it just gets bigger and bigger and bigger and bigger until 10 to 12 metres of parkland is lost. Then it becomes a really expensive exercise for Council to retrospectively fix it, and that’s the problem that I’ve been dealing with as long as I’ve been here.

So now, the LORD MAYOR’s come back into the Chamber. I’ll put my question just again to him. Councillors can’t direct mowing contractors on how to mow, so why do the terms of this Council procurement process for mowing—why are they being determined by ward? This has been problematic in the past. Council does not operate on a ward basis, as the LORD MAYOR would know. Council’s gutted Asset Services, there’s now only a northern management team and a southern management team.

So, why is there this idea that somehow mowing contracts have to be determined by ward? The whole idea of what we’ve been told by this inept Administration over the past year is, we are transforming Council. We want common standards of management. We want to see the same thing happening in this area as that area. Yet here, they’re letting one of the biggest and most important everyday contracts that we have, by ward. Why? Maybe someone will know. If not—and I suspect the LORD MAYOR of the city couldn’t even be bothered to answer a question about that earlier, and it’s a pretty genuine sort of question.

The credit review, well, you know, when you give your figures to your banker that are prepared by your banker, and your banker gives you a tick of approval, I don’t necessarily think that’s something to be proud of. Councillor CUNNINGHAM is still fairly new in this place, but the LNP has been in charge of the Lord Mayoralty since 2000 and—oh, she’s not here, either. The LNP have been in charge of the Lord Mayoralty since 2004. By the end of this term, that will be 20 long years. Not once, not once has this Administration reduced rates.

Last year, there was a pause and it was a delayed increase, but rates still went up last financial year. Not even during the floods did this Council even leave rates the same. They went up. What this LNP Administration doesn’t tell you every year at budget time is what they set the cap at. They tell you what the average rates rise is, but the cap under this LNP Administration has been six or seven per cent for years and years and years. Twenty years of rate rises, and the Councillor for Coorparoo Ward, who’s been here for five minutes, stands here and says 24 years ago, rates went up.

I think she needs to look in her own backyard first, and just remember that her team have been holding the financial levers of this city for 20 years at the end of this term, and every single one of those years, including in times of natural disaster, the LNP Administration have put rates up, every single time. That’s why they’re getting the tick.

The Health, Safety and Amenity Local Laws—and I might need an extension if I can, please, somebody—the Health, Safety and Amenity Local Law is really problematic before us today. There are—there were 60-odd—62 submissions opposing firepits in response to this—

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, your time has expired.

**340/2021-22**

At that point, it was moved by Councillor Steve GRIFFITHS, seconded by Councillor Charles STRUNK, that Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON be granted an extension of time. Upon being submitted to the Chamber, the motion was declared **lost** on the voices.

Thereupon, Councillors Nicole JOHNSTON and Steve GRIFFITHS immediately rose and called for a division, which resulted in the motion being declared **lost.**

The voting was as follows:

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

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

Chair: Further debate on A, B and E?

Councillor MARX: Thank you, Chair.

**Seriatim - Clause E**

|  |
| --- |
| Councillor Kim MARX requested that Clause E, HEALTH, SAFETY AND AMENITY LOCAL LAW 2021, be taken seriatim for voting purposes. |

Councillor MARX: Yes, please. So, Mr Chair, I rise to speak on both items A and E, and despite being a Chair of—I would suggest, one of the biggest portfolios in Council, I still only get 10 minutes to speak, so I’m going to try and get through everything that I need. So, as I spoke earlier about the grass cutting and the central role it plays in our city’s maintenance and preparation, especially in the summer months, we have over 2,000 parks. Grass cuts in suburban parks and sports fields are at the top of our priority list.

So, this item is about the significant contracting plan which we will seek tenderers to join a panel of suppliers for grass cutting. We currently use a panel of both commercial contractors and social enterprise providers to service all 26 wards, and this new contract will be no different. I do have some concerns, though, through you, Mr Chair, about Councillor CASSIDY casting aspersions on the work ethics of our current mowing contractors and social enterprise organisations, and I would suggest hopefully that nobody is listening into the debate today, because the Councillor for the Opposition, through you, Mr Chair, has already decided that their work is substandard and they haven’t even applied for a tender, which I think is pretty disgraceful.

The key difference, as the LORD MAYOR mentioned, on the value of this contract is a value we will place on electric equipment as we look towards the future—

Councillor CASSIDY: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY, point of order.

Councillor CASSIDY: Claim to be misrepresented.

Chair: Noted.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor MARX: —as we look towards the future of cleaner and greener vehicles across our city. So, with the development of electric equipment, tenderers will be strongly encouraged to show how they plan to transition towards electric mowers, snippers, and blowers, and I think you can all safely say as Councillors, we do get many complaints about the noise the blowers make in our local suburbs. I also was fortunate enough to have a trial—a visit to a trial site where they used an electric mower onsite versus the standard mower, and the difference was quite remarkable, so I’m very keen for contractors to start using that new equipment if and where possible.

As far as the item E goes, Mr Chair, we often talk in this Chamber about Brisbane’s enviable lifestyle, our subtropical climate and wonderful greenspaces. So, this Administration is dedicated to making the Brisbane of tomorrow better than the Brisbane of today, and this is what this new local law is all about. As mentioned by the LORD MAYOR, this particular local law was amended back in 2009, and I just want to take this opportunity at this moment to thank all the officers in compliance and legal who have spent many, many hours on this local law rewrite.

As the LORD MAYOR has already mentioned, the countdown is on for Brisbane 2032, and there’s no time better now to start preparing our city for this once in a lifetime event, but I would like to talk in more detail about some of the key changes that the LORD MAYOR referenced moments ago. So, many of the changes are designed to help make our city cleaner, and this includes introducing more responsibility on shopping centre owners and operators to manage and collect shopping trolleys. The new law ensures that abandoned shopping trolleys in the surrounding neighbourhood are retrieved in a timely manner. We are also tackling litter that appears in our street from unsolicited advertising material, and the new provisions make it an offence to distribute materials in a manner that potentially causes litter.

So, from what I’ll—to clarify that there, it’s about the cadastral boundary of private property. So, it allows us as a Council to develop guidelines for industry, as advertisers, publishers, and distributors all have a key role to play in tackling behaviour that impacts the amenity of our suburbs, so the idea being people who are delivering anything through to people’s houses in that, if it lands on the footpath or the roadway, that’s considered littering. It needs to be delivered within the boundaries of the private property. Graffiti is another area addressed in this local law, and we are amending provisions to require the timely removal of graffiti on private property, particularly when that graffiti is deemed offensive.

We are also having additional regulation on rubbish bins that will keep our city standards high. Residents will benefit from new requirements on providing odour from both residential and commercial bins, as well as greater certainty over what constitutes an appropriate period to present your bins for kerbside collection and bring them in again afterwards. So, this is if you’ve got a commercial facility who may only have one or two rubbish bins, but their need is up to three or four. We actually can make—have a conversation with them and make them get more regular or more rubbish bins on their site to deal with the issue.

So, at the moment, as far as the rubbish bin—bringing them in, it’s now defined as any time during the day immediately before the time of collection and at the end of the next business day after the time of the collection, so the days of residents, particularly out my way, putting rubbish bins out and leaving them out there all week and just never bringing them back in from the kerbside will be over. The changes also transfer Council’s abandoned vehicle provisions from what we call PLACA, the Public Land and Council Assets Local Law, so that’ll bring it now into this local law. So, while no changes to the provisions are proposed, during the review, we identified HSALL as a more suitable location, as a key issue in amenity and community safety.

So, at that note, Mr Chair, this local law is also aimed at making our city safe for residents. Residents will be better protected by additional requirements on electric fences, as well as the maintenance of ponds, swimming pools, and prevent stagnant water. On the issue of electric fences, we did look about removing all electric fences, but we did get confirmation from the State Government that we couldn’t do that, because apparently there are some places that State Government runs that they do need electric fences for. So, we’re letting them keep their electric fences, but we are working to make our city safer by also introducing important exemptions to general provisions against camping on-road and sleeping in vehicles.

Now, this is very important, that we need to understand that this is—quite clearly. So, officers always try to approach every situation with common sense and compassion. They now have the express exemptions for reasons of personal safety, fatigue management, or otherwise emergent circumstances such as homelessness or domestic violence, something that was not there before. I need to make that very clear. Please do not misunderstand what is intended here. We also want residents to be safe in their own homes and communities, so we expanded the definition of unsightly objects to better address amenity and safety issues.

Mr Chair, in my role as Chair of City Standards, I am passionate about how we can best maintain our city and keep it clean and safe. The new amended provisions help to protect our community’s health and safety, advance the amenity of our city and suburbs, and assure that we keep Brisbane beautiful for generations to come. Thank you.

Chair: Councillor LANDERS.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

|  |
| --- |
| **341/2021-22**  At that time, 3.03pm, it was resolved on the motion of Councillor Sandy LANDERS, seconded by Councillor Sarah HUTTON, that the meeting adjourn for a period of 15 minutes, to commence only when all Councillors had vacated the Chamber and the doors locked.  Council stood adjourned at 3.07pm. |

**UPON RESUMPTION:**

Chair: Thank you Councillors. We’re still in E&C debate on items A, B and E.

Further debate on A, B and E.

Councillor GRIFFITHS.

Councillor GRIFFITHS: Thank you, Mr Chair. I rise to speak about—

Councillor CASSIDY: Yeah, I had a misrepresentation, Chair.

Councillor GRIFFITHS: Oh, sorry.

Chair: Oh, well I’ll do that at the end of the debate, unless you want to do it now? I’m happy—to take it now if you wanted, point of misrepresentation. We’re still halfway through the debate. Normally we’d do it before we take the vote.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: We went to afternoon tea after Councillor MARX finished. Thanks very much, Chair.

Chair: I’m happy to go either way.

Councillor CASSIDY, your point of misrepresentation.

Councillor CASSIDY: Very briefly, I think Councillor MARX perhaps might have been confused about what I said and what Councillor JOHNSTON said. What I said was no reflection on the work that contractors had done, it was a reflection on the casualisation of the workforce by contracting out these contracts rather than having them in-house.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor GRIFFITHS, A, B and E debate.

Councillor GRIFFITHS: Yes, thank you, Mr Chair. I rise to speak specifically on Clause E, the Health, Safety and Amenity Local Law, particularly as it relates to the burners. I suppose I want to get up here—I think Councillor CASSIDY has covered a lot the points for the Opposition in relation to this, but my concern is with the number of complaints that Council did receive in relation to this particular trial. My understanding from the investigation work I’ve done is that in 2019, the number of complaints we received before we went to trial in relation to smoke affecting residents was 597.

But in the 2020 calendar year, there were 1,040 complaints with regards to smoke and its impact on residents. Then in this financial year there’s been—2021 calendar year, there’s to date been 565 complaints. So virtually the number of complaints in the year of the trial almost doubled and I don’t think the Administration has actually given us much of a breakdown on those complaints. Why was there such a huge number of complaints? Why did it spike so much and what did these complaints—who are they from? What were they about?

We know that we have a number of organisations, a number of helpful organisations, who are actually representing their residents and saying yes, our residents are people with asthma, people with other health issues are severely affected by this. I don’t think we’ve heard from the Administration how they’ve dealt with this, how they’ve analysed this or actually given us any real information so that we can actually debate properly on this. So I would ask the LORD MAYOR, LORD MAYOR, can you give us some more information in relation to that spike? So 2019 calendar year 597 complaints, 2020 calendar year, which is the year of the trial, we had 1,040 complaints and to date this calendar year we’ve had 565 complaints.

So obviously complaints are still going up despite the trial being undertaken. I would have thought that a good trial would actually look at this information, a good trial would have an explanation of these complaints and what these complaints relate to and then how we’re dealing with them. Obviously we aren’t dealing with them if we’ve still got that same level of complaint. I would also ask that you give us a bit of an explanation of the analysis of that, just so that it assists us in our understanding and the Chamber’s understanding in relation to how we deal with this in the future. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor GRIFFITHS.

Further debate, A, B and E?

Councillor CUNNINGHAM.

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: Yes, thanks, Mr Chair. I rise to speak on item B, the credit review of Brisbane City Council undertaken by the Queensland Treasury Corporation. I spoke about this in the Chamber last week, as you’ll remember, but again it confirms that Brisbane’s credit rating for the ninth year in a row, the ninth year in a row, is strong. This Administration’s track record of strong financial management and the continued investment and successful delivery of major projects is a key factor in our rating.

Now, the Opposition will think that the only way to manage a budget is to jack up the rates, but there is a thing called responsible budgeting. It’s called making the tough decisions and when you’re in government you have to do that, but I guess the Opposition Councillors wouldn’t remember what it’s like to be in government. On top of that, Mr Chair, we provided two rounds of rates relief last financial year, which means the average rates payable was lower than the previous year.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, please.

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: Now, I’m going to repeat that very slowly, okay? Repeating very slowly, no increase in rates payable and this was made possible by an underspend in Kingsford Smith Drive, an underspend of Kingsford Smith Drive project. Mr Chair, the QTC effectively agrees with us, citing Council’s large and diverse ratepayer base and quote, demonstrated capacity to deliver and manage large infrastructure projects while maintaining adequate capacity to service forecasted debt levels. The strong rating category indicates Council’s ability to meet its financial obligations in the short, medium and long term.

QTC indicates that the capacity is not likely to be affected by adverse changes to business and economic conditions, including unforeseen financial shocks. Mr Chair, the financial position of this Schrinner Council is the product of many years of hard work. It is not a given that we will receive this rating every year and as conditions change, we need to be careful that we can continue to work hard and maintain a strong rating. It’s a testament to this Administration’s financial management and it’s an ongoing commitment and one which will continue from both this LORD MAYOR and this Finance Chair.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor CUNNINGHAM.

Further debate, A, B and E?

Councillor ADERMANN.

Councillor ADERMANN: Thank you, Chair. I rise to speak briefly in support of item E, the amendments to the city laws, particularly in relation to littering in our suburbs with advertising materials and community newspapers. As I indicated in this Chamber before these amendments were put out to consultation, for reasons I don’t really understand littering is a bigger problem in my ward than it should be. These amendments go a long way to addressing this issue. Hopefully the days of advertising materials and community newspapers being strewn over our footpaths will soon be a thing of the past.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, please.

Councillor ADERMANN: These amendments are about eliminating eyesores such as this. Chair, as you know, we’re an Olympic City now and as such the eyes of the world are upon us more than they have ever been. How we are being perceived is important for our long-term economic and tourism opportunities. Collectively we need to take pride in how our city looks and as an Administration, take action where necessary, as we have done here against offending litterers, to ensure Brisbane is a cleaner city. The onus will now be on the producers and distributors of these materials to show the same pride in our community and respect the wishes of the majority of our residents.

The amendment to the city law stipulates that distributors are required to either place their material in letterboxes or within the property boundary. My hope is that they will place their materials in letterboxes rather than take the easy hurl and hope option. Chair, I’ll be keeping a watching brief on how these amendments will work. A good start will be the reduction in the number of complaints about littering to my ward office each month. I hope this will be the case and I urge the Chamber to join me in supporting item E to ensure the Brisbane of tomorrow is even better than the Brisbane of today. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you.

Further debate on items A, B and E?

Councillor SRI.

Councillor SRI: Thanks, Chair. I rise to speak primarily on item E and I’ll comment briefly on the penalty for sleeping in cars. I do understand the comments Councillor MARX made and I appreciate that the new local law is in some senses an improvement, because it at least includes those specific exemptions. But I do remain concerned that that offence of sleeping in your car still allows Council officers a lot of discretion. We don’t know for sure exactly how that discretion is going to be exercised on the ground. We can have a rough idea, managers can ask questions, *et cetera*, but there is a little bit of ambiguity around that.

I think though that the deeper concern I have is simply that the offence isn’t necessary. It’s trying to solve a problem that’s not there and in so doing creating a larger regulatory burden for Council officers and also a higher risk of criminalisation for vulnerable people. By that I simply mean that there are already other offences for littering, there are offences for relieving yourself in public spaces, there are offences at Council and State level for causing noise nuisances, *et cetera*. So whatever problems that this process of having a fine for sleeping in your car is trying to solve, it can already be addressed through other Council local laws or other State Government offences.

So this to me seems an example of excessive and unnecessary overregulation, where Council has introduced an additional, or is reintroducing an additional local law that doesn’t actually need to be there on the books. The concern, of course, is that even with those exemptions there will be some people who will be hassled or may even be fined for sleeping in their car, in situations where they don’t need to be. So I do still have strong concerns about that aspect of the local law. More generally, I note—and this actually came through in some of the commentary from the State Government on the local law as well—that some of the offences are very broadly drafted and in general seem to allow Council officers a lot of discretion.

I won’t go through a lot of the specific examples, but the drafting is quite broad. I understand the legal arguments in favour of broad drafting, but what again that tends to do is give individual officers on the ground a lot of discretion and there can be a high degree of subjectivity in terms of how these offences are enforced in practice. That raises the usual concerns about people of different backgrounds, or people who might be a bit more marginalised, not being able to articulate their rights as clearly. We see a similar thing with the Public Land and Council Assets Local Law.

You have these offences in both these local laws that are so broad that if a Council officer really wants to fine someone for something they can find a way to do it. But often I think that ambiguity can cause a lot of issues for residents, particularly residents who are more concerned about knowing exactly where they stand with Council on some of those issues. Which I guess brings me to the fire pits and braziers introduction. I guess it’s been a trial for a little while now and again this, I think, offence is a little broad. I personally am a bit worried that the enforcement and investigation burden on Council could become quite high.

It won’t happen immediately, it’s something that will creep up over a couple of years. But as the costs of disposing of waste lawfully through other means get higher, there will be more people who will be tempted to burn waste in their backyard under the guise of a backyard fire pit, or under the guise of we’re just having a little fire in the backyard to warm ourselves or to cook some food or whatever. The challenge for officers will then be that they’re getting called out to all sorts of fire complaints and some of those will be legitimate complaints, some of those will be perhaps illegitimate.

But in general it would seem a little bit of a backwards step to open that space up for Council to have to spend a lot of time potentially enforcing whether or not people are having a backyard fire in a fire pit for a legitimate purpose, versus just burning off rubbish because they don’t want to spend money on taking it to the dump, *et cetera*. I have lived in a couple of cities where backyard burning of various kinds was common and it does at high volumes have a really significant impact on air quality. Personally I really love a little fire in the backyard and I love campfires. I’m not personally dogmatic about this, but I do wonder a little bit how this is going to work in practice.

I was concerned by the comments Councillor GRIFFITHS raised that there has been an increase in complaints about the use of backyard fires since the trial began. I acknowledge there could be a range of variables impacting that, but what really troubles me most of all is that we did have some submissions from a range of experts, what might be called expert advisory groups, and they seem to quite strongly indicate concerns about this proposed change. At the same time, we had a pretty high volume of submissions expressing opposition to the change. So we have specialists who are expertise groups raising concerns, we have a really high proportion of public submissions raising concerns.

Weighed against that the Administration is saying that there’s strong public support for the change. There may well be, but to be honest I just don’t think we have enough data to say that confidently. It was interesting to see a lot of reference made to some of the Facebook posts. I put up one from the LORD MAYOR where the question is should the safe use of fire pits and braziers be continued in Brisbane and a lot of support via that Facebook post, undeniable, almost a factor of 10 times higher support than opposition.

But if I were to put up a Facebook post and say hey, everyone, do you like 30 kilometre hour speed limits, yes or no and got a really strong show of support via that post, some of the Councillors in this Chamber would stand up and say, but Johnno, that’s no way representative of the sentiments of the City of Brisbane as a whole. You can’t rely on a Facebook poll as a reliable and representative indicator of general public sentiment. In my own consultation processes I don’t do that. I do use a lot of online polling and online decision-making, but it’s not based strictly on Facebook. We use systems that are widely promoted through a range of mechanisms, from newsletters to emails to various social media platforms.

We don’t just run our online consultations solely on Facebook and I’m not suggesting that that’s what Council has done entirely, I acknowledge there have been multiple pathways for feedback. But the LORD MAYOR’s online Facebook presence is what, 16,000 or something? It’s not huge in a city of millions of residents, it’s a fairly small proportion of the citizens really as a whole. Certainly I don’t want us to get into the habit of equating arguably a Facebook post that’s probably a little bit subjective in terms of how it’s worded. I don’t think we should start to use one-off or a couple of Facebook posts from the LORD MAYOR as being a reliable indicator of public sentiment on an issue.

I’m not saying that to just throw stones or to be excessively critical, but I just would caution against the Administration saying hey, because a lot of people like the Facebook post that means there’s public support for something. Because if we start using that logic, then there are a lot of changes that I have been proposing for a while now that the Council really ought to be bringing in. Anyway, I think it speaks for itself but I’m not necessarily debating the premise that there is strong public support for fire pits and braziers.

Personally when it was first proposed I was like oh, yeah, that seems like an okay idea. It was only then when I started to engage with the specific concerns raised by expert groups and raised by individual residents who are making evidence‑based submissions, that I started to second guess that initial support and I started to question it a little more closely. I think this raises an important distinction between so-called direct democracy and deliberative democracy.

What the Mayor did with his Facebook post could be described as an example of direct democracy, where relatively little information was provided to the public and a question was posed, should the safe use of fire pits and braziers be continued in Brisbane? On that basis seeking feedback when we have expert groups and independent advisory groups saying actually it’s not possible for fire pits to be used in backyards safely because of their air quality concerns. So the very premise of the question that the Mayor put to the public via social media was wrong.

So I guess there’s an interesting question there about how much information do you give to the public before you open things up for a direct vote. Certainly the kinds of consultations we run when we run online polls, we take the time to make sure that residents have plenty of information available and that expert evidence is going to be considered and incorporated into decision-making before inviting people to cast a vote, rather than something that is too simple or too short or masks the nuanced impacts on minority groups.

Chair: Thanks, Councillor SRI.

Further debate on A, B and E? Any further debate on A, B and E?

LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair. Just dealing with the last one first, the issue of HSALL and particularly the issue of backyard fire pits and braziers. It’s interesting because Councillor SRI was talking about direct democracy and the different ways to do that. We’re very clear that we consult people, we listen to people, but we’re elected to make the decisions. If you want to outsource your decisions then you shouldn’t actually take a seat in this Chamber. If you can’t make decisions based on what you know and your various means of listening to the community, then you shouldn’t be here.

So if people want to make those types of policy decisions based on direct democracy, well then there is no role for elected politicians. So the reality is we listen to the community in various ways, but also we know that the opportunity to provide submissions was there for people. I’m not talking about any kind of social media poll, but in terms of actual submissions during the formal submission period. A range of different people and organisations made submissions and that was also taken into consideration.

But the reality is if you have a look at the complaints or the requests through the Council call centre and various contact channels that were made in relation to smoke and backyard burning, it was a trial that started on 1 June last year. You’ll remember this is when lots and lots of people were at home. This was the first year of COVID, everyone was at home, everyone went out to Bunnings, everyone bought—or other outlets and bought a backyard fire pit or brazier.

Literally there were a few days there where almost everyone in the city was cranking them up. Now, what’s happened since then is we’ve seen the trend more normalising. We all have busy lives and as much as we’d love to sit around a fire, life gets busy and we don’t have much time to sit around a fire. So in the emerging from COVID era, we have seen although people can still use the backyard fire pits and braziers, we never actually formally brought this trial to a close. It’s still going on right now, so if someone wants to they can fire that up right now. Now, obviously we’re coming into summer and you wouldn’t do that during summer normally.

But if you look at the calendar year, for the complaints that were received about backyard burning and smoke in 2019, this is the calendar year, so January through to December 2019, this was before we had any kind of trial, 597 complaints were received about smoke and backyard burning. Now, to be aware, backyard burning is illegal and it remains illegal. You can’t burn your rubbish or assorted items in the backyard, you just can’t do that. The only exceptions are for people that live on acreage properties where there are some strict rules about burning in those sorts of situations.

So 597 complaints were received in the 2019 calendar year. That jumped up in the 2020 year, which was the COVID situation I talked about to just over 1,000, 1,040. But this year, calendar year January to December and we’re pretty much at the end of the year, we’ve got one month to go, the complaints received so far this year were 565. So I’d suggest that given we’re going into summer, we’re not going to see a great number of complaints between now and the end of the year. It would be winter normally that would see most of those complaints. So this year, even though people are still allowed to use these fire pits and braziers, the complaints so far have been less than what we saw in 2019.

So I think we’ve seen that early burst of people busting out the fire pits, because they could and because it was COVID. I think a more normalised version will see us at no more of a level than what we have been before. I think that’s a good outcome in the end. So we’ll continue to monitor that obviously, this local law does have strict requirements about smoke nuisance and there’s action that will be taken in those cases. I think that’s a good thing, this allows us with pretty much two calendar years of data to make an informed decision and to allow plenty of community input and feedback in different channels. So we’ll continue to monitor it, but I think it will be a good sensible community outcome going forward.

I just did also want to talk about the comments that have been made on the QTC review. Now, it’s interesting, if you go to a lender and you’re looking for a home loan, they will give you various forms to fill out, they will ask you for various bits of information and you’d have to provide them with accurate information. They will then make a decision on whether to lend you money or how much to lend you. We’ve seen a couple of people now say the QTC review’s only based on what you told the QTC. Well first of all, I didn’t tell the QTC anything. I can tell you our financial team sat down with them, provided them with all the information that they need.

The QTC also happens to know a lot about Council’s finances because they have been our lender for many, many, many years, decades in fact. So they do know about our financial position and they’ve been able to track it over the years. So this insidious suggestion that information’s been provided to QTC but it may not be actual accurate information, just think about how loaded that statement is. What does actually mean? Does it mean that the Council officers are lying to the QTC? That’s one of the assumptions you could—and like I said, I didn’t talk to the QTC about their review.

I didn’t meet with them, I didn’t provide them with any information, neither did any of the Councillors. So the suggestion that our officers may have provided information that is not accurate or somehow lacking, I think, is highly offensive. As I said, that’s a very insidious suggestion. So when you go and borrow money from anyone, they will do their checks, they will do their due diligence.

But in this case, we have been a customer and a client of QTC for decades, so they do know. They don’t just need to rely on the information we provide, they know because they’ve seen year on year our financial situation and our status. So really what we’re seeing is what I can view as a deliberate attempt to undermine the credit review and to call it into question. That’s what has been done by the people that spoke against it and made those comments. They are attempting to undermine the QTC’s credit review.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: The LORD MAYOR is deliberately imputing motive towards the speakers who raised concerns about this issue. That is inappropriate behaviour under the Meetings Local Law and he should withdraw from making those unfounded assertions.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, I don’t believe they’re unfounded assertions being made by the LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: I think it’s pretty clear, based on what I’ve said and how I’ve said it and how I’ve described it, what I’m talking about here. It’s the classic case of let’s call this report into question and then be offended that you’re called out for calling this report into question. That’s what’s happening here. So we see you, we see you, we know what you’re up to. The reality is the QTC is not a Council entity; it is a State Government-controlled entity.

They are in no way either biased for or against us. They simply want to know that when they are lending money to various councils across the State that those councils have the ability to have a strong balance sheet—and we’ve been rated having a strong credit rating—and the ability to be a good borrower and we are. So any attempts to call that situation into question is very mischievous. So I would commend all of these reports to the Chamber and I’ll leave my comments at that.

Chair: Thank you, LORD MAYOR.

We now move to the votes on items A, B and E separately.

**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.

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

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 21 - The Right Honourable, the LORD MAYOR, Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER, DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Krista ADAMS, and Councillors Greg ADERMANN, Adam ALLAN, Lisa ATWOOD, Fiona CUNNINGHAM, Tracy DAVIS, Fiona HAMMOND, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Sarah HUTTON, Sandy LANDERS, James MACKAY, Kim MARX, Peter MATIC, David McLACHLAN, Ryan MURPHY, Angela OWEN, Steven TOOMEY, Andrew WINES and Nicole JOHNSTON.

NOES: 5 - The Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Jared CASSIDY, and Councillors Kara COOK, Peter CUMMING, Charles STRUNK and Jonathan SRI.

Chair: Thank you, that motion is passed.

We now move to a vote on item B.

**Clause B put**

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

Thereupon, the DEPUTY MAYOR and Councillor Sarah HUTTON immediately rose and called for a division, which resulted in the motion being declared **carried**.

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 25 - The Right Honourable, the LORD MAYOR, Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER, DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Krista ADAMS, and Councillors Greg ADERMANN, Adam ALLAN, Lisa ATWOOD, Fiona CUNNINGHAM, Tracy DAVIS, Fiona HAMMOND, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Sarah HUTTON, Sandy LANDERS, James MACKAY, Kim MARX, Peter MATIC, David McLACHLAN, Ryan MURPHY, Angela OWEN, Steven TOOMEY, Andrew WINES and the Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Jared CASSIDY, and Councillors Kara COOK, Peter CUMMING, Steve GRIFFITHS and Charles STRUNK.

NOES: 2 - Councillors Jonathan SRI and Nicole JOHNSTON.

Chair: Thank you.

Councillors, now the vote is on item E, item E in the E&C report.

**Clause E put**

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

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

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 25 - The Right Honourable, the LORD MAYOR, Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER, DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Krista ADAMS, and Councillors Greg ADERMANN, Adam ALLAN, Lisa ATWOOD, Fiona CUNNINGHAM, Tracy DAVIS, Fiona HAMMOND, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Sarah HUTTON, Sandy LANDERS, James MACKAY, Kim MARX, Peter MATIC, David McLACHLAN, Ryan MURPHY, Angela OWEN, Steven TOOMEY, Andrew WINES and the Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Jared CASSIDY, and Councillors Kara COOK, Peter CUMMING, Steve GRIFFITHS and Charles STRUNK.

NOES: 1 - Councillor Jonathan SRI.

ABSTENTIONS: 1 - Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON.

Chair: Thank you, Councillors.

We now move on to debate on items C and D.

LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair. On items C and D, these two are linked. Item D is the LGIP amendment 1b and item C is the LTIP (long term infrastructure plan) amendment 1b. Now, we’ve had a number of related submissions coming through in recent times with LGIP and LTIP changes. This is starting the process for—kicking off the process for the major amendments which would happen next year to both of these processes. So Council must review any LGIP within five years after its inclusion in the planning scheme. The LGIP review has been undertaken to ensure the LGIP complies with these statutory requirements and is accurate, relevant and current.

Due to the length of time taken to make amendments to the LGIP and LTIP, amendments are being divided into phases to ensure the plans remain as up‑to‑date as possible. Previous amendments to the LGIP were minor in nature and focused on schedules and maps. The LGIP amendment 1b is a major amendment and will provide a further update to the LGIP based on the latest information available. This amendment will come before Council in 2022, prior to progressing to the State for review and public consultation.

The LTIP proposal that’s coming forward is being done in order to align both the LGIP and the LTIP processes together, so that as we’re making changes we can update both plans. They are linked, things move between the plans, as we know. Just to point out a couple of critical points here, (1) there will be State interest checks before any major amendments are made. There will be public consultation before any amendments are made.

Secondly, the LTIP and the LGIP are not the only infrastructure that Council builds and they’re certainly not the only plans that we have to build infrastructure. We build lots of infrastructure in addition to what is in the LTIP and the LGIP. The LGIP and the LTIP allow us to set aside land for future use, whether it be to build infrastructure or for particular upgrade projects. Also to collect infrastructure charges from developers and builders and the construction industry, so that we can help fund infrastructure. We heard last time we had this discussion on this, the Opposition Leader was talking about how there’s supposedly an infrastructure deficit and that the infrastructure outlined in these documents couldn’t be covered by the charges collected.

I then pointed out that those infrastructure charges are capped by the State Government and the State Government can do something about that. But I neglected to mention at the time that there were a few things that related to property development that weren’t capped. Things like land tax that the State Government gets and things like stamp duty or transfer duty when people buy and sell properties. These things aren’t capped, these things mean that the cash is rolling in like we’ve never seen before from the property boom that we’re seeing in South East Queensland. That money is going to the State coffers.

So you can see what’s happening here, the State is cashing in on the property industry big time, big time, yet when it comes to funding local government infrastructure, oh, there’s a cap, we’ll cap that, because we want things to be more affordable apparently. They don’t seem to worry about that when it comes to transfer duty or land tax. So there’s a little bit of an issue here of inconsistency and it would be good to see some adjustments made to the infrastructure charging regime to reflect the big increase in costs of building things that we’ve seen. So that would be a positive thing, so when we hear about any kind of so-called infrastructure deficit, there is a way to help address that.

That is by the State changing their cap requirements and changing the formula by which these things are calculated to reflect the genuine growth in the cost of building infrastructure. Anyway, those things are just important background for these two plans. Ultimately we’ll be seeing the major details coming through next year. There’ll be plenty of opportunity to debate those. There’ll be plenty of opportunity for State review, for public consultation and I commend these two items to the Chamber.

Chair: Thank you.

Further debate on C and D?

Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks, Chair. The items before us are the major amendments 1b to the LTIP and LGIP. As we know, we saw other amendments for these two items, these two infrastructure plans, come through the Chamber last week. So the plans we passed just one week ago are, of course, already out of date. We know why, it’s because this LNP Administration took so long to develop those initial LTIPs and LGIPs in the first place, choosing the shortest possible horizon for them, then taking two years to develop them.

These amendments to the LGIP will keep happening until 2026 and the projects listed on it will keep being pushed further and further back beyond the horizon of the documents, which we saw at those amendments that came through last week and no doubt we will see with these amendments as they progress as well. The LGIP was supposed to be Council’s infrastructure roadmap for 10 years, which was the minimum horizon that a council could choose. It took two years to put in place, so the plan itself resulted in an eight-year horizon.

What we see, because of this LNP Mayor and LNP Administration’s incompetency, so much of that work being delayed and pushed back and left unfunded. So in 2021, after this process starting way back in 2018, we’re still seeing amendment after amendment. By the time we get to 2026, all we will have seen is pushbacks, cuts and amendments to these plans, with very little tangible outcomes, which is not a very good infrastructure planning arrangement coming into an Olympics.

So the residents of Brisbane, I’m sure when they see these projects that need to be delivered, whether they know what’s outlaid in an LGIP or an LTIP specifically, I’m sure there are very few residents that sit down and pour over the tables—if they could access them and read them, of course—of what is included in an LTIP and an LGIP. But what residents do know and what they do experience is a lack of basic infrastructure being delivered by this Administration. There is a deficit in the LGIP and that’s in black and white and that’s the document that this Administration produces.

The LORD MAYOR talks and he talked today about it, he’s talked previously about the caps precluding Council from reaching the required funding through developer contributions. Thus ratepayers have to chip in more for this infrastructure that is required as a result of a growing city. But what he never talks about are the developer discounts that they have given over many, many years. To Chinese billionaire developers building five-star accommodation hotels here in the city, or cashed up aged care providers, or student accommodation that is later converted into other things down the track.

Developers have received significant reductions in their infrastructure charges and that’s a decision, a political decision this LNP Administration took. It’s one that the Labor Opposition has opposed for those particular discounts, because we know that the basic infrastructure that a city requires, that communities require, that suburbs require to make them accessible for people, that make their streets walkable, driveable, liveable. So they have the parks that are required for all those new families moving into those places, the public transport options that are required as those people move into those suburbs.

Things like drainage infrastructure as well, to make sure that not just our communities are liveable but our homes are liveable, in a flood prone city that is now feeling the impacts of human induced climate change. So this LORD MAYOR can get up and blame, as he does in every single item, everyone else other than himself. But what he forgets to mention is that he’s contributing to that deficit significantly through those political decisions to offer developer discounts to developers that really don’t need them. They are just increasing the profit margin of those private companies.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Point of order, Mr Chair.

Chair: Point of order to you, DEPUTY MAYOR.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Relevance to the setting up of the LTIP and the LGIP.

Chair: Yes, can you come back to the item before us.

Councillor CASSIDY: The LTIP and the LGIP are specifically about the contributions that developers make to fund the infrastructure that is required as a result of development. I would have thought the DEPUTY MAYOR would know that. But Chair, these are the starts of these processes for major amendments. They don’t include projects at the moment. So we’ll be supporting these items today, but reserve our judgement on what is included when these items come back to the Council Chamber in some period. Going on the LNP’s track record, that’ll be three years from now, so it could perhaps be after the next election.

Chair: Thank you.

Further debate on C and D, items C and D?

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Thank you. I rise to speak on items C and D. I actually agree with quite a fair bit of what the Opposition Leader just said then. I read with absolute astonishment the LORD MAYOR on ABCover the weekend, (1) I think agreeing with Councillor SRI, albeit for different reasons, but (2) claiming that fees for infrastructure should be raised, that they’re too low.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, I know. Now, I know Councillor SRI’s got some views on this and that’s fine, but the problem as I see it is that this Administration does not spend that money fairly, effectively and where it is needed. The problem is not the quantum of the revenue raised, the problem is the political pork-barrelling that’s going on through this planning process. Now, the LORD MAYOR has made a number of statements here today introducing these two items and again, he’s left the Chamber. He said firstly, that the amendments that just went through last week and a couple of weeks before that, the LGIP and the LTIP, that had just literally been passed, were minor in nature.

Now, the amendments that were just passed removed all stormwater drainage that Council identified in 2000 and 2001 as being critical to support future development, which has now happened in Yeronga, 20 years ago Council identified it as being critically important. It’s been in the LGIP, it was in the PIP (Priority Infrastructure Plan) when the PIP got created in 2014 in City Plan. It was in the LGIP, when it became the LGIP and this Administration has successively cut it. So the minor changes that the LORD MAYOR mentions are cutting all stormwater drainage infrastructure investment in Yeronga. I don’t consider that to be minor.

Not only that, there have been massive cuts to the LGIP and the LTIP and it is just not good enough that this Administration creeps along, makes changes, makes it so hard for people to even read the documents. Claims they’re only minor in nature when they are removing all new infrastructure. Most of the suburbs in my ward have no infrastructure listed for them, 10 suburbs. Oxley’s got a bikeway listed and a bit of drainage, there’s barely anything. Meanwhile, suburbs in my ward have been up-zoned. Half of my ward is in a future growth zone, that’s being ignored.

The other side of my ward has been up-zoned to medium density and this Council, the one thing they’ve done out of the LGIP, I think in the whole time that it’s been going, so seven years, they’ve whacked $1 million into the arboretum out of nowhere. That could have come through parks funding, it’s the planning that doesn’t make sense, it does not make sense. There’s been so much development through Yeronga, through Sherwood and Corinda and this Council has radically changed the face of those suburbs. Yet it is not investing in the necessary infrastructure that is needed.

Now, after just finishing the process, they go well, we didn’t do that very well. It’s already out of date, we’ve got to do it again. So the LORD MAYOR said this had to be done every five years, they’re doing it every year basically. How incompetent are these people that they can’t get a proper infrastructure plan together? The LORD MAYOR says there are other documents. I’d love to see them, I’ve been calling for all the lists of infrastructure, let me tell you and it’s a battle with the CEO to try and get that infrastructure listing. LATMs (local area traffic management), intersection upgrades, you’d think I was pulling teeth asking for the lists that are being considered by Council.

The really fascinating part about it all is you’d think maybe the Transport Plan would have some lists of infrastructure projects in it. We all remember that plan when it got debated in here a few years ago. There’s no list of infrastructure projects in the Transport Plan. Meanwhile, areas of this city are just being decimated and neglected because this Administration is pork-barrelling. It is absolutely spending money in LNP wards to prop up their own political ambitions and that’s just appalling. Now, the LORD MAYOR then goes on to claim—and I quote—’there’ll be public consultation on the LGIP and the LTIP’. Well, we know that happened last time and the time before and the time before that.

Guess what happened when the LORD MAYOR did public consultations, let’s say just on the last lot. Did they make one change in response to the public consultation? No, they did not. So this is what this Administration does. It says we’ll consult with the public. They put their list up on the website and they say that’s consultation. No flyers went out on the LTIP, no flyers on the LGIP. It was down to Councillors if they wanted to do something. You had to go and find all these documents on the website, they don’t make it easy.

Then for the people who did that, hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of them in my ward, what happened? Did the LNP listen? Did they say we hear you, thank you for making your submission? Do you know what they said? Two words, hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of times, no change, no change, no change. This Administration has absolutely lost its way. They don’t understand what the meaning of consultation is. When you put out something and say here’s what we’re doing, that’s actually called notification.

It’s a different thing to consultation and this LNP Administration fundamentally does not understand the difference. So when the LORD MAYOR says there’ll be public consultation, he doesn’t actually mean he’s going to listen to you. What he means is that you’ll make an effort to have your say and speak up for the suburb or the area that you live in. He’ll then say duh, duh, no change. I don’t care what you think, I’m doing what I was going to do anyway. That’s how this Administration has acted for 20 years almost, almost 20 years.

Now, the LORD MAYOR also made the point that these two documents are linked, that they need to be brought forward together as a reason for doing this. Now, the LGIP and the LTIP a year-plus ago were actually brought forward together when they were initially processed. Then, of course, the LORD MAYOR decoupled them. So about a month ago the LTIP came through first. All the submissions from my residents were ignored, no change. About a month later the LGIP came through, hundreds of submissions from my ward, Councillor SRI’s ward, Councillor OWEN’s ward and again, hundreds and hundreds, 429 submissions, no change.

The LORD MAYOR chose to separate the LGIP and the LTIP, so how can we believe a word that he says when these two things are linked? He deliberately decoupled them when they came through Council just last week. So I’d like the LORD MAYOR to stand up in his summing up, which I know he won’t do, because why bother answering a question a Councillor might have in this place? If it’s so important that these documents are linked and brought forward together, why has he chosen just in the past few weeks to unlink them?

Fair question. A bit like the mowing contract question about why we let mowing contracts by ward. This is our LORD MAYOR, he can’t be bothered to respond to a question. He can’t be bothered to actually have a debate in this place. He thinks just ignoring me is the way to go, but guess what, it’s really not and there are plenty of other ways I can get the information if he doesn’t answer.

Finally, funding. The LORD MAYOR made a big point today of bashing up the State Government about infrastructure charges. He said that they are cashing in, the State Government is cashing in on development in this State. Guess what the LORD MAYOR wants to do, the LORD MAYOR wants to cash in on development in this State. The LORD MAYOR is out there publicly stating that he thinks development charges should be higher. That’s what he said to ABC this week, despite giving discounts over and over again to big corporations. So with one hand he says well, it’s all right, this special interest group over here, we’ll do a sweetheart deal for them and they can have a discount.

Then he’ll go out to the public and say well, no, hang on a minute, those infrastructure charges are too low so we’ll put them up. Meanwhile, the money he does get in from developers, around $170 million, $150 million a year in a good year, it’s been pork-barrelled out into wards where there’s not usually the development happening. The system is broken because of the people who are managing it and stuffing it up. This system needs to run fairly and it’s not.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, your time has expired.

Further debate on C and D?

Councillor ALLAN.

Councillor ALLAN: Thank you, Mr Chair, I rise to speak on items C and D and add a little bit more detail to the points that the LORD MAYOR raised. I will start with item D, the LGIP amendment 1b. This items relates to the Local Government Infrastructure Plan and seeks Council’s resolution to amend it. I would note that the submission before us today is in essence a matter of process to provide the mechanism to progress to an amendment. In accordance with section 25(3) of the *Planning Act 2016*, Council must review any LGIP contained in its planning scheme within five years after when the LGIP was included in the planning scheme and if the LGIP has been reviewed, the LGIP was last reviewed.

The LGIP was adopted by Council at its meeting on 5 June 2018 and took effect on 29 June 2018. To ensure the LGIP remains compliant, Council must complete its statutory review by 29 June 2023. The LGIP review has been undertaken in accordance with chapter 5, part 5 of the Minister’s Guidelines and Rules, to ensure that the LGIP complies with the statutory requirements and is accurate, relevant and current. So for Councillor CASSIDY’s benefit, due to the length of time required to make amendments to the LGIP and LTIP under the guidelines, the Minister’s Guidelines, amendments are being divided into phases to ensure the plans remain as up-to-date as possible.

You’ll remember the recent LGIP and LTIP amendments 1a which came through this Chamber and were adopted last week. They’re providing limited updates to schedules and maps based on existing information. Those amendments refreshed both documents to align them with current information and budget priorities and will commence on 10 December 2021.

The second amendment phase, LGIP amendment 1b, will constitute a major amendment and will provide a further update to the LGIP based on the latest information available, including new plans, assumptions and related growth. The full package is currently in preparation. It is anticipated it will come before Council in mid-2022, at which point approval will be sought to proceed to the formal State Government review and public consultation, in a similar way to the last LGIP amendment and it will be open for feedback.

So moving on to item C, which is the LTIP amendment 1b, once again this item relates to the tailored amendment to *Brisbane City Plan 2014*. Once again, I note that the submission before us today is in essence a matter of process, to provide the mechanism to progress to an amendment. Last week Council adopted limited amendments to the LTIP, which refreshed the document for greater alignment with current information and budget priorities. Again, due to the length of time required to make amendments under the Minister’s Guidelines and Rules, amendments to the LTIP have been divided into phases.

The second phase of LTIP amendments will be major in nature and provide a further update based on the latest information available. Like the LGIP amendment 1b, the full LTIP package will come before Council in mid-2022, before progressing to the State Government for review and public consultation. However, there is an additional step required under the Act for the LTIP amendment.

Under section 18 of the Act, Council must give notice to the Queensland Government of the proposed amendment to the planning scheme. To ensure the LTIP is amended concurrently with the LGIP, Council must seek the Queensland Government’s approval for a tailored amendment to the planning scheme, so the LTIP amendment 1b is prepared and progressed following the same steps as the LGIP amendment 1b, in accordance with chapter 5, part 3 of the guideline. This will allow for the two amendment packages to be prepared, publicly consulted on and adopted simultaneously.

By proceeding with the proposed amendment, the Chief Executive of the Department of State Development, Infrastructure Local Government and Planning will be requested to approve the tailored approach. Upon receipt of the Chief Executive’s response and approval, Council will proceed to prepare the LTIP amendment 1b and follow the tailored amendment process as approved. Together with the Local Government Infrastructure Plan, the LTIP amendment will continue critical investment plans in city infrastructure essential to sustaining a growing city, whilst creating exciting leisure and lifestyle opportunities and an enviable multimodal transport system.

There have been some questions today about the process and unfortunately, the LGIP is treated differently to the rest of the planning scheme where the LTIP sits. Under the Minister’s Guidelines and Rules, they both have different processes to undertake the amendments. So while we will align the steps and timeframes, the LGIP will be amended under one section of the legislation, that’s the LGIP amendment and the LTIP will be amended under another section and it will be a major amendment. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor ALLAN.

Further debate?

Councillor SRI.

Councillor SRI: Thanks, Chair. I rise to speak on the infrastructure plan amendments. I guess I want to address these comments to the most intelligent and freethinking Councillors in the Chamber, on both sides of the Chamber and I guess, point out that there definitely is a structural problem here in terms of how we plan for infrastructure and how we pay for infrastructure. It feels a little bit of a relief to finally hear the Mayor publicly acknowledging more clearly that infrastructure charges are too low. I did want to just take up a little bit of what Councillor JOHNSTON had said as well, because I think there’s a really interesting conversation to be had about how we pay for infrastructure and where the money comes from and where the money’s going.

We’ve said previously, we being the Greens, that (1) developers aren’t contributing enough money to cover the cost of infrastructure in general. (2) There’s a problem where money collected from developments isn’t necessarily spent on improvements in the local area. (3) Too much money is being spent on larger intersection upgrades and ineffective road widening projects and too little is being spent on public and active transport, greenspace, stormwater drainage, *et cetera*. So I think all three of those points are true to a point.

I think Councillor JOHNSTON was articulating that the—and I don’t want to put words in her mouth, but that a big part of the problem is that there’s plenty of money coming in but it’s being spent in LNP wards, or it’s being pork-barrelled to certain parts of the city. We actually took the time, my office staff, to do a little bit of analysis on this and it might be interesting to other Councillors in this Chamber as well. We picked my ward and we picked one or two wards out in the ‘burbs. I think we did Moorooka Ward perhaps and we did, I think, Marchant Ward as well. We were looking at how much money is coming in via infrastructure charges and how much is being spent on infrastructure.

Because after a bit of advocacy from Labor and the Greens, that information is actually public and you can do the analysis yourself. When we looked at the dollar figures more closely, we realised that actually most areas of the city there’s not enough spending on local infrastructure. It’s not actually necessarily a Labor or Liberal or Greens thing, it’s that everywhere is falling behind in terms of the infrastructure that’s needed for a growing community. What seems to be happening is that a big chunk of the money that is collected is being spent on really large road projects. Sometimes those have a local benefit as well, but they’re often focused on moving large volumes of cars from one part of the city to another.

So I just want to interrogate or critique the narrative that the problem is that infrastructure charges money isn’t being spent in the areas where the development is occurring. Really the problem is too much money’s being spent on road widening and not enough money is coming into the system in general. I think it’s important, particularly I hope the Labor Councillors will take this idea on in good faith, because it’s an easy narrative to say the money’s not being spent in the local area. That’s certainly a strongly held view by a lot of local residents and is a popular narrative to run at election time. But we looked at our electorate in The Gabba Ward. Quite a bit of money, to be blunt, has been spent on a couple of intersection projects.

So we had $10 million spent on the intersection of Montague Road and Victoria Street, $10 million on one set of traffic lights. Then we had $5 million spent on the Vulture Street-Montague Road intersection. So a couple of hundred metres along the road two major intersection upgrades, $15 million price tag, remembering that for each new apartment in an area we only get $10,000 in infrastructure charges. So the infrastructure charges from 1,500 apartments has just paid for those two traffic lights and there’s no money for stormwater, new parkland, *et cetera, et cetera*.

That’s just that one little case study, but it does seem to us that actually the amount of money that Council is collecting in infrastructure charges simply doesn’t come close to covering the cost of that actual delivery cost of infrastructure. As I’ve said before in this Chamber, part of the problem is outsourcing and private contractors adding in their own fat profit margins and part of the problem is developers not putting enough money into the system.

But I also wanted to highlight and critique a narrative that we’ve heard the Mayor and the LNP run a couple of times in this Chamber and that I’ve also heard Labor State Government Ministers run at times. Which is if you increase developer infrastructure charges, that will put upward pressure on housing costs. We’ve probably all heard that at one point or another, if you charge the developers more they’ll pass that onto the end consumer and the prices of buying an apartment or a house will go up proportionally. That’s not true, that’s a lie, it’s a blatant lie told by the property industry. They repeat it at length but it doesn’t stack up to rigorous economic analysis.

We’ve got a few good case studies to look at in the Queensland context, because 10 years ago, the State Government brought in the cap on infrastructure charges. Even though that cap was brought in and suddenly a lot of councils weren’t able to charge as much to developers from infrastructure charges, that had no measurable impact on property values. It wasn’t like oh, suddenly there’s a cap, councils can’t charge infrastructure charges to developers, the developers will pass on that discount to buyers. They didn’t, it had no discernible impact.

But similarly, what the economic modelling suggests—and there’s an economist, Cameron Murray, who’s worth looking up in this respect from UQ, but there are a few others who’ve done similar studies—is that if you increase the cost of new private development such as by adding on infrastructure charges, the property industry and the market responds by changing their calculations of how much profit they can make from certain development sites, because their costs have risen. So if a developer says actually it’s going to cost me a bit more now to build new apartments on a certain site or in a certain neighbourhood, that puts downward pressure on land values.

Because developers still have to meet the market, in that there’s plenty of existing housing stock out there that’s up for sale. So if you’re building and selling new apartments or new houses, you can sell for drastically higher prices than existing stock that was maybe built a couple of years ago and is up for sale again. So the really large proportion of existing housing supply out there in the market is really what’s setting the price, as opposed to the price of new housing and new apartments being dictated primarily by construction costs and land values.

So what that means is that if construction costs or project costs increase as a result of something like infrastructure charges, or indeed as a result of making it mandatory to include rooftop gardens and solar panels like we were talking about last week, if the costs of a development rise and that cost is a generalised cost increase that’s spread across the city or a neighbourhood or is being implemented across the entire LGA, such as would be the case with changes to infrastructure charges, then the property industry would respond by attaching less value to land. Because the development potential or the profit potential of those sites is slightly reduced. That’s a really good outcome.

If increasing infrastructure charges means some developers say we don’t want to pay as much for land anymore, that puts downward pressures on land values, which in turn makes it easier for Council or the State Government to buy those sites for public parkland and other forms of public infrastructure like land for libraries and community halls and all that sort of stuff. So there’s actually a really strong benefit here to increasing infrastructure charges. Not only does it mean that there’s more money coming into Council coffers to pay for the stuff we need, but arguably it would also have a slight downward pressure impact on land values themselves.

So there’s kind of a double benefit there and I think it’s important that all Councillors in this place understand that this narrative that the development industry continually trots out month after month, year after year, if you increase charges we’ll just pass that onto buyers, it’s not true. It doesn’t stack up to rigorous economic analysis, there’s no hard evidence for it. You can twist the numbers if you want, you can cherry-pick stats and try and build a contrary argument, but the blunt reality is that in a system where most development is undertaken by the private sector and most of the housing stock is already out there in existence, it’s not like we’re building a brand new city from scratch.

Developers still have to meet the market and they can’t pass on significantly higher construction costs or project costs for new developments, because there’s still existing housing stock out there that they’re competing with. So I do hope that the Mayor has taken on board these comments as well. I’ve sent him articles about this. We really need to have the courage to resist this spin that the property industry is putting out there and recognising that increasing infrastructure charges will benefit everyone in the long term.

It’ll certainly benefit the residents who end up living in these areas. It’ll allow us to have the money for stormwater infrastructure and new parks and new libraries and all that sort of stuff. But it’ll also make it easier for first homebuyers to buy their own blocks of land, because there’ll be less pressure on land values, which in turn makes sites more affordable for owner-occupiers and small-time developers and housing co-ops. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor SRI.

Further debate on C and D? Any further debate on C and D?

LORD MAYOR, no further debate?

Councillors, we’ll put C and D to the vote.

**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 were declared **carried** on the voices.

Chair: Thank you, Councillors, we now move on to item F.

Item F, LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair. As discussed previously in this Chamber, the item F is Meetings Amending Local Law, which seeks to do a number of things relating to improvements to the way this meeting operates, to make sure that we’re operating in a way that is consistent with the law and consistent with the State regulations, the law and the City of Brisbane Act. But also we’re seeing a situation where there’s also an ability for family-friendly hours as well, which is something that we know is supported up at George Street with the way that they hold their meetings.

The process for this local law went out for consultation, a total of six submissions were received. Two submissions were from the Queensland Government. We made some amendments based on those Queensland Government submissions. The amendments included deletion of the concept of automatic adjournment of Council meetings after a period of time. Obviously this is something that’s come into play in recent times, which was interesting. As you know, the previous requirement for the meeting to be adjourned automatically after seven hours was in place. This was to ensure that Council would not stand adjourned unless it is voted on by the Council, so that was a clear decision of the Council.

There was an inclusion of a motion of dissent for an aggrieved Councillor regarding a declaration of unsuitable meeting conduct. We ensure that remote participation at meetings is included in all relevant sections. Amendments to the process for raising points of order have been made. Obviously, once again, we’ve had an issue recently about points of order, so that’s being cleared up to make sure that people can continue to make points of order in the way that they have always done. There are some amendments made relating to the adoption of Committee meeting minutes, revising public attendance provisions to be consistent with the *City of Brisbane Act 2010*.

Amendments to ensure consistency with existing legislation and the clarification of the definition of Standing Rules. The main changes being put forward in this draft are amendments to include references to virtual meetings and electronic attendance, clarification on how the video broadcast is to be used, using the same words as the State Parliament. So here, I’m sure, we’ll hear that this is somehow anti-democratic but up the road in George Street, perfectly fine. We never see that kind of difference in approach, do we, in this Chamber?

We’ve extended the deadline for the receipt of a Notice of Motion. As you know, in the past it’s been the Thursday afternoon before, five o’clock on a Thursday before the Tuesday meeting. We’ve been incredibly flexible here and allowed Notices of Motion to be put forward by 1pm the business day prior to a Council meeting. So 24 hours of a meeting people can put a notified motion in. I think that’s very fair and reasonable and that gives people more opportunity to put in Notices of Motion.

We’ve also amended the criteria for suspending Standing Rules by way of a motion to require a Council to clearly establish the reason for not providing a Notice of Motion, i.e. if you’re going to put an urgency motion make sure it’s actually an urgent motion and not just a fake urgent motion, like we’ve seen for the last 18 months or so from the Labor Party. Motions that are in no way urgent, that are in no way time sensitive, but just being used as a political stunt and wasting this Council’s time.

Limiting contributions in General Business to one 10-minute speech per Councillor, in line with our desire to have more family-friendly sitting hours. So these are the key changes being proposed and I commend these changes to the Chamber.

Chair: Thank you.

Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair. I rise to speak on this item, the Meetings Amending Local Law. The LORD MAYOR has said this is all about how Council operates and it’s quite clear he wants it to operate in a way that suits himself and suits the LNP. Nothing to do with improving scrutiny or accountability for the people of Brisbane, it’s nothing about good order in this place. The LORD MAYOR, at least he’s not shying away from the fact in his comments here today and previously in this place, that this is all about, all designed to limit the ability for non‑administration Councillors to raise important issues here in the Council Chamber. So I suppose you have to ask yourself the question, Chair, when you’re in power—

LORD MAYOR: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order to you, LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Claim to be misrepresented.

Chair: Noted.

Councillor CASSIDY: So you sort of ask yourself the question, Chair, what do you do when you are in power, but you really don’t have much control of the situation around you. That’s obviously something that this LNP LORD MAYOR has been pondering for some time.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: He’s just said—yes, he changed the rules. He just said he doesn’t like the way in which Councillors have been using the rules of this place. We haven’t been breaking the rules in moving those motions and the suspension of standing orders. There’s been no referrals to the OIA (Office of the Independent Assessor) or to the Department or to anyone about the use of the Standing Rules, but the LORD MAYOR has made it very clear he just doesn’t like it. This LNP LORD MAYOR just does not like that kind of accountability and that kind of debate in this place. He likes to have total and utter control.

The LNP Administration don’t like community consultation because residents are starting to use their voice against this LNP Administration. He doesn’t like it here in the Chamber when we use our voices and our democratic prerogative to raise these issues here in the Chamber. So we don’t support, we’re not going to be voting in favour of this amendment. We don’t support the amendments to urgency motions that the LORD MAYOR has outlined. they’re anti-democratic and they are aimed at stifling debate in this Chamber and preventing non-administration Councillors from raising important issues.

If the LORD MAYOR wasn’t a hypocrite, he and his team wouldn’t be supporting these urgency motions this session that Labor Councillors have been raising, thus endorsing the urgent nature of them, but then delaying them by a week or in some cases years on the one hand, Chair. Then on the other hand, arguing that these things are not urgent, like he has just done today. Just last week we had a motion on the suspension of standing orders for an urgency motion that they supported, but they’re saying that they’re not urgent motions. So Chair, you’ve got to take what the LORD MAYOR is saying about these matters with a grain of salt.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: Absolutely, I’ll take that interjection, Councillor GRIFFITHS, he is 100% a political operator. He’s a political operator and has been his whole life and he’s trying to change the rules to suit himself. So in the previous year, Labor moved 13 motions for the urgent reinstatement of kerbside collection, the kerbside collection service which had been cut by this LNP Mayor. Each and every time these motions were voted down by the Mayor and those Councillors and that was their prerogative, they could do that and it was all well within the rules.

We also moved urgency motions calling on footpaths to be fixed, local jobs to be supported and bushland to be preserved. These people on this side of the Chamber, Chair, have the gall to stand up and say Labor doesn’t bring anything, we don’t put anything on the table. Well we do, we do meeting in, meeting out, they just don’t like talking about it because we are shining a light on their deficiencies, Chair. What do you do when you don’t like that if you’re the LNP? You just go and change the rules, you just go and change the rules so those things can’t be discussed.

As we’ve said, the LORD MAYOR has now admitted on several occasions today and previously, when this first came, that the changes to these local laws are politically motivated. He has spat the dummy entirely and decided to use his massive majority in here to wind back the democratic rights of elected Councillors. We’ll just remind those LNP Councillors—and they like—they’ve crowed about it today, their massive majority here in the Council Chamber. Councillor CUNNINGHAM said it earlier, that the election result was overwhelming. She didn’t point out that the LNP Councillors only won 52% of that two-party-preferred vote.

So you might hold 19 wards, but you’re on wafer-thin margins and when you start playing around with the rules of democratic debate in a place like this, which is entirely on message with the way in which you treat local residents through community consultation processes, you will be booted out at the next election. We know this is all politically charged as well because when you go and look at the initial submissions, the E&C submission and all of the material on file, there is absolutely no record of why this was requested.

We know that the Chief Legal Officer was tasked by the LORD MAYOR and Civic Cabinet to draft these changes that he was instructed to do at the LNP’s request in this place. But there is no reason why these laws are being changed. Sure, if there are definition issues and issues with State legislation we need to align with, we have to do that. We have to do that because we are bound by that through the City of Brisbane Act and City of Brisbane Regulation. But it’s quite clear these political changes have been directed solely by this LNP LORD MAYOR to limit debate and limit accountability in this place.

We also don’t support proposed amendments surrounding audio and visual recordings of Council meetings and their use. These changes would limit the use of meeting footage that is already publicly livestreamed onto YouTube, it’s happening right now. It would also give the Chair of this Council the ability to verbally revoke accreditation to members of the media at any time. This does nothing but limit the ability for the media to hold this Administration—and any administration for that matter—to account and that’s an important thing to do.

So to say that these changes to this Meetings Local Law have gone too far is a complete understatement. The LNP Mayor is going to extreme and extraordinary lengths to avoid accountability in this place. He doesn’t like the people of Brisbane seeing him for who he truly is. In the words of Lord Acton, ‘Power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely’.

We need some very robust rules and regulations in place to ensure that there is sufficient accountability on the political decisions that this political Administration is doing. We have to bear in mind they like to go around and say they are Council. Well they are not Council; Council is an organisation that is made up of 8,500 to 9,000 people, plus contractors. What they are is a political Administration and in this place, they use their massive majority to make changes. They use their massive majority—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: You’ve got the floor, Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: You are not the Council, Councillor SCHRINNER.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor MURPHY, please.

Councillor CASSIDY: I’m standing in a Council Chamber, this is not the Council.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: You are not the Council, LORD MAYOR.

Chair: Councillor MURPHY, please.

Councillor CASSIDY: You are the LORD MAYOR, you’re a politician.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: LORD MAYOR, please.

Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: These are political decisions being made and this LNP LORD MAYOR doesn’t like people calling him out on the political decisions that are being made. We will continue to do that whether he is trying to stop us in here or not. So these amendments are anti-democratic and there’s no two ways about it.

We also don’t support the proposed changes which give the LNP Administration more ability and reason to close Council meetings to the public. There should be very, very, very limited reasons why Council meetings should be closed to the public. These amendments propose that meetings can be closed to discuss issues such as the discipling of the CEO or senior executives, rating concessions or even the Council budget. So it’s now up to this LNP Administration to determine that a Council meeting could be closed for budget deliberations.

They are some of the most important meetings that a council can have, that elected representatives, political representatives making decisions on behalf of ratepayers can have. Now this LNP Administration is seeking the ability to have them closed to scrutiny and closed to the public. The people of Brisbane pay for us to exist. They elect us to make decisions on their behalf, not just on the whim of the LNP. So they deserve to know what’s going on in this place, in this Council Chamber, how their money is being spent, how their elected Councillors are representing them, whether it’s good, bad or ugly, they deserve to know.

Finally, the Opposition does not support the politically motivated changes to limit Councillors speaking only once during General Business. It’s another amendment deliberately aimed at gagging non-administration Councillors and limiting their ability to contribute in this Chamber. Democracy in this Chamber is certainly under threat from this LNP LORD MAYOR and no matter how much he tries to rig the rules in this place, Chair, we’re not going to be silenced either here in the Chamber or out in the community right across Brisbane.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor CASSIDY.

Further debate on item F? Further debate?

Sorry, point of misrepresentation, LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Point of misrepresentation. Councillor CASSIDY suggested that the change to urgency motions was about stopping Opposition Councillors having their say. In fact we’ve made it easier for people to lodge notified motions, which gives them more opportunity to have a say.

Chair: Thank you.

Councillor CUNNINGHAM.

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: Yes, thanks, Mr Chair. I rise to speak on item F and I’ll get to some of the specifics raised by Councillor CASSIDY in a moment. The *Local Government Act 2009* provides that the chief executive of a local government must make model procedures for the conduct of meetings of a local government and its committees and that the local government must either adopt the model procedures or prepare and adopt other procedures for the conduct of its meetings and meetings of its committees. The *Meetings Local Law 2001* outlines the Standing Rules and provides for proper Councillor, public speaker and public attendants conduct at Council meetings.

Recent amendments to the City of Brisbane Act and the City of Brisbane Regulation and the Local Government Act require that the *Meetings Local Law 2001* is amended to ensure consistency with the Standing Rules applicable to Council meetings and Standing Committee meetings. On 14 September earlier this year, Council resolved to propose to make the Meetings Amending Local Law 2021. In accordance with Council’s local law-making procedure, Council undertook public consultation from 27 September until 18 October on the proposed local law. This included a State interest check via consultation with the Queensland Government and the departments.

As the LORD MAYOR said, just six submissions were received, including two from the State. As a result of this consultation, a number of minor changes have been proposed which I’ll now go through. The existing provision relating to the automatic adjournment of a Council meeting which has sat seven hours has been removed. This is to ensure that a Council will not stand adjourned unless it is voted by the Council. A provision has been included to ensure that minutes of Committee meetings are endorsed by the Committee members. This is to codify an existing practice.

An amendment has been included to limit the purpose for which a Committee Chair or a Chair of Council can evict a member of the public. This has been limited to the same reason for removal, because of a closed meeting and also disorderly conduct, to be consistent with the legislation.

An amendment has been made to remove the existing limit of points of order to being raised in debate only. This is consistent with existing practice prior to the decision of the OIA that you raised at the start of this session, Mr Chair. Amendments have been made to ensure exact consistency with legislative provisions and to ensure consistency across all amendments in terms of terminology. Amendments have also been made to ensure that Councillors appearing by audio or video means are deemed to be present. This is to ensure consistency with the legislation.

Moving back to the substantive shifts in the local law now, Mr Chair. Advances in technology and the flexibility required due to the pandemic and other reasons have led to the inclusion of references to electronic meeting attendance in the local law. With another year of unpredictability ahead, we know that virtual meetings are here to stay and it is positive that it is enshrined in the local law.

Another change required due to the modernisation of our Council meetings is references to video recordings and the broadcast. Consistent with the State rules on the use of parliamentary broadcast, there are changes to clarify how the Council meeting video can be used. Now, Councillors should be free to use the broadcast to highlight and communicate matters of importance that they have raised in the Chamber. However, the broadcast should not be used selectively to take Councillors’ words out of their original context.

Councillor SRI: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor SRI.

Councillor SRI: Will Councillor CUNNINGHAM take a question?

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: No, I won’t, Councillor SRI.

As I was saying, the video broadcast should not be used to take Councillors’ words out of context and to run misleading advertising campaigns. In fact no political party should be doing that and I’ll stand by that comment and the Labor Council team have serious form in this space. We hear the Opposition cry crocodile tears on the alleged death of democracy. Well, I’m far more concerned about their juvenile behaviour in manipulating and twisting the words of Councillors in this place. That’s what’s demeaning to this Chamber and it is behaviour reflective of extreme fringe groups and those who want to move politics into a post-truth era.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: The changes proposed here are entirely consistent with the rules currently supported and consistently enforced by the State Labor Government and the Speaker and the Clerk of the Queensland Parliament. The updated local law gives Councillors additional time to provide a motion for debate. Those opposite have made all sorts of ridiculous comments about this amendment. Yet while on one hand they have welcomed recent changes to how meeting documents and agendas are distributed prior to a meeting, they still believe they should have the right to move motions without any notice to their colleagues under the clearly false pretence of urgency.

Yes, the changes mean that legitimately urgent matters, which could not have been possibly foreseen the day before, can still be debated. What we don’t support is the ongoing misuse of urgency motions for political gameplaying by those opposite. It is completely hypocritical for those opposite to peddle lines on Facebook and to the media, saying this change limits their ability to raise matters in the Chamber when it in fact does the complete opposite. There is a long‑established procedure for placing motions on the Council agenda. These amendments mean we are going even further to provide the opportunity for Councillors to put forward matters for debate in a transparent manner.

Now, regarding the media, there have been no changes to proposed rules around journalist accreditation. I have not heard any specific examples of issues around the current process and in fact no submissions were received from journalists. Once again, this is scaremongering, Mr Chair, from the Opposition. Now, on General Business limitations, the response from non-administration Councillors has been out of proportion. Nobody ever watched a meeting of the Brisbane City Council and thought gee, I wish Councillors had more speaking opportunities. I can guarantee that, Mr Chair.

There are plenty of speaking opportunities, let’s count them. With the E&C report, eight Committee reports and General Business, that’s 10 opportunities to make 10‑minute speeches for each and every Councillor, including the non‑administration Councillors. Yet for all the rhetoric from Labor on family‑friendly hours, they refuse to back a common-sense limit to limit the General Business debate to one speech per Councillor. Never mind the fact that in adjournment debates in the Labor-controlled State Parliament, only a limited few get three-minute speaking slots.

In conclusion, Mr Chair, Councillors have had two opportunities to contribute to this local law review and where legitimate, we have made amendments based on feedback. Our bosses, the people of Brisbane, don’t think this Chamber should be a place for political games. It is a place of business and the rules governing the conduct of these meetings should allow for professional and civil debate. I would like to commend this local law to the Chamber.

Chair: Thank you.

Further debate on F?

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: I rise to speak on item—I think it’s F, isn’t it, that we’re speaking on?

Chair: It is, F.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, item F, the Meetings Local Law. I’ll just put on the record that I was one of the submitters. I’m so pleased to see that the LNP Councillors made an effort to put in a submission. They didn’t, apart from you, Mr Chairman, who didn’t need to because the OIA clearly got that wrong and it was just completely unnecessary. You decided to interpret what they said and apply it erroneously, so just unnecessary. But what Councillor CUNNINGHAM has just read out, she’s read out a speech that was written for her, with her head down, is extraordinary.

So I just want to say a few things. Firstly, yes, this is Brisbane City Council and guess what, the only people in this place who don’t think it is Brisbane City Council is the LNP. They’ve taken ownership of Brisbane City Council and it’s now called the Schrinner Council. So let’s be clear—and they’re all hear hearing. So when the LORD MAYOR hopped up here full of mock outrage about this is not Brisbane City Council and had a go at Councillor CASSIDY, he publicly calls this Council after himself. This is how out of control the LNP have got and this is a brand-new thing that only started a few months ago.

So when he stands up and says this is Brisbane City Council, that’s not what he does every single day now; he calls this the Schrinner Council. So let’s just be clear, the people who are making these new rules today are not interested in open and transparent debate in this place. They are not interested in fairness and transparency. They are not interested in making sure that everybody can contribute to debate in this place. Councillor CUNNINGHAM in her speech today, all Councillors have an opportunity to speak whenever they want to speak.

I tried to speak earlier today and guess what, they voted down my right to speak. So let’s be clear, the LNP have used the guillotine over and over and over in this place to deny people the opportunity to speak. Their track record is about limiting debate. Their track record is about shutting down debate. Their track record is about hiding decision-making processes. That’s what is going on and these Meetings Local Law changes do nothing to enhance the transparency and the fundamental importance of open and transparent debate in this place.

Now, I did go to the effort of making a reasonably detailed submission. Interestingly enough, there’s a couple of responses on here. There are four dot points in response to my submission, which was three full pages. The first one is the automatic adjournment has been deleted. Well, apparently the State Government told them to delete it, so that’s not even in response to my submission. (2) The minutes of the meeting, there’s a new subsection so that the previous Committee meetings have to be put to the members of the Committee for endorsement.

Now, anybody who knows me on any Committee that I’ve ever been on—and Councillor McLACHLAN is a prime offender here—knows that half the chairs in this place don’t even put their meeting minutes to the Committee for endorsement. Councillor MARX doesn’t do it. You go to any community meeting in the suburbs of P&C or Neighbourhood Watch, first item of business is apologies, second item of business is approving the minutes. Who gets to approve the minutes? The people who are on the Committee. Except in this place, where if you’re on the Committee you don’t actually get to approve the minutes, the Chair does it on their say so.

It’s taken 14 years of me complaining about this for it to be changed. Presumably the State Government told them to do that too, because they don’t listen to me. The third dot point here says 75(5) public and media behaviour at meetings, amended to remove reference to Civic Cabinet. That’s not what I asked for, that response allegedly to my submission is not what I asked for with respect to section 75(5). I objected to the Chair having the power to let every Tom, Dick and Harry mate of the LNP into this Chamber when they feel like it.

So that dot point’s completely irrelevant to my submission and presumably it’s been put in there to beef it out. The fourth dot point, that there should be a definition for Standing Rules. This is why there are so many problems with these local laws, that the language has changed over time but it’s not changed consistently through the document. So basically I’ll say the LNP’s not listened to my submission.

There are a few things I want to put on the record. Firstly—and Councillor CUNNINGHAM again just no idea about what’s about to happen here—disorderly conduct is gone, there is no such thing as disorderly conduct any longer. That’s been a well-known and well-established process of identifying issues in this Chamber that people seek rulings on. It has been abolished. Interjecting is no longer disorderly behaviour, it’s all gone. You can defame someone if you want, not disorderly behaviour. The Meetings Local Law now refers to unsuitable meeting conduct. It goes on to say that unsuitable meeting conduct is actually defined in the Local Government Act. Well, no, it’s not.

What the Local Government Act says is it’s actually the Councillor Code Of Conduct. So going forward, I’m going to be really fascinated to see how this meeting’s going to be run, because interjecting is no longer disorderly. It’s not even unsuitable meeting conduct. I don’t know how this place is actually going to run. Whilst the Chair might think he has residual power under section 12—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: —subsection 3. Let me be clear, the decision to abolish specific disorderly conduct and to not put rules in, makes it very clear that there aren’t any.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: Right? If the court has to come back and interpret this, there’s a very clear decision being made here to remove all of these things as disorderly conduct.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: It’s a very deliberate decision. I don’t think it’s a good one. I think we need some general rules. But there are a lot of other problems here. The LNP did not take the opportunity to fix up some other issues in here. Many of them have been outlined by the previous speakers.

I actually thought that this would be the opportunity to fix up Question Time myself. I think we should limit questions to one minute and answers to three minutes. We would get through more questions, we could have more interaction. But no, that wasn’t considered. I mean I didn’t get a no change, I just got a no response all together. So that’s really delightful.

You know these are reforms that have already happened at the State and the Federal level. They’ve introduced supplementary questions down there. But limiting the timeframe to ask a question and answer a question would have been a very good and practical improvement to this place. But no, that didn’t happen.

There are massive problems here with closing the meeting. I absolutely and fundamentally do not support those changes to the Meetings Local Law. It is improper that this Council can close Council meetings on pretty much any issues it wants now.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: Again, that undermines—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: —transparency and openness and accountability and that is not appropriate in my view.

The process of warnings, I appreciate that there’s now a system set out in the Local Government Act but this Administration takes it further. It gives the Chair of Council unilateral power to eject somebody as the first response. Which is absolutely not right. I’ve been to the Supreme Court three times to try and stop the abuses of the chairs in this place and it’s not acceptable that it has continued over such a long period of time.

This just gives more unbridled power to the Chair of Council, who acts politically and acts in the interest of their own party, and not in the interests of fairness and transparency in the running of debate in this place. For many years I’ve voted against the minutes in this place since this change was made. I don’t believe that the CEO of Council and his staff should be able to change the draft minutes before we’ve seen them. He’s been doing that for some years now since Councillor Dick and I raised some concerns about his behaviour. It’s wrong in my view that we don’t see the draft. That is just wrong.

There’s lots of other issues here as well. I think that there is a very big—very big problem in allowing the Chair’s—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: —powers to go outside the running of the meeting here. There’s some attempt to sort of claim he can do anything he wants under any legislation. Well that’s just not how things work. It won’t work. There are—

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON your time has expired.

Further speakers?

Councillor WINES.

Councillor WINES: Thank you, Mr Chair, I rise to speak to item F. I’d like to make a small confession. I really like meetings rules procedures and I’m glad that so many other people can find the passion that I do to go—to enter this debate with such aggression and fervour about meeting rules and procedure.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: So as I—just some really strange comments a moment ago. But I’d like to just point out that section 55(6). No Councillor who is speaking shall be interrupted, except as provided for by these Standing Rules. So, no, interjections are still banned, I can assure you of that. But also, Mr Chair, 55(6) electronic devices shall be turned off or operated in silent mode in the Chamber and public gallery. So that’s just one that’s a trap for—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: —young players on that one.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: So there was an interesting question put to the group. How is the meeting meant to run without a ban on interjections?

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: That’s a fascinating question if you think about it.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: Because interjections are not a fundamental part of this meeting. In fact speaking and having others hear what you have to say is the fundamental action of the entire meeting.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: Not interjecting through the entire thing. But this leads us to other rules in this update that basically bring into the local law things that are, by nature, conventions. Things that we’ve often done in this place. For example, sign the book every day through the budget. A codification of a simple thing. I am unaware of what other Committee chairs do but I always move my minutes and have a vote. That was now part of the rules.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: Part of the modernisation issues that we’ve had, to make sure that people can Zoom in, to make sure that the video streaming system works. These are relatively new ideas for this Council and I must stop and insist that when all 27 of us get together we are the Council. If anyone was curious about—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: —what the Council is and isn’t. When all of us group together in a meeting in this place, we are the Council.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: I know that—and I appreciate that—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor WINES: Now strictly the activities we just saw would be banned in the future, Mr Chair, under section 55.

Chair: Six.

Councillor WINES: Five.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: Sixty—section 55(5).

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: So the other thing that this does. So this is the document here, right. So I’ll show that. So it’s quite hefty for the comparative minimal changes that are in it.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: But the bulk of this document actually speaks to a change of the rules and another instance of modernisation. The old rules spoke to chairmen, all of them—all of the instances where chairman exists now read chair. That actually is what takes up the bulk of this document. The other things—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: —that we should—and look, I support gender neutrality in the way we conduct things. I think that’s an appropriate way to behave. The other thing that puts a great deal of sort of weight into this document, why it is larger than what you’d expect. Is because the conflict of interest and the maintenance of good order rules that were in a different part of our admin procedures will now be in this. So it will be a one-stop shop for the Chair to be able to manage the meeting with a limited—with as few documents as possible. That allows for better operation and better preparation for the meeting.

So this—while a lot of the discussion earlier was—I’m going to say—a touch disingenuous and hyperbolic.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: This document tidies up a lot of things and brings them into the age where we can have Zoom. Into a gender-neutral language. It allows policy resolutions, notified motions to be done very late. I would describe it as very late—and to provide and the mechanisms to bring in urgency motions remain.

Councillor SRI: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Councillor SRI, point of order, I’m taking it.

Councillor SRI: Would Councillor WINES take a quick question?

Chair: Councillor WINES will you take a question?

Councillor WINES: Go on, why not, go on.

Councillor SRI: Yes, it’s a simple one. Just wondering what do you understand to be the definition of political advertising in terms of the limitation on use of video footage from Council?

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor SRI: Because I honestly don’t quite understand what the definition would be.

Councillor WINES: Yes, so I suppose what it all comes down to is potential misuse of the film, effectively. What it comes down to.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: So some of the criticism that the Administration has worn through this debate and the interjections just made at the moment. Infer that only—that we’re concerned about ourselves being traduced, the film being manipulated to indicate something has happened that didn’t in fact happen. We actually saw that in the recent elections. The film of the LORD MAYOR was manipulated to have him saying something that he didn’t say.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: Now that’s a big concern to me that that a major political party would confect a quote from a leader in a campaign.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: I think that we really should be concerned with confections. I have no issue with what I say being repeated. But I do take an issue with misuse of what I say. I think that has to be a serious consideration of what we’re about. So I think if the objective—there’s a whole range of things around free speech, to address Councillor SRI’s question specifically. But dishonesty, manipulation and confection aren’t actually—they actually fly in the space of free speech. I think that that’s something I hope many of us can agree on.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: On the matter of changes to how the Chair can treat the media. The only changes are renumbering. So in the old rules you would have found them in section 55. Under the new rules, you’ll find exactly the same words, section 75. So these things are still there.

In many ways this document—the bulk of it—can really be put down to codification of the rules so they’re all in one place for us. Which will make life much earlier. Gender-neutrality of the terms within it and just addressing how we’re meant to use and how the increasing use of computerisation and technology affects the way that we conduct this meeting.

So once again I’m very, very happy to see that people are so enthusiastic about meetings procedure as I am. To be so passionate through their earlier statements. I look forward to these coming into play so that we can have a cleaner and clearer understanding of the conduct of this meeting. I look forward and recommend—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: —it to the Chamber. I look forward to its ratification later on.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Thank you, Councillor WINES.

Further debate?

Councillor SRI.

Councillor SRI: Thanks, Chair. I rise to speak on item F. I think the term Councillor WINES used was disingenuous and a little hyperbolic. Was that right?

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor SRI: I feel like if Brisbane City Council meetings were a movie, that would be the by‑line. It’s Brisbane City Council, disingenuous and a little hyperbolic.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor SRI: Anyway, I had a few points I wanted to raise and I’ll pick up on that tone about the use of video footage that Councillor WINES was kind enough to answer a question on. Because I completely understand where the Administration is coming from in terms of wanting to limit or in some way regulate misuse of video footage. I get that there’s a genuine and perhaps sincere motivation behind that. But what the actual wording of the local law does is prohibits anything that could be described as political advertising.

The ordinary definition of political advertising used by the Electoral Commission and other government bodies. Is much broader than what we might call misuse or misleading conduct or whatever. According to the Electoral Commission’s definitions, if I shared a clip from the Council meeting and said here’s what a Councillor said and I posted that on my Facebook page—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor SRI: —that would constitute political advertising. That would meet the standard definitions of advertising. Because it’s—yes, anyway, I don’t need to go into detail about it. But that’s really I think a weakness of these local laws. I understand that they were to some extent modelled on State Parliament processes. But the drafting of that particular section is just too broad.

I’m not too worried about it because I don’t actually think the Chair will have the time or resources to police or enforce this stuff in detail. But I do wonder whether the first time a Councillor posts a video from the Chamber with a bit of—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor SRI: —commentary. Whether the Chair is then going to have to deal with a bunch of complaints about it on the grounds that it’s political advertising and we’re going to get into some messy territory. Where an LNP Chair is deciding whether another Councillor from another party of whatever has engaged in political advertising. Which is, of course, an inherently subjective and political decision itself.

So that really brings me to my broader concern with the entire updated Meetings Local Law. Which is that it seems to be giving more power and discretion to Committee chairs and the Chair of the Council meetings. Just as a general proposition it seems like it is empowering the Chair to make subjective decisions about what kind of behaviour’s appropriate. What kinds of sanctions are appropriate in terms of kicking Councillors out *et cetera, et cetera*.

I do think that is a—that puts the Chair in a precarious position. Where for these meetings to be able to function effectively, we need to be able to trust that the Chair is acting independently and is not misusing their discretion. The more discretion you give to the Chair, the greater the risk is that they’ll be pressured into applying that discretion favourably towards the LNP in the case of the current Council composition.

I don’t think the Administration has fully reflected on the long term ramifications of that. We don’t want the Chair of this meeting to become a politicised role. But I would argue that—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor SRI: —in recent years it already has become a politicised role. So I think it’s a mistake to allow—to introduce so many sections that give the Chair more discretion, particularly in terms of responding to conduct. I remember being a little bit disappointed when during the last Council budget debates I interjected I think twice. Probably the first time all year that I actually interjected during a speech. I was ejected quite promptly by the Chair at the time. That was an example of the Chair using discretion to eject me from a meeting.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor SRI: Yes, without any formal warnings. It was quite a—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Yes, Councillor WINES, point of—

Councillor WINES: Claim to be misrepresented.

Chair: Okay, noted.

Councillor SRI: I didn’t refer to any statements by Councillor WINES. But I’m happy to take a question from Councillor WINES.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Point of order to you Councillor WINES.

Councillor WINES: Thank you. No, no, I’ll be back.

Councillor SRI: Yes, cool. I’m not actually necessarily debating whether the decision itself was legitimate or not. I’m simply pointing out that that’s an example of the Chair using a lot of discretion. In a context where an LNP Chair is going to be perceived as acting politically, according to party lines. Even when they might not be. I think that’s a stark contrast with the stronger conventions and the stronger assertion of the independence of the Speaker that we see in Parliament at the State and Federal roles.

That’s often a contested space at that level of government as well. But there seems to be a stronger defence of the idea that the Speaker of their Chamber or the House has to act a bit more neutrally. I do worry that in this Chamber we’ve seen a lot of very partial and subjective decisions made by different chairs over the years. Not necessarily your good self. But I do worry that the local laws won’t necessarily address those concerns.

Just turning to the cutting of General Business. I think I might have been the first one who kind of worked out that you could speak multiple times. Or maybe it was done before me.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor SRI: But yes but I think the—if the Chamber is going to take that approach of saying look, you can only speak once during General Business. It will be very, very important for the Chair of this Chamber and the Deputy Chair to be a little less restrictive about what counts as relevant content—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor SRI: —during Committee debates or debates on reports or other items of the agenda. I say that because when the Mayor stands up and gives their report. Or when any of the Committee chairs—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor SRI: —stand up. They can speak on a very wide range of topics within their portfolios. They’re empowered to talk about whatever the heck they want. Can raise all sorts of issues. Can, if they want, indirectly cast aspersions on other Councillors in the Chamber, *et cetera, et cetera*.

The only opportunity for Councillors like myself to respond to that is oh, bring it up in General Business. That’s been a frequent refrain in this Chamber over the years. Councillor SRI, if you don’t like it, just bring it up during General Business. Councillor SRI, you’re veering off the topic, bring it up in General Business. There comes a point where there’s only so many things you can squeeze into a 10 minute speech. So I’m not necessarily strongly or vehemently objecting to limiting General Business to one 10 minute section per Councillor. I think it’s a bad call but I’m not going to die in a ditch over it.

But what I do want to remind the current and future chairs of this Chamber. Is that if you’re going to restrict how much Councillors can talk about—what they can talk about during General Business. That’s what you’re doing, you’re introducing a new, quite significant restriction, on Councillors abilities to raise matters that haven’t been covered by existing reports. Then you need to be mindful of the fact that you’re introducing that new restriction in terms of how much leeway you allow Councillors during debates on other topics throughout a Council meeting.

I thought it was very disingenuous and a little bit hyperbolic of Councillor CUNNINGHAM to add up all the speaking opportunities in a Council agenda. When we know that those are limited to the topics of the agenda items. If I want to stand up and talk about an issue that’s important to residents in my electorate. Or an event or a significant occasion or whatever. I’ve only got that one 10 minute slot at the end of the meeting. I don’t have the opportunity to talk about that during the report items that are happening in other parts of the Council agenda.

So I thought it was very, very misleading and I was surprised at Councillor CUNNINGHAM. Because she’s usually a little more even handed. But I thought it was very misleading to try and argue that oh, Councillors already have plenty of opportunities to speak. They can speak for 10 minutes here and there and in this report and that report. Nonsense. We can only speak on the items that are being debated. So if the Administration is seeking to—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor SRI: —strictly limit how much we can talk about things during General Business, there are two consequences. (1) We’ll need the opportunities to respond to some of the statements that the Mayor or other chairs are making during their remarks on reports. I would suggest that there’s a little bit of flexibility and discretion that chairs ought to be applying there. Because currently the Mayor can stand up and speak about whatever he wants and no one else has the opportunity to rebut or contradict or critique the claims he makes.

But (2) if that doesn’t happen and if we see a very strict policing of what Councillors can say and we also see that hard limit on General Business matters. We’re going to have to have more and more notified motions. Which will undermine the Administration’s stated goal of family-friendly meeting times. I hope the LORD MAYOR is alert to this. Is that if you’re introducing more limits on what we can speak on during General Business. We’ll have to bring more notified motions.

I do want to acknowledge that it’s a good move by the Administration to propose a shorter notice period for notified motions. I think that will be a positive change and I really welcome that. I actually share some of the Administration’s concerns that some of the urgency motions brought by Labor probably aren’t that urgent. But I do think the notified motions notice period being changed is a good step in that regard.

But by the same token I think we should be a little nervous about the fact that limiting our opportunity to raise matters in General Business just means we’re going to be talking about them at other points. Could actually lead to longer meetings with more notified motions. So on those grounds I won’t be supporting the new local law.

Chair: Councillor SRI, your time has expired.

Councillor WINES. I don’t think you were mentioned by name so I don’t think you have a point of misrepresentation.

Councillor WINES: Noted by position and title.

Chair: Oh, no it’s only by name.

Councillor WINES: All right.

Chair: Further debate on item F? No further debate on item F?

LORD MAYOR.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair, and thank you to all those Councillors who contributed on this particular item. It was interesting, we knew Councillor CASSIDY would talk about democracy and accountability and—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —make the *Chicken Little* claim that this is—oh this is some kind of retrograde step. But he exposed a serious lack of knowledge in a basic, fundamental principle of—

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —what we’re doing here, i.e. who the Council is.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: He actually stated that the Council is the 8,000 or 9,000 people that work for it.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Well, not according to the City of Brisbane Act, it’s not.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Not according to the democratic system that we operate under. All of the people in this Chamber who are elected are the Council.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: We are the Council and that is what the Act says. So page 19 of the City of Brisbane Act says that Brisbane City Council (The Council) is the elected body that is responsible for the good rule and local government of Brisbane.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: It then goes on, page 21—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, please.

LORD MAYOR: There’s no such thing as the Johnston Council, I can tell you right now and there never will be.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: The page 21 of the City of Brisbane Act—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —further goes on to say. The Council is constituted by the Mayor and the 26 other Councillors who are elected or appointed to the Council under this Act or the *Local Government Electoral Act* *2011*. So in other words, those Councillors who are elected. Or if there’s a vacancy within 12 months of the election, those who are appointed. That is the Council.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Now in the same way that the Palaszczuk Government exists. The Government is not all the public servants that work for the Government. The Government are the people who sit in State Parliament in George Street. That is the Palaszczuk Government.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: In a situation of—

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —party politics. Which we have and which we’ve had for a long, long time. Since I think 1925 and maybe even beyond that. There is an Administration and there is an Opposition.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: The Administration, just like—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, please.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: We are the Council. All the people in this room are the Council.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: We’re not an Administration.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: We are not administrators. We are the elected Council—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Point of order Councillor SRI.

LORD MAYOR: So people on this side of the room—

Chair: Point of order, Councillor SRI.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor SRI: Just having a bit of trouble hearing the LORD MAYOR and would ask—

Chair: Yes.

Councillor SRI: —that you call the Chamber to order.

Chair: Councillors, please allow the LORD MAYOR to be heard in silence.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: So the people on this side of the room, i.e. the majority, are Team Schrinner, the Schrinner Council.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: So it’s not that hard to get. Because you get it at the other levels of government. You just—

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —don’t like hearing it, do you?

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: You don’t like hearing it.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: It’s basic democracy 101.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: But let me put this theory to the test.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, please, don’t make me go to the red tabs.

LORD MAYOR: Let me put this theory to the test.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: So if a Council officer makes a mistake, whose fault is it?

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: No, no, whose—

Chair: Councillor MURPHY, please.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor MURPHY, please.

LORDS MAYOR: Who does the Labor Councillors blame if a Council officer makes the mistake?

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Well I don’t think they share in any of the blame because they—

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —certainly never—that’s when they don’t consider themselves to be part of the Council.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: That’s the Administration.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —i.e. the Schrinner Council. So if—

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —someone gets a parking ticket—

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —on the road, who’s going to get the blame? Is it the Council officer? Is it this joint body that we’re talking about here?

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: No. It is the Administration or the majority.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: So look, even a basic look at what Councillor CASSIDY has said shows that his view is seriously lacking, or maybe deliberately so. I don’t know.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: But this claim that somehow debate is being limited in some way is just—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Councillor WINES, you said it, it’s hyperbolic. The claim is hyperbolic. Because we are not changing the number of times that people can speak on the Committee reports and the submissions that come through. That has not changed at all. That has been the same for as long as anyone can remember. In fact there’s nothing to stop a Councillor speaking on every single item. There might be even one Councillor in the room that speaks on every single item, I don’t know.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: But—and it’s interesting because—

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: I take that interjection. She said—

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —a Councillor—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —who identified as the independent Councillor for Tennyson said I will be speaking on every item now.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Well, as if that’s going to be a chance.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: As if that is going to be a chance.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: I remember that same Councillor has had a disagreement about something that’s been said in this meeting. She’s like, I’m going to punish you guys, I’m going to speak on every single item.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Remember? You remember that?

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Like it’s some kind of punishment when she speaks.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: This is democracy, this is not punishment. If you see speaking as punishment, you have a very warped view of this whole process.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: But before—Councillor JOHNSTON said earlier today they denied my right to speak. She was referring to the majority. Now let’s actually put that claim to the test.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Was Councillor JOHNSTON denied the right to speak?

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: No. She spoke for 10 minutes which was her right.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: But last time I checked she was not the Leader of the Opposition.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Actually, hang on a second. Have I got this wrong?

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Will the Leader of the Opposition please put their hand up?

Councillor MACKAY: Point of order, Mr Chair.

Chair: Point of order Councillor MACKAY.

Councillor MACKAY: I’m really enjoying what the LORD MAYOR’s saying, I’m on the edge of my seat. But there’s just a continual drone from the corner—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor MACKAY: —that you’ve warned a few times.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor MACKAY, it’s from all sides, dare I say.

So please allow the LORD MAYOR to be heard in silence.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: So I’ve always made it clear that if the Leader of the Opposition wants extra time to speak, we always support that. That’s been an ongoing tradition of this place and we do. Doesn’t mean we like hearing what he has to say but we support it. Because that’s the right thing to do for the Leader of the Opposition. Councillor JOHNSTON is not the Leader of the Opposition.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: So to suggest that we denied Councillor JOHNSTON’s right to speak is a falsehood, an absolute falsehood. She got the same right that anyone would get other than the Leader of the Opposition and that is to speak for 10 minutes on an item. So we’re not changing that.

In terms of other matters here. This issue of the debate of motions. It’s really interesting because what Labor Councillors have done is they’ve tried to work out the shortest, the easiest and the laziest way of making a political point.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: So what they’ve done is misused this urgency motion provision to basically make a three minute statement on something.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Because that’s really all they want to do.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: That’s all—that’s the only fire that they have in their belly.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: It lasts for about three minutes—

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: You’ll remember there’s been a couple of times where we’ve actually voted yes to urgency. You can see them scrambling around because—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —they actually weren’t prepared to debate the item. They weren’t actually prepared to have a debate. They just wanted to make a pithy, political point—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —for three minutes and then—

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —sit down and then go, the LNP voted against whatever it is that we voted against.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Never mind that we were voting on urgency not the actual substantive issue. But they have—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —taken the laziest route.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: So, look if you want to debate an issue, we’re making it easier for you to actually debate an issue. Here’s another thing. Tell me, are you going to get more informed debate if you have 24 hours to prepare for that debate? Rather than—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —20 seconds to prepare for that debate?

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Is it going to be more informed if you have 24 hours’ notice or 20 seconds? You tell me.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: I think both sides will agree that you’re not going to have a particularly informed debate with 20 seconds notice.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: So that is not the way Australia’s most professional and largest council makes its decision. Based on 20-second, political motion—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —point scoring. That’s not how we make decisions.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: If you have an issue that you really want to debate, 24 hours’ notice is fair enough.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: That gives all of us an chance to have a think about the issue and how we might approach it. That’s a reasonable thing in a democratic situation.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: But then let’s go further. Because there were other hyperbolic claims made about you know oh, the accountability and the death of democracy and all that sort of ridiculous untrue claim. Let’s have a look at something basic like Question Time. I mean the Labor Party has the opportunity to ask me. Side to side, every week they get the opportunity to ask me a question. Guess what that question is? Once again, it’s like a—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —two-minute statement followed by a rhetorical question.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: It’s a rhetorical question. So they don’t actually ask you a question, they make a statement.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: So they use their opportunity, instead of asking a question, they make a statement.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Followed by a rhetorical question. So—and then half of the time they ask a Chair, rather than me. So look, you know—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: LORD MAYOR, your time has expired.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Thank you.

LORD MAYOR: You squibbed it.

Chair: We’ll now put item F to the vote.

**Clause F put**

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

Thereupon, Councillors Jared CASSIDY and Steve GRIFFITHS 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, DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Krista ADAMS, and Councillors Greg ADERMANN, Adam ALLAN, Fiona CUNNINGHAM, Tracy DAVIS, Fiona HAMMOND, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Sarah HUTTON, Sandy LANDERS, James MACKAY, Kim MARX, Peter MATIC, David McLACHLAN, Ryan MURPHY, Angela OWEN, Steven TOOMEY and Andrew WINES.

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

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

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

#### A STORES BOARD SUBMISSION – SIGNIFICANT CONTRACTING PLAN FOR GRASS CUTTING SERVICES

**165/830/179/849**

**342/2021-22**

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 1 November 2021.

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. The Stores Board recommends approval of the Significant Contracting Plan (SCP) to establish a Corporate Procurement Arrangement (CPA) in the form of a Panel Arrangement, for Grass Cutting Services. The CPA will be for a maximum term of five years. The estimated expenditure is $84 million over the potential five-year term.

Background/business case

6. Council has approximately 70,000 hectares of greenspace in parks and 1,279 hectares in road corridors. These areas require grass cutting maintenance services ranging in seasonal frequency, averaging between 15 and 35 services per annum. Areas of greenspace include general open space parklands, high-profile parks, major and minor roadways, firebreaks, sporting fields, remediated land, flood mitigation areas and cemeteries, which require general cutting services. Open drains, embankments and wetland boundaries are currently serviced by long-reach vegetation slashing contractors.

7. Since 2001, Council-owned vacant land and Village Precinct Projects have been serviced by selected social enterprises (SEs) and community enterprises (CEs) under Memorandum of Understandings (MoUs). In addition, contracted SEs and CEs maintain limited general open space parks and sports fields.

8. Renewal of the CPA for Grass Cutting Services will ensure the continued grass cutting maintenance services for Council’s greenspace areas.

9. The following Categories will be established as part of the Request for Proposal (RFP) process:

- Category 1 – Commercial Grass Cutting of Council Wards

- Category 2 – Cemeteries

- Category 3 – Landfill

- Category 4 – Social and Community Enterprise Grass Cutting

- Category 5 – Long Reach Grass Cutting and Difficult Sites.

10. Current ward boundaries will be used in the tender process. Category 1 will consist of 26 portions. Tenderers may submit for any or all of these portions.

11. The tender evaluation process for commercial operators and SEs and CEs are proposed to be conducted separately.

Commercial operators

12. A two-stage process is proposed.

13. Stage 1 (planned to occur during December 2021 and January 2022)

- Open market RFP process to assess local benefit, experience and track record, Workplace Health and Safety (WH&S), quality and environmental systems, and commercial viability.

- Respondents will need to agree to Council’s contract conditions at this stage.

- Respondents will be given the opportunity in their Stage 1 submission to comment on Council’s specification, key performance indicators (KPIs) and any other aspects that they believe will deliver an improved outcome. Any comments will be taken into account by Council and may be adopted before releasing Stage 2.

14. Stage 2 (planned to occur during February and March 2022)

- Those commercial operators shortlisted from Stage 1, will be given the opportunity to submit firm pricing and a detailed methodology to demonstrate their ability to deliver services to the required standards (including timeframes), as well as provide assurance of such delivery.

- All commercial tenderers will be notified that, prior to contract award or during the term of the contract, a proportion of each ward’s park and/or sports field area may be reassigned to a SE or CE. Existing Council contracts with commercial operators permit an annual 20% variation in expenditure before contract rates can be renegotiated. It is proposed to have a similar clause in new contracts to provide Council with ongoing flexibility to manage commercial and social providers.

Social and Community Enterprises

15. SEs and CEs will be invited to submit a proposal to cut low profile parks and/or sports fields (not roads due to additional safety requirements and pricing complexity). Assessment will be based on demonstrating local benefits, social and/or community benefits, experience and track record, management systems, environmental outcomes and deliverability.

Policy and other considerations

16. Is there an existing CPA/contract for these goods/services/works?

Yes. Council has three CPAs in the form of Panel Arrangements and seven Preferred Supplier Arrangements (PSAs) for the provision of grass cutting services. Commercial services were allocated on a ward-by-ward basis and use a schedule of rates per metre per cut. The rates include a rise and fall provision relating to fuel and Consumer Price Index (CPI), and a provision allowing each contractor’s volume of grass to vary +/- 20% from the original ward meterage before a rate review is undertaken. A fixed price per site is currently used for SEs and CEs.

The CPAs for commercial grass cutting services, long reach vegetation slashing services and grass cutting by SE and CE organisations are due to expire on 30 June 2022. An optional extension period for the commercial and the SE and CE contracts is available.

The six MoUs for Grass Cutting and Landscape Maintenance Services in Council Parks, Council-Owned Vacant Land and Village Precinct Projects (by SEs and CEs) are due to expire on 15 December 2023. The MoU for Grass Cutting and Sports Field Maintenance is due to expire on 30 June 2022. Options to extend for an additional 12 months are available.

17. Could Council businesses provide the services/works?

Yes. Some services could be undertaken by Council officers, however, Council does not have the internal capacity to service all areas. The work is less suited to internal delivery as some elements of the services may involve specialist equipment or be subject to technological change.

18. Are there policy, or other issues, that the delegate should be aware of?

No

19. Have the following issues been considered in the development of the specifications and evaluation criteria: Environmental sustainability, access and equity, Zero Harm, quality assurance (QA), local benefit and support for locally produced and Australian products?

Yes. Environmental sustainability, access and equity, Zero Harm and QA have been addressed in the specifications and evaluation criteria. Council will be seeking to reduce emissions associated with this CPA, including through the use of some electric mowers and equipment. The market for electric equipment is not considered to be sufficiently advanced at this time to enable the CPA to use only electric equipment. It is anticipated that the next CPA (commencing in 2027) would likely use only electric equipment. The use of some electric equipment in this CPA and an evaluation criterion for environmental outcomes will be a key step in the transition. Local benefit has been allocated a weighting of 30%. A [Commercial-in-Confidence] allocation has been included for social/community benefits for Category 2.

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

No

21. Does this proposed contract involve leasing?

No

Market analysis

22. Electric handheld equipment such as whipper snippers and blowers are established tools for commercial grass cutting service delivery. Electric ride-on mowers are available but have run‑time restrictions and the availability of quick-swap battery systems and portable charging are limited. Electric ride-on mowers have a higher initial cost than the petrol-powered equivalent, although they do have lower ongoing maintenance costs. Currently, the market for commercial electric ride-on mowers is limited and more expensive than petrol equivalents.

23. The industry is highly competitive due to low barriers to entry. Outlays for equipment need to be considered in contract durations to enable financing. Industry demand is generally high in Queensland but is impacted in periods of low rainfall and drought conditions. Due to semiconductor shortages, there are currently delays on the delivery of new equipment of up to nine months.

24. Many local suppliers have been identified with the capacity to be able to meet Council’s needs.

Procurement strategy and activity plan

25.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Procurement objective: | To procure grass cutting services 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: | Grass Cutting Services |
| Type of procurement: | Establishing a CPA in the form of a Panel Arrangement, which will include separate categories for:  - Category 1 – Commercial Grass Cutting of Council Wards  - Category 2 – Cemeteries  - Category 3 – Landfill  - Category 4 – Social Enterprise and Community Grass Cutting  - Category 5 – Long Reach Grass Cutting and Difficult Sites. |
| Process to be used: | RFP. A two-stage process will be used for Categories 1, 2, 3 and 5 with only those tenderers having sufficient capability and experience progressing to Stage 2. Category 4 will be tendered as a single-stage process. |
| RFP standard to be used (and any amendments to the standard): | The RFP standard will be Council’s corporate standard with no amendments. |
| Market engagement e.g. public tender/sole or select sourcing/Exemption under *SP103 Procurement Policy and Plan 2021-22* | Offers are to be sought publicly via Council’s supplier portal. |
| How RFP is to be distributed and submitted: | Via Council’s supplier portal |
| How tenders/proposals are to be lodged: | Via Council’s supplier portal |
| Part offers: | Part offers will be considered for individual wards in Categories 1 and 5 and for parks only or roads only in the Pullenvale Ward.  All offers will be considered for Category 4. |
| Joint offers: | Joint offers will not be considered. |
| Contract standard to be used (and any amends): | Council’s standard Services Panel Arrangement contract. The arrangement will include a provision that allows Council to add further participants, if needed, or to include participants with new and innovative methods of service delivery. Any additions to the panel will be approved by the relevant delegate for the value of that contract. |
| Period/term of contract: | 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. However, alternative options may be negotiated within the five-year maximum term to manage delays on the delivery of new equipment. |
| Insurance requirements: | Public liability of $20 million and motor vehicle insurance of $20 million. Workers’ compensation insurance to an amount as required by legislative requirements in Queensland. |
| Price basis: | Schedule of rates, subject to negotiation during the RFP process. |
| Price adjustment: | To be established as a result of negotiations and advised in the post‑market submission. |
| Liquidated damages: | No liquidated damages apply but Council’s right to claim general law damages will be preserved. |
| Security for the contract: | Not applicable |
| Defects liability period/warranty period: | Not applicable |
| Other strategy elements: | The tender will consolidate current arrangements into a CPA with five categories.  Approaching the market early will assist with transitioning in the new CPA well in advance of key delivery periods.  Negotiation of the initial term and optional periods may be used to mitigate delays on the delivery of new equipment by suppliers. For example, alternate periods may be used to allow use of existing equipment and alignment of optional periods with purchase of new equipment with sufficient duration for suppliers to be able to obtain finance if needed.  A tender briefing will be undertaken prior to release of the RFP.  The tender will include a two-stage process for Categories 1, 2, 3 and 5 as set out in ‘Tender evaluation’. Only suppliers assessed as sufficiently capable and experienced will be put to the time and cost of pricing the tender during the second stage.  The specification will provide for the addition of equipment to monitor/track mower cutting. This may be implemented during the term of the CPA to assist with tracking of performance and proof of service.  The evaluation will seek opportunities to increase SE spend (subject to budget and operational constraints), dependent on submissions received and reduce emissions including a specification requirement to use electric mowers within inner city wards, allowing suppliers a suitable period (e.g.12 months) to transition.  It is anticipated that the allocation of wards (Category 1) will limit award of multiple sites to one tenderer to manage performance risk to Council. In addition, poor performance by a supplier may lead to re‑allocation of whole/part of that ward/sub-category to another CPA supplier.  The CPA will continue to provide for the increase/decrease of meterage by up to 20% to accommodate additional greenspace and development.  Continued geospatial mapping improvements have been used to increase accuracy of cut areas and payment.  Suppliers will be expected to provide the services without significant subcontracting to maintain a close working relationship between Council and the entities undertaking the work. |
| Alternative strategies considered: | Utilising the final optional period of the current contracts which expire in 2023. |

Anticipated schedule

26. Commercial operators (Categories 1, 2, 3 and 5)

Pre-market approval: 30 November 2021

Date of release to market: 3 December 2021

Tender closing date: 22 December 2021

Stage 1 evaluation completion date: 28 January 2022

Stage 2 release: 4 February 2022

Stage 2 evaluation completion date: 31 March 2022

Contract prepared: 4 April 2022

Post-market approval: 10 May 2022

Contract commencement: 1 July 2022

27. Social and community enterprises (Category 4)

Pre-market approval: 30 November 2021

Date of release to market: 4 February 2022

Evaluation completion date: 31 March 2022

Contract prepared: 4 April 2022

Post-market approval: 10 May 2022

Contract commencement: 1 July 2022

Contract expenditure and budget availability

28. Estimated total expenditure under this CPA/contract (including any optional additional periods):

The estimated expenditure is approximately $84 million over the potential five-year term.

29. Sufficient approved budget to meet the total spend under this CPA/contract?

The establishment of the CPA will not commit Council to any purchases. Funding is only required when an appropriately delegated Council officer approves entering into a contract made under the CPA.

30. Program budget line item:

Grass Cutting Streets

Program: Program 6 City Standards, Community Health and Safety

Outcome: 6.1 Maintaining the City

Strategy: 6.1.1 Maintaining the City Infrastructure

Service: 6.1.1.1 Maintaining Active Transport Infrastructure

Operating/projects: 5000001039 – 1420 – Grass Cutting Streets – 1001

Parks Grass Cutting

Program: Program 6 City Standards, Community Health and Safety

Outcome: 6.2 Open Space Management

Strategy: 6.2.1 Trees and Parks Maintenance

Service: 6.2.1.1 Trees and Parks Maintenance

Operating/projects: 5000001063 – 1422 – Parks Grass Maintenance and Management

31. Anticipated procurement savings (if any):

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

Procurement risk

32. Summary of key risks associated with this procurement:

| **Procurement risk** | **Risk rating** | **Risk mitigation strategy** | **Risk allocation** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Tenderers may not have electric mowers and equipment at time of tendering | High | - Tenderers will be given sufficient time to acquire electric mowers and equipment where required.  - Acquisition of required equipment will be listed as a contractual obligation.  - Specification requirements may be negotiated during the tender process. | Contractor |
| Poor quality tenders received | Medium | - A tender briefing session will be held to clarify the requirements of the tender. | Council/ contractor |
| Tenderers submit unsustainable pricing | Medium | - Two-stage process. Only those tenderers with demonstrated capability will proceed to Stage 2.  - Council has benchmarked pricing for comparison purposes and has an understanding of key cost drivers. | Council/ contractor |
| Tenderers have insufficient time to submit for Stage 1 and request extension | Medium | - Tender briefing to clarify Stage 1 requirements, timing and to prepare tenderers for release of the RFP.  - Only high-level information will be requested for Stage 1 (refer paragraph 34(b)).  - Should an extension be required, tenderers can be provided an extension into the new year and Council may utilise a portion of the additional extension period of the current arrangements. | Council |
| RFP analysis and negotiation takes longer than anticipated | Low | - All stakeholders informed of the timeline.  - Accuracy of RFP documentation to reduce clarifications required.  - Tender briefing to reduce uncertainty of what is required.  - Utilising a portion of the additional extension period of the current arrangements. | Council |
| Small number of responses received | Low | - All incumbents and known grass cutting suppliers will be contacted and advised of the RFP release. | Council |
| **Operational risk** | | | |
| Quality of service/poor performance | Medium | - Evaluation of tenderers’ track record via referee reports, quality of work, timeliness and resourcing.  - Regular review of performance against KPIs.  - KPIs are incorporated into specifications and Contract Management Plans.  - Audits of completed works.  - Contract provisions allowing termination of whole/part of their allocation for poor performance. | Council |

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

Yes

Tender evaluation

34. Evaluation criteria:

(a) Mandatory/essential criteria – Categories 1, 2, 3 and 5:

- Has a valid ABN.

- Has an acceptable financial position.

- Has a satisfactory response to legislative and regulatory compliance.

- Has the required insurances or has a commitment to obtain such insurances.

- Has appropriate safety management systems and practices.

- Has a satisfactory Business Continuity Plan.

- Has demonstrated experience in providing direct services of a similar size and nature in a sub-tropical environment.

(b) Non-price weighted evaluation criteria – Stage 1 – Category 1, 2, 3 and 5:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Weighted evaluation criteria** | **Weighting**  **(%)** |
| Local benefit (Stage 1) | 30 |
| Experience and track record (Stage 1) | [Commercial-in-Confidence] |
| WH&S, quality and environmental management systems (Stage 1) | [Commercial-in-Confidence] |
| Commercial (Stage 1) | [Commercial-in-Confidence] |
| **Total Stage 1** | [Commercial-in-Confidence] |
| Deliverability (including but not limited to sustainability of price, resourcing, proof of service, risk management plan) (Stage 2) | [Commercial-in-Confidence] |
| Environmental outcomes (Stage 2) | [Commercial-in-Confidence] |
| **Total Stage 2** | [Commercial-in-Confidence] |
| **Total (Stages 1 and 2)** | **100** |

(c) Price model – Categories 1, 2, 3 and 5:

- Category 1 – Tendered price in each ward.

- Category 2, 3 and 5 – Tendered price.

(d) Mandatory/essential criteria – Category 4:

- Has a valid ABN.

- Has an acceptable financial position.

- Has a satisfactory response to legislative and regulatory compliance.

- Has the required insurances or has a commitment to obtain such insurances.

- Has appropriate safety management systems and practices.

- Is considered by Council to be an SE or CE.

(e) Non-price weighted evaluation criteria – Category 4:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Weighted evaluation criteria** | **Weighting**  **(%)** |
| Local benefit | 30 |
| Social/Community benefits | [Commercial-in-Confidence] |
| Experience and track record | [Commercial-in-Confidence] |
| Management systems and environmental outcomes | [Commercial-in-Confidence] |
| Deliverability (including but not limited to sustainability of price, resourcing, proof of service, risk management plan) | [Commercial-in-Confidence] |
| **Total** | **100** |

(f) Price model – Category 4:

Tendered price.

35. Evaluation methodology:

Commercial operators (Categories 1, 2, 3 and 5)

(a) Shortlisting process Stage 1:

Shortlisting, if required, will be based on the total score against the non-price weighted criteria assessed for Stage 1. Only those tenderers that have an acceptable score (must pass all criteria) in Stage 1 will be shortlisted to proceed to the second stage of the RFP.

(b) Shortlisting process Stage 2:

Further shortlists, if required, will be based on the value for money (VFM) score. At any time during the evaluation, a proposal may be excluded from further evaluation or a shortlist where:

- a score against any criterion (regardless of weighting) is so low that the proposal is considered to be high risk or not advantageous for Council

- the submission contains non-compliances with the specifications or draft contract that are considered unacceptable/not advantageous for Council

- the proposals/tenderers are considered to be high risk or not advantageous for Council, regardless of the criteria stated in the tender documents.

Any submission may be included on any shortlist where the Evaluation Team considers that, despite the score achieved, there are strong, documented commercial reasons for further consideration of the proposal.

(c) VFM method:

Council’s standard VFM methodology. This is non-price score divided by price to create a VFM index.

Social and community enterprises (Category 4)

(a) Shortlisting process:

An initial shortlist, if required, will be based on the total score against the non-price weighted criteria. Further shortlists, if required, will be based on the VFM index. At any time during the evaluation, a submission may be excluded from further evaluation or a shortlist where:

- a score against any criterion (regardless of the weighting) is so low that the proposal is considered to be high risk or not advantageous for Council

- the submission contains non-compliances with the specification or draft contract that the Evaluation Team considers to be unacceptable/not advantageous for Council

- the submission/tenderer is considered to be high risk or not advantageous for Council, regardless of the criteria stated in the tender documents.

Any submission may be included on any shortlist where the Evaluation Team considers that, despite the score achieved, there are strong, documented reasons for further consideration of the submission.

(b) VFM method:

Council’s standard VFM methodology. This is non-price score divided by price to create a VFM index.

36. The Chief Executive Officer provided the following recommendation and the Committee agreed.

37. **RECOMMENDATION:**

**THAT THE STORES BOARD RECOMMENDS APPROVAL OF THE SIGNIFICANT CONTRACTING PLAN TO ESTABLISH A CORPORATE PROCUREMENT ARRANGEMENT (CPA) IN THE FORM OF A PANEL ARRANGEMENT, FOR GRASS CUTTING SERVICES. THE CPA WILL BE FOR A MAXIMUM TERM OF FIVE YEARS. THE ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE IS $84 MILLION OVER THE POTENTIAL FIVE-YEAR TERM.**

**ADOPTED**

#### B QUEENSLAND TREASURY CORPORATION’S 2021 BRISBANE CITY COUNCIL CREDIT REVIEW

**134/715/583/9**

**343/2021-22**

38. The Divisional Manager, Organisational Services, provided the information below.

39. As a condition of receiving ongoing approval from the Queensland Government to borrow funds, Council is required, and has agreed, to submit to an annual credit review of its financial position by the Queensland Treasury Corporation (QTC). The purpose of the credit review is to assess Council’s credit worthiness and provide a recommendation to the Queensland Government’s Department of State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning for Council’s proposed annual borrowing program.

40. Council has been rated ‘Strong’ with a ‘Neutral’ outlook since the 2013 financial year.

41. QTC has recently completed its 2021 review and on the basis of this review, has again rated Council as ‘Strong’ with a ‘Neutral’ outlook.

42. Factors positively contributing to Council’s rating included Council’s:

- large and diverse ratepayer base

- demonstrated capacity to deliver and manage large infrastructure projects while maintaining adequate capacity to service forecast debt levels.

43. The ‘Strong’ rating category indicates a local government’s strong capacity to meet its financial commitments in the short, medium and long term.

44. QTC has continued to rate Council’s outlook as ‘Neutral’ reflecting that no known foreseeable events are expected to have a direct impact on Council’s rating to meet its financial commitments.

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

46. **RECOMMENDATION:**

**THAT COUNCIL NOTE THE QUEENSLAND TREASURY CORPORATION’S 2021 BRISBANE CITY COUNCIL CREDIT REVIEW, AS SET OUT IN ATTACHMENT A** (submitted on file).

**ADOPTED**

#### C TAILORED AMENDMENT TO *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014* – LONG TERM INFRASTRUCTURE PLANS AMENDMENT 1B

**152/160/1218/502**

**344/2021-22**

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

48. *Brisbane City Plan 2014* (the planning scheme) contains Council’s Long term infrastructure plans (LTIP). The LTIP was adopted by Council at its meeting on 5 June 2018 and ensures that longer term infrastructure planning information and requirements, beyond the 2026 planning horizon of Council’s Local government infrastructure plan(LGIP), are identified in the planning scheme.

49. Due to the length of time required to make amendments to the LTIP and LGIP under the *Minister’s Guidelines and Rules*, amendments to the LGIP and LTIP are being divided into phases to ensure that the plans remain as up to date as possible. Interim LGIP amendment 1a and LTIP provided minor, limited updates to schedules and maps based on existing information. It refreshed both documents to align them with current information and budget priorities and will commence on 10 December 2021. The second phase of amendments, LGIP and LTIP amendment 1b, will constitute a major amendment and will provide a further update to the LGIP and LTIP based on the latest information available, including new planning assumptions related to growth.

50. Under section 18 of the *Planning Act 2016*, Council must give notice to the Queensland Government of the proposed amendment to the planning scheme. To ensure that the LTIP is amended concurrently with the LGIP, it is proposed to seek the Queensland Government’s approval for a tailored amendment to the planning scheme, so that the LTIP amendment 1b is prepared following the same steps as the LGIP amendment 1b in accordance with Chapter 5, Part 3 of the *Minister’s Guidelines and Rules*. This will allow for the two amendments to be prepared, publicly consulted on and adopted simultaneously.

51. Should Council decide to proceed with the proposed amendment, the Chief Executive of the Department of State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning (the Chief Executive) will be requested to approve the tailored approach. Upon receipt of the Chief Executive’s response and approval, Council will proceed to prepare the LTIP amendment 1b and follow the tailored amendment process notified by the Chief Executive.

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

53. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

Attachment A**Draft Resolution**

**DRAFT RESOLUTION TO DECIDE TO PREPARE AN AMENDMENT TO *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014* – LONG TERM INFRASTRUCTURE PLANS AMENDMENT 1B**

As Council:

(i) decides, pursuant to section 18 of the *Planning Act 2016* (the Act) to amend the Long term infrastructure plans (LTIP amendment 1b) contained within the *Brisbane City Plan 2014*,

then Council:

(i) directs, pursuant to section 18 of the Act, that the relevant notice of the proposed amendment LTIP amendment 1b be given to the Chief Executive of the Department of State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning

(ii) directs that the LTIP amendment 1b be prepared.

**ADOPTED**

#### D REVIEW AND AMENDMENT TO *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014* – LOCAL GOVERNMENT INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN – AMENDMENT 1B

**152/160/1218/503**

**345/2021-22**

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

55. Part 4 of *Brisbane City Plan 2014* (the planning scheme) contains Council’s Local government infrastructure plan (LGIP). The LGIP was adopted by Council at its meeting on 5 June 2018. The LGIP has a planning horizon from 1 July 2016 to 30 June 2026.

56. Due to the length of time required to make amendments to the LGIP and Council’s Long term infrastructure plans (LTIP) under the *Minister’s Guidelines and Rules* (the Guideline), amendments to the LGIP and LTIP are being divided into phases to ensure the plans remain as up to date as possible. Interim LGIP amendment 1a and LTIP provided minor, limited updates to schedules and maps based on existing information. It refreshed both documents to align them with current information and budget priorities and will commence on 10 December 2021. The second phase of amendments, LGIP and LTIP amendment 1b, will constitute a major amendment and will provide a further update to the LGIP and LTIP based on the latest information available, including new planning assumptions related to growth.

57. In accordance with section 25(3) of the *Planning Act 2016* (the Act), Council must review any LGIP (LGIP Review) contained in its planning scheme within five years after:

a) the LGIP was included in the planning scheme; and

b) if the LGIP has been reviewed—the LGIP was last reviewed.

58. The LGIP Review has been undertaken in accordance with Chapter 5, Part 5 of the Guideline to ensure that the LGIP complies with statutory requirements and is accurate, relevant and current.

59. The outcome of the LGIP Review is set out in the LGIP Review Checklist (refer Attachment B, submitted on file). It is proposed that Council prepares LGIP amendment 1b in accordance with Chapter 5, Part 3 of the Guideline.

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

61. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A  
Draft Resolution**

**DRAFT RESOLUTION TO DECIDE TO PREPARE AN AMENDMENT TO *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014 –* LOCAL GOVERNMENT INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN (LGIP AMENDMENT 1B)**

As Council:

(i) has undertaken and completed a review of the Local government infrastructure plan (LGIP) contained in *Brisbane City Plan 2014* (the planning scheme) pursuant to section 25(3) of the *Planning Act 2016* (the Act) and followed the LGIP review process (LGIP Review) set out in Chapter 5, Part 5 of the *Minister’s Guidelines and Rules* (the Guideline)

(ii) has considered the accuracy, currency and relevance of the LGIP by using the LGIP Review Checklist (Attachment B, submitted on file) to determine compliance of the LGIP with the matters identified in Chapter 5, Part 6 of the Guideline, pursuant to Chapter 5, Part 5, Section 23.1 of the Guideline,

then Council:

(i) decides, pursuant to Chapter 5, Part 5, Section 23.2 and Chapter 5, Part 3, Section 8.1 of the Guideline, to make an LGIP amendment (LGIP amendment 1b)

(ii) directs, pursuant to Chapter 5, Part 3, Section 8.2 of the Guideline, that Council prepares LGIP amendment 1b in accordance with Chapter 5, Part 6 of the Guideline and the LGIP template prescribed by the Guideline

(iii) directs, pursuant to Chapter 5, Part 5, Section 23.3 of the Guideline, that notice be given to the Chief Executive advising of the completed LGIP Review and that Council’s decision is to make LGIP amendment 1b in accordance with Chapter 5, Part 3 of the Guideline.

**ADOPTED**

#### E HEALTH, SAFETY AND AMENITY LOCAL LAW 2021

**155/455/468/48**

**346/2021-22**

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

63. On 15 June 2021, Council resolved to propose to make the Health, Safety and Amenity Local Law 2021 (the proposed local law).

64. The proposed local law, as set out in Attachment B (submitted on file), repeals the *Health, Safety and Amenity Local Law 2009* and amends the *Health, Safety and Amenity Subordinate Local Law 2012* and aims to:

(a) introduce a regulatory framework for fire pits and braziers

(b) extend odour provisions in relation to waste containers to residential premises

(c) provide clarity about camping on Council controlled roads

(d) clarify the existing regulatory framework for:

(i) shopping trolleys

(ii) unsightly objects, materials and vegetation

(iii) hazardous fencing material and electric fencing

(iv) swimming pools, portable wading pools and ponds

(e) update enforcement provisions.

65. The proposed local law also amends the *Public Land and Council Assets Local Law 2014* by relocating the abandoned vehicle provisions to the proposed local law.

66. In accordance with Council’s Local Law Making Procedure, Council undertook public consultation on the proposed local law from 17 June 2021 until 7 July 2021. At the same time, in accordance with section 31(3) of the *City of Brisbane Act 2010*, Council undertook consultation with Queensland Government departments which concluded on 14 July 2021.

67. Council received 72 public submissions and nine responses from Queensland Government departments, 80 of which were in relation to the proposed local law. Submitters raised concerns in the following categories:

- potential health and safety risks presented by the use of fire pits and braziers

- prohibition of camping on roads

- the appropriateness of electric fences in rural zone areas

- proposed restrictions on hazardous fencing and impacts upon the operations of Queensland Corrective Services

- locating owners of abandoned vehicles

- ability to provide graffiti removal notices

- consistency with the *Environment Protection Regulation 2019*, *Building Act 1975* and the *City of Brisbane Act 2010*.

68. Amendments were made to address a range of the submitters’ concerns including:

- exemption for corrective services facilities in relation to hazardous fencing material provisions

- changes to penalty units for consistency with the *Environmental Protection Regulation 2019*

- minor drafting changes for consistency with the language in other legislation

- consequential amendments to the *Health, Safety and Amenity Subordinate Local Law 2012*

- amendment of the *Public Land and Council Assets Local Law 2014* to remove provisions relating to unregistered vehicles on Council roads and removal of other vehicles on council roads.

69. A summary of all public submissions and Queensland Government department responses is set out in Attachment C (submitted on file).

70. Minor amendments were also made to the proposed local law consistent with the Queensland Government’s *Guidelines for Drafting Local Laws*.

71. An analysis of the anti-competitive provisions in the proposed local law was undertaken in accordance with section 41 of the *City of Brisbane Act 2010*,the results of which are contained in the Public Interest Test Report (refer to Attachment E, submitted on file). Council is not required to undertake any further review of the anti‑competitive provisions but must notify the community of the existence of the anti-competitive provisions when making the proposed local law. This notification will be achieved through public notification on Council’s website.

72. As consultation on the proposed local law is now complete and all responses have been considered, Council may now proceed to make the proposed local law.

73. To assist in the implementation and ongoing administration of the proposed local law, Council’s powers under the proposed local law will need to be delegated to the Establishment and Coordination Committee (E&C) and the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) under section 238 of the *City of Brisbane Act 2010* (save those powers that must be exercised by resolution). The conditions of the delegations to the E&C and the CEO under the proposed local law are set out in Attachment D (submitted on file).

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

75. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

Attachment A**Draft Resolution**

**DRAFT RESOLUTION TO MAKE THE HEALTH, SAFETY AND AMENITY LOCAL LAW 2021**

As:

(i) Council resolved on 15 June 2021 to propose to make the Health, Safety and Amenity Local Law 2021 (the proposed local law)

(ii) public consultation on the proposed local law was undertaken between 17 June 2021 and 7 July 2021

(iii) relevant Queensland Government departments were consulted about the proposed local law between 17 June 2021 and 14 July 2021

(iv) amendments have been made to the proposed local law as a result of the public consultation and relevant Queensland Government consultation, as set out in Attachment C (submitted on file)

(v) minor amendments have been made to the proposed local law following further internal review to ensure the proposed local law is consistent with the Queensland Government’s *Guidelines for Drafting Local Laws*

(vi) under section 238 of the *City of Brisbane Act 2010*, Council may delegate its powers to the Establishment and Coordination Committee and to the Chief Executive Officer,

then Council:

(i) resolves to make the Health, Safety and Amenity Local Law 2021, as set out in Attachment B (submitted on file), to commence on 1 February 2022

(ii) delegates the powers under the proposed local law specified in column 1 of the table, as set out in Attachment D (submitted on file), to each delegate specified in column 2 of the table, pursuant to the special conditions stated in column 2 and the General Conditions stated at the end of Attachment D (submitted on file)

(iii) revokes all previous delegations under the *Health, Safety and Amenity Local Law 2009*

(iv) notes that the proposed local law contains anti-competitive provisions

(v) authorises the Chief Legal Counsel, City Legal, City Administration and Governance, to undertake all relevant activities required to inform the public that the proposed local law has been made.

**ADOPTED**

#### F MEETINGS AMENDING LOCAL LAW 2021

**137/268/608/6**

**347/2021-22**

76. The A/Divisional Manager, City Administration and Governance, provided the information below.

77. Section 29 of the *City of Brisbane Act 2010* provides Council with the power to make and enforce any local law that is necessary or convenient for the good rule and local government of Brisbane.

78. Amendments to the *City of Brisbane Act 2010*, *City of Brisbane Regulation 2012* and *Local Government Act 2009* necessitate updates to the *Meetings Local Law 2001* to ensure it is a consistent and comprehensive reflection of the standing rules applicable to Brisbane City Council and Standing Committee meetings.

79. On 14 September 2021, Council resolved to propose to make the Meetings Amending Local Law 2021 (the proposed amending local law), as set out in Attachment B (submitted on file).

80. In accordance with Council’s Local Law Making Procedures, Council undertook public consultation from 27 September 2021 until 18 October 2021 on the proposed amending local law. In accordance with section 31(3) of the *City of Brisbane Act 2010*, Council undertook consultation with Queensland Government departments from 20 September 2021 until 18 October 2021.

81. Council received a total of six submissions, two of which were from the Queensland Government. A summary table of all submissions and the response to those submissions is provided in Attachment D (submitted on file).

82. The proposed amending local law has been drafted to reflect the legislative amendments and to address some of the submissions received, particularly:

- deletion of the concept of automatic adjournment of Council meetings after a period of time;

- inclusion of motion of dissent for an aggrieved Councillor regarding declaration of unsuitable meeting conduct;

- ensuring remote participation at meetings is included in all relevant sections;

- amendments to process for raising points of order;

- adoption of committee meeting minutes;

- revising public attendance provisions to be consistent with the *City of Brisbane Act 2010*;

- amendments to ensure consistency with existing legislation;

- clarify the definition of standing rules.

83. A consolidated version of the *Meetings Local Law 2001*, incorporating those amendments, is attached as Attachment C (submitted on file). Further minor amendments were also made to the proposed amending local law to ensure that the proposed amending local law is drafted in a manner which is consistent with the Queensland Government’s *Guidelines for Drafting Local Laws*.

84. An analysis of the anti-competitive provisions in the proposed amending local law was not required to be undertaken in accordance with section 41 of the *City of Brisbane Act 2010.*

85. As consultation on the proposed amending local law is now complete and all responses have been considered, Council may now proceed to make the proposed amending local law.

86. The A/Divisional Manager provided the following recommendation and the Committee agreed.

87. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

Attachment A  
**Draft Resolution**

**DRAFT RESOLUTION TO MAKE THE PROPOSED MEETINGS AMENDING LOCAL LAW 2021**

As:

(i) Council resolved on 14 September 2021 to propose to make the Meetings Amending Local Law 2021 as set out in Attachment B (submitted on file) (the proposed amending local law)

(ii) relevant Queensland Government departments were consulted in accordance with section 31(3) of the *City of Brisbane Act 2010*, between 20 September 2021 and 18 October 2021

(iii) public consultation on the proposed amending local law was undertaken in accordance with Council’s Local Law Making Procedure, between 27 September 2021 and 18 October 2021

(iv) Council received two submissions from Queensland Government departments

(v) Council received four submissions during the public consultation stage

(vi) amendments were made to the proposed amending local law in response to those submissions

(vii) an analysis of the anti-competitive provisions in the proposed amending local law in accordance with section 41 of the *City of Brisbane Act 2010* resulted in no anti‑competitive provisions being identified,

then:

(i) resolves to make the Meetings Amending Local Law 2021 as set out in Attachment B (submitted on file), to commence on the date of gazettal

(ii) notes that the proposed amending local law does not contain any anti-competitive provisions in accordance with the *National Competition Policy – Guidelines for conducting reviews on anti-competitive provisions in local laws*

(iii) authorises the Chief Legal Counsel, City Legal, City Administration and Governance, to insert the dates of commencement into the proposed amending local law

(iv) authorises the Chief Legal Counsel, City Legal, City Administration and Governance, to undertake all relevant activities required to inform the public that the proposed amending local law has been made.

**ADOPTED**

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

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

The DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Krista ADAMS, Civic Cabinet Chair of the Economic Development and the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Sandy LANDERS, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 23 November 2021, be adopted.

Chair: DEPUTY MAYOR.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair. First of all, before I go to the Committee report is our Business Hub update for this week. There’s only one workshop this week and that is Make an Impact: Video Content to Turn Heads. That is on Thursday morning at 9am, which is being presented by Girl Director from CCIQ (Chamber of Commerce and Industry Queensland).

However, we do have to see that we are having some fantastic feedback from the Business Hub. Future Brisbane events, ‘it’s a great space’, ‘you cover so many topics’, ‘very well organised’. On the Couch with JC, John Collins, very, very popular, ‘great interview’, ‘questions were well controlled’, ‘the interviewer was professional’, ‘the session was really informative’, ‘JC was really good’, he always is when he’s interviewed.

Of course they’re also running the Women in Business grants at the moment. So far up to date we have had 17,700 visits to the website, 21,500 impressions and 850 clicks on the EDM call to action. So with 475 submissions in progress LORD MAYOR, we may have to look at how we can support women further into the future—

*Councillors interjecting.*

DEPUTY MAYOR: —with the business grants as well.

With the Committee presentation last week it was the launch last week of the City Centre Master Plan Stage 1. A document that has been many months in the making because we were always quite—not sure how it was going to be ready to be delivered with COVID, as we had ups and downs over the last 12 months, but we are ready now. It is a short-term strategy because of the uncertainty going forward. But with clear and achievable actions which will help bring the CBD back to its former glory.

At its best times in that former glory the CBD was home to over 11,000 businesses and 120,000 workers. The city centre is regarded as the engine room for the whole of the Brisbane and the greater region. So we need to make sure it does remain a priority in helping drive growth. That doesn’t mean that we don’t deliver for the suburbs but it does have a very special place as our city heart as well.

Add to that our beautiful climate and the weather opportunities and the people that are flocking to Queensland at the moment or in the very near future. Of course now that we are an Olympic and Paralympic Host City, we really do need to make sure that we are elevating ourselves to that global status which people are expecting of us.

*Councillors interjecting.*

DEPUTY MAYOR: We release this is going to be a hard task but the city centre is a main part of that. Because when visitors come to Brisbane they don’t flock to the suburbs, they flock to the city centre. Hopefully they’re then staying the suburbs as well to experience the true, beautiful Brisbane life.

*Councillor interjecting.*

DEPUTY MAYOR: The old City Centre Master Plan is now seven years old and it saw a number of key items delivered. Lots of connections with the river with new and upgraded ferry terminals.

*Councillors interjecting.*

DEPUTY MAYOR: Howard Smith Wharves has been completed. The Kangaroo Point Green Bridge is scheduled. There’s been 18 new towers constructed since 2014. Queens Wharf is well out of the ground and DA (development application) approvals for CBD office towers remain strong. So we need to make sure, based on this foundation, that we move forward with the City Centre Master Plan.

This is absolutely a very, very important part of making sure our Olympic legacy is right. So when we heard last week about what do you think you’re doing Councillor ADAMS in the Olympic and Paralympic space? This is exactly what we’re doing, planning how we make sure that the legacy is set up for the next 10 years and the 10 years after that as well.

We are looking first of all, as I said though, short-term action plans. Activation campaigns to bring people back to the city, like Christmas in the City. Making it easy to move around our CBD streets. Flexible working places, access and inclusion promotion as well. Encourage visitors and workers and students back into the city centre with maybe promotions like festive fairs over two weekends leading into Christmas. We ran one with the Property Council at Fridays in the city during the middle of years as well. Making sure we’re enhancing those river connections as well. Of course work continuing on Brisbane Metro and the State on Cross River Rail as well.

We do need to work with the private sector to make sure we can get involved in bringing back the life into the city. We never can underestimate the power of foot traffic as well. It’s about illuminating the city centre, creative lighting delivered with new development and new infrastructure. It’s about making walkable city streets with our pedestrian strategy but also our cycling infrastructure that we’re trialling and introducing across the city. It’s about being a green city and through the developments, not only the green concrete, the green steel and buildings that breathe, but trees and greenery on the ground level and right across the building as well.

As we set our sights towards the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games, the time is right now to think very strategically about how our city heart exemplifies the best of Brisbane and Queensland. So the Master Plan is now live on the Council website. It’s being promoted through social channels. We will be heading out for consultation starting on the full City Centre Master Plan early in the new year. I look forward to delivering these 15 key action items in Stage 1 and working with everybody across Brisbane to bring the CBD back to its former glory.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Thank you.

Further debate?

Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair. I rise to speak on the presentation about the City Centre Master Plan. This is a very important document given where we are as we emerge from COVID at the moment. What’s included in this initial draft of the City Centre Master Plan is certainly very telling, but what is also very telling is what is excluded from this. That tells a bigger story, I think, about the values of this current LNP Administration or lack thereof.

There are big changes coming to the way our city works and the way in which people live in our city as we emerge from COVID-19. There are immense pressures on people and where people can live and that housing in our city is becoming more precarious for people. Housing affordability is at a crisis level now. The most recent stats from the Australian Bureau of Statistics on wages show they went backwards last quarter by 0.8%, but rents went up by eight per cent over that same period.

There is a desperate shortage of affordable housing stock right around Australia and particularly here in Brisbane as well. There are 50,000 people, on the waitlist for public housing and another 500,000 nationwide seeking secure, affordable housing. So you would hope that any Council document in this day and age would try to help address that great challenge that our community faces.

Because the solution or part of the solution to many of the problems our city faces now and will face into the future, including traffic and congestion, loss of greenspace and lack of community services and facilities where people live—does relate directly to secure and affordable housing. It’s all about values and priorities, Chair. We ask what kind of council do we want to be? What kind of city do we want to leave for future generations?

I asked about the initial consultation last week in the Committee and how that was conducted. We were told the key stakeholders were engaged and were part of this process to get us to this point. We’ve certainly heard a bit of that from the DEPUTY MAYOR just now and that the private sector is engaged quite extensively in developing this document. However, I was pretty horrified to find out that key affordable housing providers have been left out so far. They are a very important part to addressing this problem.

So the LNP Administration like to talk about inclusivity, but their words contradict their actions when it comes to documents like this, Chair. For a city to be inclusive in this current time, in 2021, there needs to be a robust plan to address housing affordability and Council should be doing everything it can and pulling every lever that it has at its disposal.

But this LORD MAYOR can’t even make our streets and footpaths accessible and inclusive for all residents. So what hope is there for people who are struggling to keep a roof over their head? Seeing as this LNP Administration do not value safe and affordable housing in a document like this, the Labor team has reached out to affordable housing providers to make sure that they are part of that conversation going forward for the City Centre Master Plan.

We have met with some of those providers and will continue to do so, because making sure Brisbane is a truly inclusive city with safe, secure and affordable housing for all is a Labor priority.

Chair: Thank you Councillor CASSIDY.

Further speakers?

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, I rise to speak on the City Centre Master Plan. Look, I’ve read this report and I listened to the DEPUTY MAYOR. I’m struck by how—well, word salad was the idea that came into my head. I think Councillor ADAMS used every word that was sort of related to this and chucked it all into the salad bowl and then mixed it all up.

But the problem that I see with what’s going on with what this Administration is doing, is that it’s fundamentally underpinned by an outmoded concept. The last two years has shown us that people are changing how they work and live in our city. Everything that the LNP appear to be doing at his stage is about getting them to go back to the way that they were doing it. That is, you must come back into town, you must come back to work. We’re going to give you freebies if you come back to work.

It’s all of this thinking, which, okay, there must be an element of that, that has to be considered. But fundamentally two years of dealing with a global pandemic, which will continue next year—has absolutely and fundamentally changed the nature of the way in which our city is being used by our community. None of that is recognised within the premise of this City Centre Master Plan.

So I think there’s a big disconnect between what is happening in our culture and lifestyle in Brisbane and what the LNP are trying to do to satisfy the people who donate to their campaigns. They are property owners. I think there is a problem with that and the City Centre Master Plan has to reconsider that cultural and behavioural change in how people are working and living in this city. This old school way of thinking is definitely not the right way to do it.

The themes that are outlined as the priority actions over the next—sorry, 18 months are also quite interesting. Welcoming, create more to see and do. Adapt the modern workforce, promote events—promote access and inclusion. Well let’s start with that. It’s probably two months ago now that I logged a job for Queensland Walks, because a CBD footpath was blocked, fully blocked, by scaffolding. There was nowhere for people to go. Do you know what this Council’s done? Despite repeated follow ups of my office, weeks and weeks and weeks later we still don’t have that matter resolved.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: Now—yes, of course—fundamentally this city has failed to deal with pedestrian issues. They are exacerbated by development in the city and this Administration giving their developer mates free licence to take up a whole footpath.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order first, Councillor ADAMS.

DEPUTY MAYOR: That is imputing motive. The majority of works in this city is Cross River Rail and Queens Wharf.

Chair: Thank you Councillor ADAMS.

Councillor JOHNSTON continue please but be careful about imputing motive.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Sorry, was that actually a point of order, was it?

Chair: Continue, you’ve got the floor.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Was it—was that a point of order? I’m just checking whilst the Meetings Local Laws don’t start until next week, I presume, the new ones. But I’m just checking—

Chair: Yes.

Councillor JOHNSTON: —was that a point of order?

Chair: It was a point of order, yes.

Councillor JOHNSTON: You’re saying that that’s an appropriate point of order?

Chair: Please, Councillor JOHNSTON, you have the floor. Please continue.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, well you know I—what’s the point? The big problem—I mean—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: Do you know the biggest project that’s actually stuffing up the city at the moment? It’s their own Metro. Councillor ADAMS, just her failure to understand what is happening in this city is quite extraordinary. Yes, there are other projects but the Metro just shut off North Quay. It has completely shut off roads. It’s stopped people driving into the city over a bridge that’s been there for 120 years. Guess who did that? The LNP Administration, but don’t worry, it’s all the Labor Government—State Government’s fault.

Anyway, my point is that this Administration is failing to make sure that pedestrians can access this city safely. It’s failed, categorically failed. I know that Queensland Walks has been raising these issues and this Administration is ignoring their concerns. They’ve written to me again this week about it.

There is—connected—they want to improve city cycle networks and enhance river connections and upgrade public transport. The first thing they need to do is come clean about which of the 125 bus services around this city are going to be cut.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: Which ones are going to be truncated and how is it going to be—

DEPUTY MAYOR: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor ADAMS.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Relevance to the report. There is nothing about the bus network review in this report.

Chair: Yes, I agree.

Councillor JOHNSTON can you please come back to the item before us.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Well, I’m on page 2, point 11. Specifically, upgrading public transport is one of the themes and the key priority actions that Councillor ADAMS says that they’re going to be consulting on over the next 18 months. So let’s see, what consultation might this Council be doing in the public transport space in the next 18 months? Does anybody want to guess?

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: What sort of public transport are we responsible for, Councillor GRIFFITHS? Could it be buses?

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: Could it be buses? I mean I understand Councillor ADAMS doesn’t like what I’m saying.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: But is she now not aware that her Council is undertaking the Metro and that part of that project is public transport, buses. I know it’s complicated for her. So let’s be clear. If we’re going to have a talk about how people are going to access the city and move around the city. We don’t know how the Metro is going to impact on public transport services. My point here today, which Councillor ADAMS really, clearly is not liking, is this Council should come clean and tell people what bus services are going to be cut—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: —and what bus services are going to be truncated. Because that is what the Metro says is going to happen.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: This—again we see that Council’s going to light up the CBD. I would have thought we’ve pretty much lit up everything you can possibly light up in the CBD, and that perhaps some of the key suburban hubs around Brisbane could do with a little illumination.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: Whilst this report says—I think it’s about half of the Olympics’ venues are within five kilometres of the city, that means half are not. Half are not, but clearly that’s not getting any consideration at all. We need to have a beautiful green city, walkable streets, active small spaces. Well you know—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: —we’re definitely not seeing walkable streets around Brisbane. The lack of spending on footpaths is quite significantly problematic. We’re unlocking the potential, facilitate growth and plan our Olympic and Paralympic legacy. Great.

So I’m just going to make a few general observations here now. Firstly, this City Centre Master Plan—the current one—is now seven years old to my knowledge. The Brisbane Olympics are in 2032. So that’s 11 years away. Whatever plan that we look at now will be redundant well and truly before the Olympics. I understand that Councillor ADAMS is desperate to try and link her portfolio with the Olympics.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: But the problem is the future of this the future of this city has to look beyond just the Olympics.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: It has to be relevant to our community now, relevant to the issues that are—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: —important to residents now. Fundamentally how residents use this city has changed and the old ways that this LNP Administration continue to push are out of date.

Chair: Thank you Councillor JOHNSTON.

Further debate? Any further debate?

Councillor ADAMS, Deputy Chair, yes—DEPUTY MAYOR.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair. As I said it is a Stage 1 of the City Centre Master Plan. Which is setting the basis for where we need to go in the next 10 years. We can’t sit on our laurels, I think we’ve heard everyone from John Coates through to Premier Palaszczuk and everyone in between. That now is not the time to sit back, relax and think hey, we’ve got plenty of time. Plenty of time. We don’t, we have 10 years and it takes a long time. Because let’s have a look at it, Cross River Rail, 16, 17, 18 years from when it started being talked about to when it got delivered.

*Councillor interjecting.*

DEPUTY MAYOR: There is no time to be—

*Councillor interjecting.*

DEPUTY MAYOR: —wasting when you have the opportunity now to lay the ground—to lay down the ground rules on what we would like to see in the city. What I did find extremely interesting though is the Green, ALP alliance back out again. All of a sudden the Labor Party’s main focus is affordable housing.

*Councillor interjecting.*

DEPUTY MAYOR: Which is ironic considering the one thing that Councillor CASSIDY didn’t want in Sandgate was five storeys. Which would have given—

*Councillor interjecting.*

DEPUTY MAYOR: —affordable housing.

*Councillor interjecting.*

DEPUTY MAYOR: So as long as it’s not in his patch, affordable housing is fine.

*Councillor interjecting.*

DEPUTY MAYOR: But to say that we’re not speaking about affordable housing is just plain wrong.

*Councillor interjecting.*

DEPUTY MAYOR: That question was not asked of me last week. It was not asked who do we speak to in the stakeholders? We are speaking to all stakeholders. I have often said in this place, in Committee and across Brisbane, that there is a change coming in the CBD. One of those changes is office space to residential, which is why these 15 actions are so important. Creating more to see and do, enhancing the river connections, promoting access and inclusion, adapting the modern workplace, that may be adapting it to loft living, to apartment living, to student accommodation. Staging iconic city events, walkable streets, activating small spaces.

It’s all about the look, the feel and making sure that our CBD is the city heart. Whether it’s for affordable housing or penthouses. Whether it’s for buses, bikes or feet. Then of course enhancing it with the river access as well. This is Stage 1, City Centre Master Plan starts proper next year. I am looking forward to the many ideation and consultation engagements we’re going to have over the next 12 months, to hear from the people of Brisbane who are way more in touch than the last two comments I just heard in this place.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Thank you, DEPUTY MAYOR.

I now put this motion to the vote. The Economic Development and Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games report.

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

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

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

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – CITY CENTRE MASTER PLAN – STAGE 1

**348/2021-22**

1. The Legacy and Precinct Planning Manager, Brisbane 2032 Host City Office, Office of the Chief Executive, attended the meeting to provide an update on City Centre Master Plan (CCMP) – Stage 1. She provided the information below.

2. The city centre is strategically important, as Brisbane is a gateway to the Asia Pacific region. Brisbane is defined by its enviable lifestyle and growing knowledge economy. In 2016, the city centre of Brisbane had 122,486 workers, 2.2 million square metres gross floor area of office space, and 11,474 registered businesses. The city centre has attracted 2,807 new residents since 2016.

3. The Committee was shown a map outlining the perimeter of the city centre. The current CCMP, the *Brisbane City Centre Master Plan 2014: A vision for our open city* is a foundational plan for future growth, that includes one overarching vision, five strategies, 10 city-making moves, six priority projects and 31 transformative projects being implemented within this area.

4. Projects and achievements of the CCMP since it was launched in 2014 were presented to the Committee. These include works underway or completed at Howard Smith Wharves, Queen’s Wharf, and the Neville Bonner Bridge; works on Cross River Rail and Brisbane Metro; green bridges projects; new hotel and student accommodation developments; outdoor gallery and public art collections; subtropical boulevards; and growing the calendar of visitor experiences.

5. The Committee was shown an image of the city centre, indicating the location of key sports, media and entertainment venues. Over half the planned Olympic and Paralympic sports staged in 2032 will be within 5 km of the CBD. The swimming venue (Brisbane Arena) and live sites (public simulcast viewing) will be located in the CBD. Developing a new CCMP and other precinct plans will be critical to help shape Brisbane’s Olympic legacy. The CCMP – Stage 1 is a refresh of the 2014 plan and is an important short-term step towards city centre legacy planning and will set the priorities for the 10 years preceding the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games.

6. Brisbane has been named the world’s 10th most liveable city in the Economist Intelligence Unit’s latest Global Liveability Index (June 2021). Changes in the greater Brisbane region from 2019 to 2020 include:

- 43% fewer domestic visitors

- 82% fewer international visitors

- 17% reduction in net overseas migration

- 11% reduction in international students.

In the city centre, office vacancy has increased from 12.7% in January 2020, to 13.6% in January 2021. Pedestrian numbers have decreased by 32% on average across the city centre between June 2019 and June 2021.

7. Key actions taken by Council to support Brisbane’s economic recovery were shown to the Committee. From March 2020 to the end of June 2021, more than 14,600 businesses and organisations citywide received over $18.9 million in relief from Council fees, rent and charges. Council continued its ‘buy local’ strategy and introduced seven-day payment terms for Council’s business suppliers. In partnership with Council, the Property Council of Australia delivered the ‘Fridays in the City’ initiative, promoting activity in the city centre on Fridays. Council established the Business Hub to deliver targeted training and support for local businesses and invested in the Brisbane Holiday Dollars initiative to support the tourism industry.

8. The existing CCMP outlines the ongoing delivery of priority projects. From November 2021 the transitional document *Brisbane City Centre Master Plan Stage 1: An action plan to reignite our city heart* will come into effect, to provide a short term bridge between CCMP 2014 and a new, longer term CCMP. The Stage 1 action plan actions will support revitalisation efforts in the city centre while the delivery road map for the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games is developed. The new CCMP will align Olympic legacy planning and the forthcoming Inner City Framework, and set out priorities for the next 10 years and beyond.

9. The CCMP project team engaged with stakeholders through an online survey and collaborative workshops with industry representatives, to get respondents’ views on short term challenges and immediate priorities for the development of the city centre. Online survey respondents included a mix of workers, visitors, property owners, city centre residents and business owners. Industry representatives were from sectors including universities, the Queensland Government, advocacy groups, the creative sector and the property industry.

10. Stakeholders considered short term challenges were fewer people visiting the city centre, impacts on trade and business, and increased working from home. Immediate priorities were considered to be enhancing access to the city centre, improving the public realm and green space, repurposing and reactivating empty shops and offices, increasing events and activities, enhancing cycling and e-wheeling, and prioritising public art and lighting.

11. The Committee was shown a graphic outlining the action plan’s 15 priority actions over the next 18 months grouped around five themes, and the lead agencies and contributors with responsibility for their delivery. The themes are: welcoming; connected; animated; beautiful; and unlocking potential. Agencies contributing to the action plan delivery include Council, the Queensland Government, the Australian Government, and the Brisbane Economic Development Agency. Strategies arising from each theme include the following.

- Welcoming: create more to see and do, adapt the modern workforce and promote access and inclusion.

- Connected: improve the city centre cycle network, enhance river connections, and upgrade public transport.

- Animated: stage iconic events, deliver creative lighting installations, and grow the visitor economy.

- Beautiful: green our city, create walkable streets, and activate small spaces.

- Unlocking potential: facilitate growth, plan our Olympic and Paralympic legacy, and elevate our global city.

12. Next steps in the plan will be to reignite growth and build momentum in the city centre. Stage 2 of the CCMP development project will occur in 2022, involving a community engagement focus and a call for ideas. Stage 3 will be in 2023 and will commence with the release of the future City Centre Master Plan 2032.

13. Following a number of questions from the Committee, the Civic Cabinet Chair thanked the Legacy and Precinct Planning Manager for her informative presentation.

14. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

Chair: Councillor LANDERS.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

|  |
| --- |
| **349/2021-22**  At that time, 5.58pm, it was resolved on the motion of Councillor Sandy LANDERS, seconded by Councillor Sarah HUTTON, that the meeting adjourn for a period of one hour, to commence only when all Councillors had vacated the Chamber and the doors had been locked.  Council stood adjourned at 6.04pm. |

**UPON RESUMPTION:**

Chair: Okay, all right. Thank you.

Councillor MURPHY, Transport Committee report please.

### TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

Councillor Ryan MURPHY, Civic Cabinet Chair of the Transport Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Angela Owen, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 23 November 2021, be adopted.

Chair: Is there any debate?

No debate? Thank you.

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

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

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

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – BRISBANE METRO DEPOT UPDATE

**350/2021-22**

1. The Program Director, Major Projects, City Projects Office, Brisbane Infrastructure, attended the meeting to provide an update on the Brisbane Metro depot. He provided the information below.

2. The Brisbane Metro depot is located on School Road, Rochedale, adjacent to the South East Busway. The 10-hectare depot facility will provide advanced charging infrastructure, storage and maintenance for the new battery electric Brisbane Metro vehicle fleet. The location will provide future Metro services with direct access to the South East Busway, and in consideration of the Queensland Government Department of Transport and Main Roads’ (TMR) busway extension between Rochedale and Springwood, the depot is located approximately 1 kilometre from the future Rochedale bus station.

3. Brisbane Metro will be delivered through five key elements, with new and upgraded infrastructure being one of the key components, and the Brisbane Metro depot forms a part of this. Other components include the below.

- Vehicles – an initial fleet of 60 new battery electric vehicles.

- Systems – new customer and vehicle management systems.

- Network and services – high-frequency, turn-up-and-go Brisbane Metro services and how these will integrate with busway operations.

- Policy and operational changes on the busway – enabling handover to TMR and TransLink. This includes aspects such as revenue protection resulting from a potential increase in fare evasion with the implementation of all door boarding.

4. Planning for the Brisbane Metro depot commenced in 2017. Initially, four parcels of land (5.1 hectares) were identified for the future site. In March 2019, the four parcels of land were acquired, with an additional four also acquired to increase the total size of the depot facility.

5. In February 2021, a design and construct contract was awarded to ADCO Constructions, with works commencing in mid-2021. ADCO has nearly 50 years’ experience in delivering industrial facilities of a similar scope, size and scale. Previously successful projects include:

- the Trade Coast Bus Depot at Eagle Farm

- the South Regional Business Centre at Yeerongpilly

- the redevelopment of the Chinatown Mall in Fortitude Valley.

6. As the project currently stands, early works are expected to be completed in mid-2022, with the construction expected to be completed in mid-2023.

7. A video was shown to the Committee showing an artist’s impression of the administration building frontage, the depot workshop, end of trip flash charges at School and Priestdale Roads, and vehicle stabling bays with slow pedestal chargers. The roof of the administration building shows the solar panels, which will also be installed across all of the depot buildings.

8. A number of environmental considerations have been taken into account to ensure the building design will achieve a ‘5 Star’ Green Star rating through sustainable design solutions. This will be achieved through:

- a photo-voltaic system targeting 1 megawatt of solar energy per year, which will offset some of the operational demands. For comparison, Council currently has approximately 2.2 megawatts of solar infrastructure installed across 37 sites

- proposing harvested rainwater use across the site as well as recycled water as part of the Brisbane Metro vehicle wash facility.

9. Earlier this year, the project team established the Rochedale-Brisbane South Project’s Coordination Working Group as the Brisbane Metro depot project interfaces with several nearby major works, including:

- the Rochedale Road and Priestdale Road intersection upgrade (mid-2021 to late 2022)

- the Pacific Motorway (M1), Eight Mile Plains to Daisy Hill upgrade (expected to commence from late 2022 to late 2024)

- the Gardner Road Extension (mid-late 2022 to early 2024).

10. Given the number of projects occurring within a close proximity, the purpose of this group is to provide a forum where Council can provide updates and share information about key activities. This group has been particularly beneficial in progressing discussions and planning for the future closure of School Road. Many recent key stakeholder briefings have occurred as joint briefings with representatives from each of the projects.

11. Following a number of questions from the Committee, the Civic Cabinet Chair thanked the Program Director for his informative presentation.

12. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

Chair: Councillors, we move onto the Infrastructure Committee report.

Councillor WINES.

Councillor WINES: Ready as I’ll ever be. All right, thank you, Mr Chair.

### INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE

Councillor Andrew WINES, Civic Cabinet Chair of the Infrastructure Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Sarah HUTTON, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 23 November 2021, be adopted.

Chair: Councillor WINES is there any debate?

Councillor WINES: Thank you, Mr Chair. The Committee saw a presentation last week on the speed limit review process. Now, speed limit reviews—speed limit reductions—are an issue *du jour* among the petition process at the moment; about a third of the petitions we’re getting through are on the topic of speed limit reductions. I thought it was important to use the Committee process and this reporting process to outline to Councillors how you go about getting a speed limit review and how you get a speed limit reduction.

The Council officers and I are working on a one sheeter to prepare so that people know how that it works, what the officers are looking for and how best to find success.

*At that time, 7.06pm, the Deputy Chair, Councillor Steven TOOMEY, assumed the Chair.*

Councillor WINES: So, when your residents do come asking for a speed limit reduction (SLR) what is required to ensure that you get the outcome that they and you are seeking, so that was part of the presentation.

So, what I’ll just do I’ll just move through it in a little bit, but we’ll be producing—the slides will be made available to all Councillors and also—as I say—a one page sheet explaining how the system works will also be made available.

So, the first step is the need for a—review needs to be identified and that Council’s initial investigation will include the check of the complaint history, analysing historical crash data, analyse the function of the road and surrounding land use, check existing traffic volume, speed data and road characteristics. If the investigation identifies that a more detailed investigation is required, they will undertake a new survey which includes speed and volume data, and they will use the Department of Transport and Main Roads Speed Limit Review Tool to determine if a formal speed limit review is warranted.

Council engage independent engineers and consultants to consider formal SLRs. The second step is the application of a criteria-based speed limit that includes consideration of shared zones, high active transport user areas, car parks and local urban streets. Now, mind this is once it progresses to an independent engineering investigation. Steps three through five are a risk assessed speed limit process with a crash risk, infrastructure risk and road classification considerations, assessed against the speed data—speed limit—with an assessment made of what a motorist would perceive to be a reasonable travel speed.

That independent engineer will then move through and make a recommendation to the Speed Management Committee, and this is an important part of the process. This committee includes three representatives: a Council representative, a Department of Transport and Main Roads representative, and a Queensland Police Service representative and all three require consensus for a speed limit review to be reduced—for the recommendation to be that the speed limit is reduced, all three individuals must agree and the recommendation must be made by that independent engineer discussed earlier.

Once endorsed, the change to a speed limit can proceed to implementation. If consensus cannot be achieved, the speed limit review—this is an important point to understand. If consensus cannot be achieved, a speed limit review can be referred to the Speed Limit Review Panel which is a Department of Transport and Main Roads service, and it is comprised only of senior Transport and Main Roads representatives.

Once those decisions are made, the changes—if they are supported—will then proceed and they will occur. Now, it’s important to remember that speed limit reviews—because we bring in an independent assessor—can take up to eight months and cost this Council—if we advance through the whole process—up to $80,000. So, I think that people should be mindful of that when they go through this process and that we are—and I take a personal position that I have a bias towards the residents and towards their requests and I try to facilitate a system which will assist them in finding the outcomes that they seek.

As I say, I’m looking forward to cooperating with my fellow Councillors to assist them in some of those endeavours. There are three petitions, two of which are about speed limit reductions, one of which about an LATM. I’ll look forward to contributions from the Chamber.

Deputy Chair: Thank you Councillor WINES.

Further speakers?

Councillor JOHNSTON.

**Seriatim - Clause B**

|  |
| --- |
| Councillor Nicole JONHSTON requested that Clause B, PETITION – REQUESTING COUNCIL REDUCE THE SPEED LIMIT ON KING ARTHUR TERRACE, TENNYSON, AND GRACEVILLE AVENUE, GRACEVILLE, FROM 60 KM/H TO 50 KM/H, be taken seriatim for voting purposes. |

Councillor JOHNSTON: Firstly, on item A—the speed limit review process that’s set out here—I guess I’ve got one simple question for the Infrastructure Chairperson; was this process that you’ve just outlined followed for Stanley Terrace, Taringa? It’s fascinating to me—and you can choose not to answer if you don’t want to answer tonight, that’s fine, but this is a matter that I’m pursuing. It’s fascinating to me that I’m told that we can’t extend school zones in the area that I represent, we can’t have streets going from 50 to 40 outside of school zones on the frontage of a school.

But, meanwhile, I was driving through the back of Taringa the other day and surprisingly there’s almost a kilometre of new school zone where there’s no school, and it was quite interesting to me. So, just let me be clear again, Mr Deputy Chair, my question is did Stanley Terrace, Taringa, go through this process of being assessed by a Committee and what was the outcome of that Committee request, because I’m quite interested in whether or not that process applied in Stanley Terrace, Taringa.

It’s very clear to me that this Council is not acting in a consistent way with respect to speed limit review processes and Ipswich Road is the best example of that. For many years, I tried to get Annerley Junction—that key part of Ipswich Road—reduced to 40; you can see the school—you can see the school from Annerley Junction. This Administration repeatedly voted against reducing the speed limit to 40 kilometres an hour. You can’t see a school on Stanley Terrace, Taringa—there are schools nearby for sure, but you can’t see the school—but that’s gone from 50 to 40.

It took three years and persistent action by me, the community and Councillor GRIFFITHS and the State Member to get (1), the Committee to assess the proposed speed limit reduction and Council refused to take it up and then it came back and then they put it back up and it was a bit of a mess. So, my concern is that there’s no consistent process and if this is the process, that’s great, because this will be the benchmark that I use from now on with respect to these matters and I absolutely want to clarify what happened on Stanley Terrace, Taringa.

With respect to item B, this is another street where we have attempted—over many years—to have the speed limit reduced. So, the area is a district access road that runs between Fairfield Road, half of it is essentially King Arthur Terrace, Tennyson, and the other half of it is King Arthur Terrace, Graceville, and Graceville Avenue. Part of King Arthur Terrace—in the new section—is 40, part of it is 60 and the existing section of King Arthur Terrace, Tennyson, is 60 and Graceville Avenue is also 60.

This is the third petition—or fourth petition it may be—now where residents have been asking for speed limit reductions along these streets. They are very busy streets. They are residential streets in the sense that they have hundreds and hundreds of homes that open directly up onto these very busy streets. We’ve got four SAM signs—two each way—and it’s clear there’s a speed problem.

Reducing the speed from 60 to 50 would make it much safer for everybody. It’s disappointing that yet again the Administration simply are ignoring residents’ requests, they are well placed to make views about their speed limits on their streets known. So, this is an issue that is raised with me regularly at the Tennyson Residents Association, this petition came from residents who wanted to see the speed limit reduced. It is just incredibly disappointing that Council refuses to consider those requests and it’s certainly not in keeping with residents’ requirements, it’s not in keeping with ways to improve safety.

It’s really problematic, I think, that Council, I guess—I think the interesting part about it is that they do special deals for their own people but then they won’t do anything to assist in other areas simply because they don’t vote LNP; that’s the only way that I see it based on what I’ve seen particularly happening in Stanley Terrace, Taringa.

We don’t really have a lot of detail about crash history here, there’s three crashes, it says the crashes are the result of poor driver behaviour, well, sure, that’s really why most crashes happen isn’t it? I mean I don’t think that any crash is not the result of poor driver behaviour. So, there is a crash history here, it’s really disappointing that Council’s not acting on these residents’ requests, this issue is not going to go away. Part of King Arthur Terrace is 40, part of King Arthur Terrace is 60.

It needs to be consistent; the speed limit needs to be reduced and I just hope no one dies because we know that the big difference by dropping the speed limit means that the severity of accidents is significantly reduced. It’s disappointing that Council continues to ignore residents’ views and I’m left with no choice other than to let the residents know that the LNP Council is just not listening to their concerns.

Deputy Chair: Thank you Councillor JOHNSTON.

Any further speakers?

Councillor WINES.

Councillor WINES: Thanks, Mr Deputy Chair. Just for clarification to all Councillors, the speed limit reduction—or the speed limit review process I discussed earlier—does not relate to school zones; school zones use a separate process to identify them. I raise this so that people understand that they are separate, that if a school—there are certain rules that govern where and how school zones operate and that the speed limit review process acts independently and separately to the school zone process.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: Now, I hear some discussion about special deals—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: —that was clearly refuted in the previous speaker—Councillor JOHNSTON’s—comments when she said she was able to get a special deal for Ipswich Road, Annerley—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: —but not able to get a special deal for King Arthur Terrace.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: So, clearly the point that she was making—

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

Councillor WINES: —is not correct.

Deputy Chair: Point of order Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Claim to be misrepresented.

Councillor WINES: In the same speech, the Councillor indicated she was able to secure a speed reduction in one place and not in another, then accused people who receive speed reductions of receiving a special deal. Clearly that means herself—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: —in that instance. Also, I’m advised—a preliminary advice has been that Stanley Terrace, Taringa—or Stanley Parade, Taringa—includes a school that responded to a school zone.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Deputy Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, your misrepresentation?

Councillor JOHNSTON: I absolutely never said that we got a special deal on Ipswich Road at Annerley. We went right through this whole process of doing a speed limit review, it went up to the Committee, it came back down, it went back up to the Committee—

Councillor WINES: Point of order, Mr Chair, this is a speech not a clarification.

Councillor JOHNSTON: No, I am clarifying what I said.

Councillor WINES: No point has been made. No point has been made about what she’s saying that—

Deputy Chair: Thank you Councillor WINES.

Councillor WINES: —special recognition was given to Ipswich Road—

Deputy Chair: Thank you Councillor—

Councillor WINES: —to achieve the outcome she sought.

Deputy Chair: Thank you Councillor WINES.

Thank you, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: No, I didn’t even get to speak as Councillor WINES interrupted me, so I would like to—

Deputy Chair: Can you keep it concise please?

Councillor JOHNSTON: —make my point of misrepresentation.

Deputy Chair: Keep it concise please.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Thank you.

Deputy Chair: On the misrepresentation.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Councillor WINES claimed I said that Ipswich Road, Annerley, got a special deal. I indicated that we’d gone right through the speed limit review process, and it had gone up to the Committee and come back down and had to go back up and come back down.

Deputy Chair: Yes, understand.

Councillor JOHNSTON: What he said was completely wrong.

Deputy Chair: Thank you.

We will now put items A, C and D.

**Clauses A, C and D put**

Upon being submitted to the Chamber, the motion for the adoption of Clauses A, C and D of the report of the Infrastructure Committee were declared **carried** on the voices.

Deputy Chair: We’ll now put item B.

**Clause B put**

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

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

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 17 - The DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Krista ADAMS, and Councillors Greg ADERMANN, Adam ALLAN, Fiona CUNNINGHAM, Tracy DAVIS, Fiona HAMMOND, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Sarah HUTTON, Sandy LANDERS, James MACKAY, Kim MARX, Peter MATIC, Ryan MURPHY, Angela OWEN, Steven TOOMEY and Andrew WINES.

NOES: 1 - Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON.

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

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

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

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – *MANUAL OF UNIFORM TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES* – SPEED LIMIT REVIEWS – THE PROCESS OF SPEED LIMIT SETTING

**351/2021-22**

1. The Transport Network Operations Manager, Transport Planning and Operations, Brisbane Infrastructure, attended the meeting to provide a presentation on *Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices’* (MUTCD) speed limit reviews and the process of speed limit setting. She provided the information below.

2. A speed limit review (SLR) describes the process by which speed limits on existing Queensland roads are reviewed and set, with the SLR process being detailed in Part 4 of the MUTCD. An SLR is considered a professional engineering service under the *Professional Engineers Act 2002*, which can only be undertaken by a Registered Professional Engineer of Queensland.

3. The SLR process consists of an eight-step, staged technical assessment and is used to determine the appropriate speed limits for existing roads. The process provides consistent methodology across jurisdictions and was fully revised in 2019, with the current process coming into effect in November 2019. The Committee was shown a flow chart of the SLR process as provided in Part 4 of the MUTCD.

4. Upon receiving a request to review a road’s speed limit, Council will:

- check the complaint history

- analyse historical crash data

- analyse the function of the road and the surrounding land use

- check the existing traffic volume, speed data and road characteristics.

5. If the investigation identifies that a more detailed investigation is required, then Council will undertake a new traffic survey, which includes volume and speed data. Council will also use Queensland’s Department of Transport and Main Roads’ (TMR) SLR tool to determine if a formal SLR is warranted, and if so, engage independent engineering consultants to conduct the formal SLR.

6. There are a number of different types of SLRs, and one of these is a criteria based speed limit (CBSL) review. This involves assessing if speed limits can automatically be applied to roads with a particular design or function, such as:

- shared zones

- high active transport user areas (HATUA)

- car parks

- local urban streets.

7. A risk assessed speed limit (RASL) review is determined based on a combination of crash risk, infrastructure risk and road classification. A speed data speed limit (SDSL) review is based on existing speed data to determine what motorists perceive as a reasonable travel speed. The recommended speed limit is the lower speed of the RASL and SDSL.

8. The SLR process recommends a speed limit based on CBSL, RASL and SDSL. The next step of the process requires an engineering judgement to consider whether the recommendation is suitable. Considerations may include:

- adjacent speed limits

- length of speed zones

- route consistency

- road infrastructure elements not identified in the SLR process

- specific safety risks not fully accounted for in the SLR process.

9. SLRs must be submitted to the Speed Management Committee (SMC) for endorsement. The SMC includes representatives from Council, TMR and Queensland Police Service, and consensus is required for SLR endorsement. Once endorsed, a change to a speed limit can proceed to implementation. However, should consensus not be achieved, the SLR can be referred to Speed Limit Review Panel (SLRP) for further review, which is comprised of senior TMR representatives.

10. Speed limits should be programmed for review on a regular basis to identify changes in traffic conditions, speed environment, land uses and crash rates. When speed limits are modified, the outcome should be monitored to ensure compliance.

11. Some examples of recently completed SLRs include:

- Beaudesert Road, Moorooka, between Fegen Drive and Granard Road, with a speed reduction from 70km/h to 60km/h in June 2021

- Ipswich Road, Annerley, between O’Keefe Street and Cracknell Road, with a speed reduction from 60km/h to 50km/h in March 2021

- Chapel Hill Road, Chapel Hill, between Moggill Road and Russell Terrace, with a speed reduction from 60km/h to 50km/h in February 2021

- Russell Terrace, between Chapel Hill Road, Chapel Hill, and Moggill Road, Indooroopilly, with a speed reduction from 60km/h to 50km/h in February 2021.

12. Some examples of roads currently undergoing an SLR include:

- Sylvan Road, Toowong

- Fleming Road, Chapel Hill

- Old Cleveland Road, Coorparoo, between Macaulay and Leicester Streets

- Tarlina Lane, Coorparoo

- Leicester Street/Newman Avenue, Camp Hill, between York and Kelsey Streets

- Martha Street, Camp Hill, between Newman Avenue and Combles Road.

13. The SLR process does not apply for temporary speed zones for roadworks, advisory speeds or school zones. The SLR process is also not used when designing new roads, with the design speed adopted based on desired form and function of road.

14. Following a number of questions from the Committee, the Civic Cabinet Chair thanked the Transport Network Operations Manager for her informative presentation.

15. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

#### B PETITION – REQUESTING COUNCIL REDUCE THE SPEED LIMIT ON KING ARTHUR TERRACE, TENNYSON, AND GRACEVILLE AVENUE, GRACEVILLE, FROM 60 KM/H TO 50 KM/H

**CA20/1393443**

**352/2021-22**

16. A petition requesting Council reduce the speed limit on King Arthur Terrace, Tennyson, and Graceville Avenue, Graceville, from 60 km/h to 50 km/h, was received during the Summer Recess 2020‑21.

17. The A/Manager, Transport Planning and Operations, Brisbane Infrastructure, provided the following information.

18. The petition contains 110 signatures. Of the petitioners, 51 live in Tennyson Ward, 58 live in other wards in the City of Brisbane and one lives outside the City of Brisbane.

19. King Arthur Terrace, between Softstone Street and Pamphlett Bridge, and Graceville Avenue, between Pamphlett Bridge and Oxley Road, are both classified as district roads in Council’s *Brisbane City Plan 2014* road network hierarchy. Both of these roads have a posted speed limit of 60 km/h. District roads facilitate the movement of people and goods to and through suburbs and include use by buses and heavy vehicles. Attachment B (submitted on file) shows a locality map.

20. The petitioners’ request to reduce the speed limit on King Arthur Terrace and Graceville Avenue, from 60 km/h to 50 km/h, has been noted. Speed limits on all roads in Queensland are assessed and set in accordance with the Queensland Government’s Department of Transport and Main Roads (TMR) *Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices*. This ensures that speed limits are set in a consistent and credible manner across Queensland. Roads identified as potentially suitable for a speed limit reduction are subjected to a formalised Speed Limit Review (SLR) process.

21. All SLRs consider the road’s intended function, recorded traffic speeds and volumes, risk assessment of the road environment and analysis of recorded crash data from the Queensland Government’s crash database. Where the SLR supports a change to the posted speed, the proposal is presented to the Speed Management Committee (SMC) for endorsement. The SMC has representatives from the Queensland Police Service (QPS), TMR and Council.

22. An independent SLR was conducted earlier this year on King Arthur Terrace, between Pamphlett Bridge and Fairfield Road, taking into consideration the factors outlined above. The outcome of the SLR recommended that the speed limit remain at 60 km/h on the section of King Arthur Terrace, between Softstone Street and Pamphlett Bridge, and Godiva Street and Fairfield Road. Accordingly, Council presented this recommendation to the SMC for endorsement, with the outcome being that the 60 km/h speed limit on King Arthur Terrace, between Softstone Street and Pamphlett Bridge, and Godiva Street and Fairfield Road be retained. However, the 40 km/h speed limit on King Arthur Terrace, between Softstone Street and Godiva Street, is to be retained.

23. Due to a previous petition (CA14/437491) received in 2014, requesting Council reduce the speed limit from 60 km/h to 50 km/h on Graceville Avenue, a review of a traffic survey undertaken in June 2013 was conducted to determine if a formal SLR was warranted. The survey found that on average, approximately 9000 vehicles per day used Graceville Avenue, with 85% of motorists travelling at or below 60 km/h. The review of this traffic survey and of Queensland Government’s crash data, at the time, did not suggest a change in the speed limit was required for Graceville Avenue. Accordingly, a formal SLR was not carried out for Graceville Avenue in 2014.

24. A new traffic survey was undertaken on Graceville Avenue in March 2021. The new traffic survey found that on average, approximately 9,222 vehicles per day use Graceville Avenue, with 85% of motorists recorded to be travelling at or below 58 km/h, showing good compliance with the 60 km/h speed limit. Attachment C (submitted on file) sets out the new traffic survey results. A review of Queensland Government crash data identified three crashes over the previous five years, however, these crashes were identified to be due to a result of poor driver behaviour and not as a result of the road configuration or speeding motorists. As a review of the new traffic survey and Queensland Government crash data does not suggest a change in the speed limit is required for Graceville Avenue, a formal SLR is not proposed for Graceville Avenue.

25. To further promote road safety, Speed Awareness Monitor (SAM) signs are installed on Council roads. SAMs are installed for a minimum of one month and increase motorist awareness of their travelling speed by acting as a reminder to adhere to the speed limit. The citywide program has seen a decrease in the number of motorists travelling over the speed limit when passing the signs, with an average speed reduction of more than 8 km/h across all sites since the program began in late 2013.

26. There are four SAM sites located across King Arthur Terrace and Graceville Avenue. For westbound travelling motorists, a SAM sign was previously installed outside 114 King Arthur Terrace, between 8 January and 30 April 2021, showing an average speed reduction of 3 km/h. A SAM sign was previously installed outside 185 King Arthur Terrace, between 18 April and 29 June 2019, showing an average speed reduction of 5 km/h.

27. For westbound travelling motorists, a SAM sign was previously installed outside 79 Graceville Avenue, between 8 January and 30 April 2021, showing an average speed reduction of 4 km/h. A SAM sign was previously installed outside 134 Graceville Avenue, between 9 February and 28 March 2020, showing an average speed reduction of 6 km/h. SAM signs will continue to be installed at the four SAM sites located across King Arthur Terrace and Graceville Avenue on a rotating basis.

28. The petitoners’ concerns regarding speeding and tailgating motorists have been noted. Speeding and tailgating are considered to be poor driver behaviour and this occurs to some extent across the entire city. Council has no authority to enforce moving traffic violations which are under the jurisdiction of the QPS. As such, the petitioners are encouraged to raise any concerns with speeding and tailgating motorists directly with the QPS via the Hoon Hotline on 13 HOON (13 46 66).

Consultation

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

30. The A/Manager recommended as follows and the Committee agreed, with Councillors Steve Griffiths and Charles Strunk abstaining.

31. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A**

**Draft Response**

**Petition Reference:** CA20/1393443

Thank you for your petition requesting Council reduce the speed limit in King Arthur Terrace, Tennyson, and Graceville Avenue, Graceville, from 60 km/h to 50 km/h.

Your request to reduce the speed limit on King Arthur Terrace and Graceville Avenue, from 60 km/h to 50 km/h, has been considered. Speed limits on all roads in Queensland are assessed and set in accordance with the Queensland Government’s Department of Transport and Main Roads (TMR) *Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices*. This ensures that speed limits are set in a consistent and credible manner across Queensland. Roads identified as potentially suitable for a speed limit reduction are subjected to a formalised Speed Limit Review (SLR) process.

All SLRs consider the road’s intended function, recorded traffic speeds and volumes, risk assessment of the road environment and analysis of recorded crash data from the Queensland Government’s crash database. Where the SLR supports a change to the posted speed, the proposal is presented to the Speed Management Committee (SMC) for endorsement. The SMC has representatives from the Queensland Police Service (QPS), TMR and Council.

An independent SLR was conducted earlier this year on King Arthur Terrace, between Pamphlett Bridge and Fairfield Road, taking into consideration the factors outlined above. The outcome of the SLR recommended that the speed limit remain at 60 km/h on the section of King Arthur Terrace, between Softstone Street and Pamphlett Bridge, and Godiva Street and Fairfield Road. Accordingly, Council presented this recommendation to the SMC for endorsement, with the outcome being that the 60 km/h speed limit on King Arthur Terrace, between Softstone Street and Pamphlett Bridge, and Godiva Street and Fairfield Road, be retained. However, the 40 km/h speed limit on King Arthur Terrace, between Softstone Street and Godiva Street, is to be retained.

Due to a previous petition received in 2014, requesting Council reduce the speed limit from 60 km/h to 50 km/h on Graceville Avenue, a review of a traffic survey undertaken in June 2013 was conducted to determine if a formal SLR was warranted. The survey found that on average, approximately 9000 vehicles per day used Graceville Avenue, with 85% of motorists travelling at or below 60 km/h. The review of this traffic survey and of Queensland Government’s crash data at the time did not suggest a change in the speed limit was required for Graceville Avenue. Accordingly, a formal SLR was not carried out for Graceville Avenue in 2014.

A new traffic survey was undertaken on Graceville Avenue in March 2021. The new survey found that on average, approximately, 9,222 vehicles per day use Graceville Avenue, with 85% of motorists recorded to be travelling at or below 58 km/h, showing good compliance with the 60 km/h speed limit. A review of Queensland Government’s crash data identified three crashes over the previous five years, however, these crashes were identified to be due to a result of poor driver behaviour and not as a result of the road configuration or speeding motorists. As a review of the new traffic survey and Queensland Government crash data does not suggest a change in the speed limit is required for Graceville Avenue, a formal SLR is not proposed for Graceville Avenue.

To further promote road safety, Speed Awareness Monitor (SAM) signs are installed on Council roads. SAMs are installed for a minimum of one month and increase motorist awareness of their travelling speed by acting as a reminder to adhere to the speed limit. The citywide program has seen a decrease in the number of motorists travelling over the speed limit when passing the signs, with an average speed reduction of more than 8 km/h across all sites since the program began in late 2013.

There are four SAM sites located across King Arthur Terrace and Graceville Avenue. For westbound travelling motorists, a SAM sign was previously installed outside 114 King Arthur Terrace, between 8 January and 30 April 2021, showing an average speed reduction of 3 km/h. A SAM sign was previously installed outside 185 King Arthur Terrace, between 18 April and 29 June 2019, showing an average speed reduction of 5 km/h.

For westbound travelling motorists, a SAM sign was previously installed outside 79 Graceville Avenue, between 8 January and 30 April 2021, showing an average speed reduction of 4 km/h. A SAM sign was previously installed outside 134 Graceville Avenue, between 9 February and 28 March 2020, showing an average speed reduction of 6 km/h. SAM signs will continue to be installed at the four SAM sites located across King Arthur Terrace and Graceville Avenue on a rotating basis.

Your concerns regarding speeding and tailgating motorists have been noted. Speeding and tailgating are considered to be poor driver behaviour and unfortunately this occurs to some extent across the entire city. Council has no authority to enforce moving traffic violations which are under the jurisdiction of the QPS. As such, the petitioners are encouraged to raise any concerns with speeding and tailgating motorists directly with the QPS via the Hoon Hotline on 13 HOON (13 46 66).

Should you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact Mr Kiran Sreedharan, Senior Transport Network Officer, Transport Planning and Operations, Brisbane Infrastructure, on (07) 3178 1178.

**ADOPTED**

#### C PETITION – REQUESTING COUNCIL IMPLEMENT TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT MEASURES IN MERRETT AVENUE AND FISHER PARADE, ZILLMERE

**CA21/854808**

**353/2021-22**

32. A petition requesting Council implement traffic management measures in Merrett Avenue and Fisher Parade, Zillmere, was received during the Winter Recess 2021.

33. The A/Manager, Transport Planning and Operations, Brisbane Infrastructure, provided the following information.

34. The petition contains 36 signatures. Of the petitioners, eight live in Merrett Street, one lives in Fisher Parade, 19 live in suburbs around the City of Brisbane and eight live outside the City of Brisbane.

35. Merrett Avenue has a posted speed limit of 50 km/h outside of the school zone restrictions of 40 km/h from 7am to 9am and 2pm to 4pm on school days, near the intersection of Murphy Road. Fisher Parade has a speed limit of 50 km/h. Merrett Avenue and Fisher Parade perform a neighbourhood road function in Council’s road hierarchy under *Brisbane City Plan 2014,* providing access to local residential properties. Attachment B (submitted on file) shows a locality map.

36. The petitioners’ request for traffic calming measures on Merrett Avenue and Fisher Parade to deter speeding and ‘rat running’ vehicles has been noted. The installation of traffic calming devices, such as speed platforms and chicanes, is used to discourage use from non-local traffic and to moderate vehicle speeds, providing a safer environment for all road users. Traffic calming devices are generally applied to local and neighbourhood access roads, which primarily provide access to dwellings, residential buildings and other local streets, with limited traffic movements.

37. Council considers the installation of traffic calming devices only where there is a combination of both a demonstrated widespread issue of non-local traffic utilising the street and where there is a demonstrated speeding issue. Speeding issues alone are not sufficient to consider the use of traffic calming devices as speeding is observed to some extent in all streets throughout Brisbane.

38. Council has previously undertaken an investigation for traffic calming in this area and Merrett Avenue and Fisher Parade have been identified as streets where traffic calming would be beneficial. These streets will be listed in a future year’s traffic calming program subject to funding prioritisation in future budgets.

39. There is a high demand for traffic calming throughout Brisbane, which is why all requests are prioritised to ensure Council resources are directed to the streets and areas most in need, and those that offer the greatest benefit, with respect to safety and amenity, to the wider community.

40. The petitioners’ request for Council to consider measures to prevent heavy vehicles from using Merrett Avenue and Fisher Parade has been noted. The Queensland Government’s Department of Transport and Main Roads (TMR) has developed guidelines and policies to facilitate the movement of large vehicles within Queensland in a safe and efficient manner. The guidelines state that vehicles with an overall length not exceeding 19 metres, and with a Gross Vehicle Mass not exceeding 42.5 tonnes are permitted general access to all roads in Queensland.

41. It is expected that there will be some truck use on Merrett Avenue and Fisher Parade. A review of traffic data conducted in 2017 showed 5.3% of vehicles using the street were heavy vehicles. This is within the expectations for a neighbourhood road. Notwithstanding this, a new traffic survey will be undertaken when funding is received for the traffic calming, which will allow Council officers to review heavy vehicle usage and to determine if any further measures are required to be undertaken if heavy vehicle usage is deemed to be too high.

42. Speeding is a behavioural issue under the jurisdiction of the Queensland Police Service (QPS). As such, the petitioners are encouraged to raise any concerns with speeding motorists directly with the QPS via the Hoon Hotline on 13 HOON (13 46 66).

Consultation

43. Councillor Jared Cassidy, Councillor for Deagon Ward has been consulted and supports the recommendation.

Customer impact

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

45. The A/Manager recommended as follows and the Committee agreed.

46. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A**

**Draft Response**

**Petition Reference:** CA21/854808

Thank you for your petition requesting Council implement traffic management measures in Merrett Avenue and Fisher Parade, Zillmere.

Your request for traffic calming measures on Merrett Avenue and Fisher Parade to deter speeding and ‘rat running’ vehicles has been noted. The installation of traffic calming devices, such as speed platforms and chicanes, is used to discourage use from non-local traffic and to moderate vehicle speeds, providing a safer environment for all road users. Traffic calming devices are generally applied to local and neighbourhood access roads, which primarily provide access to dwellings, residential buildings and other local streets, with limited traffic movements.

Council considers the installation of traffic calming devices only where there is a combination of both a demonstrated widespread issue of non-local traffic utilising the street and where there is a demonstrated speeding issue. Speeding issues alone are not sufficient to consider the use of traffic calming devices as speeding is observed to some extent in all streets throughout Brisbane.

Council has previously undertaken an investigation for traffic calming in this area and Merrett Avenue and Fisher Parade have been identified as streets where traffic calming would be beneficial. These streets will be listed in a future year’s traffic calming program subject to funding prioritisation in future budgets.

There is a high demand for traffic calming throughout Brisbane, which is why all requests are prioritised to ensure Council resources are directed to the streets and areas most in need, and those that offer the greatest benefit, with respect to safety and amenity, to the wider community.

Your request for Council to consider measures to prevent heavy vehicles from using Merrett Avenue and Fisher Parade has been noted. The Queensland Government’s Department of Transport and Main Roads (TMR) has developed guidelines and policies to facilitate the movement of large vehicles within Queensland in a safe and efficient manner. The guidelines state that vehicles with an overall length not exceeding 19 metres, and with a Gross Vehicle Mass not exceeding 42.5 tonnes are permitted general access to all roads in Queensland.

It is expected that there will be some truck use on Merrett Avenue and Fisher Parade. A review of traffic data conducted in 2017 showed 5.3% of vehicles using the street were heavy vehicles. This is within the expectations for a neighbourhood road. Notwithstanding this, a new traffic survey will be undertaken when funding is received for the traffic calming, which will allow Council officers to review heavy vehicle usage and to determine if any further measures are required to be undertaken if heavy vehicle usage is deemed to be too high.

Speeding is a behavioural issue under the jurisdiction of the Queensland Police Service (QPS). As such, the petitioners are encouraged to raise any concerns with speeding motorists directly with the QPS via the Hoon Hotline on 13 HOON (13 46 66).

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

Should you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact Ms Maheshi de Silva, Senior Transport Network Officer, Transport Planning and Operations, Brisbane Infrastructure, on (07) 3178 8841.

Thank you for raising this matter.

**ADOPTED**

#### D PETITION – REQUESTING COUNCIL REDUCE THE SPEED LIMIT FROM 60 KM/H TO 40 KM/H ON KITCHENER ROAD, ASCOT, BETWEEN LANCASTER ROAD AND MCGILL AVENUE

**CA21/923789**

**354/2021-22**

47. A petition requesting Council reduce the speed limit from 60 km/h to 40 km/h on Kitchener Road, Ascot, between Lancaster Road and McGill Avenue, was presented to the meeting of Council held on 10 August 2021, by Councillor David McLachlan, and received.

48. The A/Manager Transport Planning and Operations, Brisbane Infrastructure, provided the following information.

49. The petition contains 124 signatures. Of the petitioners, 103 live in Hamilton Ward, and the rest live in other wards in the City of Brisbane.

50. The petitioners are requesting a reduction in the speed limit due to young families accessing C&K Ascot Community Kindergarten; residents accessing the community centre, Ascot Park and the dog park; and parking on both sides of the street.

51. Kitchener Road has a speed limit of 60 km/h and is classified as a district road in Council’s *Brisbane City Plan 2014* road hierarchy. District roads facilitate the movement of people and goods to and through suburbs, including use by heavy vehicles. Attachment B (submitted on file) shows a locality map.

52. The petitioners’ request for Council to reduce the speed limit from 60 km/h to 40 km/h on Kitchener Road, between Lancaster Road and McGill Avenue, has been noted. Speed limits on all roads in Queensland are assessed and set in accordance with the Queensland Government’s Department of Transport and Main Roads’ (TMR) *Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices* (MUTCD*)*. This ensures that speed limits are set in a consistent and credible manner across Queensland. Roads identified as potentially suitable for a speed limit reduction are subjected to a formalised Speed Limit Review (SLR) process.

53. All SLRs consider the road’s intended function, recorded traffic speeds and volumes, a risk assessment of the road environment and analysis of recorded crash data from the Queensland Government’s crash database. Where the review supports a change to the posted speed, the proposal is then presented to the Speed Management Committee (SMC) for endorsement. The SMC has representatives from the Queensland Police Service (QPS), TMR and Council.

54. In response to a previous request in 2016, Council commissioned an independent SLR on Kitchener Road, taking into account the factors outlined above. The findings of the SLR were that the existing 60 km/h speed limit was appropriate for Kitchener Road. The SLR also identified good driver compliance with the 60 km/h speed limit. As a result, the SLR recommended that the existing 60 km/h speed limit be retained on Kitchener Road. Given the findings of the previous SLR that there have been no changes to the adjacent land use since 2016, Council does not propose a new SLR. Therefore the existing 60 km/h speed limit on Kitchener Road is to be retained.

55. Further, 40 km/h school zones are installed in accordance with the Queensland Government’s School zone guidelines, published by TMR, which specify that 40 km/h reduced school zones are not permitted at tertiary institutions, kindergartens or day care centres.

56. The petitioner’s concerns regarding pedestrian safety, and request for a pedestrian crossing to be installed outside the C&K Ascot Community Kindergarten on Kitchener Road, has been noted. Council investigates requests for pedestrian crossings in line with the guidelines outlined in the MUTCD and Australian Standard AS1742.10. There are specific guidelines as to where pedestrian crossings are permitted to be installed, with consideration to approach speeds, consistency of pedestrian demand, available sight distance and local environmental factors. Under the current guidelines, zebra crossings cannot be installed on roads with speed limits of 60 km/h or above. Therefore Council is unable to install a pedestrian crossing on Kitchener Road.

57. It should be noted that there are two existing crossing facilities on Kitchener Road. There is a signalised crossing approximately 100 m south of the C&K Ascot Community Kindergarten at the signalised intersection of Lancaster Road, and a pedestrian refuge crossing approximately 170 m north, near Oriel Road.

58. Council has reviewed the latest available data from the Queensland Government’s crash database, which revealed a good pedestrian safety record, with no recorded pedestrian related crashes along this section of Kitchener Road (between Lancaster Road and McGill Avenue) in the last five years. As crash history did not identify a pedestrian safety issue, and the existing crossing facilities are considered to be within reasonable walking distance for pedestrians crossing Kitchener Road to access the C&K Ascot Community Kindergarten, the community centre, Ascot Park and the dog park, the installation of an additional pedestrian crossing facility is not proposed at this time.

59. To further promote road safety, Speed Awareness Monitor (SAM) signs are installed on Council roads. SAMs are installed for a minimum of one month and increase motorist awareness of their travelling speed by acting as a reminder to adhere to the speed limit. The citywide program has seen a decrease in the number of motorists travelling over the speed limit when passing the signs, with an average speed reduction of more than 8 km/h across all sites since the program began in late 2013.

60. A SAM site is located on Kitchener Road for southbound traffic adjacent to Ascot Park. A SAM sign was previously installed at this location between 12 September and 26 December 2020, showing an average speed reduction of 9 km/h. During the same period, 241,832 vehicles were recorded by the SAM with 85% of motorists travelling at or below 54 km/h, indicating good compliance with the 60 km/h speed limit. All future SAM rotations are planned in consultation with the local Councillor and the next scheduled SAM rotation to this location is in May 2022.

61. Speeding and reckless driving are considered to be poor driver behaviour and this occurs to some extent across the entire city. Council has no authority to enforce moving traffic violations which are under the jurisdiction of QPS. As such, the petitioners are encouraged to raise any concerns with speeding directly with the QPS via the Hoon Hotline on 13 HOON (13 46 66).

Consultation

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

63. The A/Manager recommended as follows and the Committee agreed.

64. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A**

**Draft Response**

**Petition Reference:** CA21/923789

Thank you for your petition requesting Council reduce the speed limit from 60 km/h to 40 km/h on Kitchener Road, Ascot, between Lancaster Road and McGill Avenue.

Your request for Council to reduce the speed limit from 60 km/h to 40 km/h on Kitchener Road, between Lancaster Road and McGill Avenue, has been considered. Speed limits on all roads in Queensland are assessed and set in accordance with the Queensland Government’s Department of Transport and Main Roads’ (TMR) *Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD)*. This ensures that speed limits are set in a consistent and credible manner across Queensland. Roads identified as potentially suitable for a speed limit reduction are subjected to a formalised Speed Limit Review (SLR) process.

All SLRs consider the road’s intended function, recorded traffic speeds and volumes, a risk assessment of the road environment and analysis of recorded crash data from the Queensland Government’s crash database. Where the review supports a change to the posted speed, the proposal is then presented to the Speed Management Committee (SMC) for endorsement. The SMC has representatives from the Queensland Police Service (QPS), TMR and Council.

In response to a previous request in 2016, Council commissioned an independent SLR on Kitchener Road, taking into account the factors outlined above. The findings of the SLR were that the existing 60 km/h speed limit was appropriate for Kitchener Road. The SLR also identified good driver compliance with the 60 km/h speed limit. As a result, the SLR recommended that the existing 60 km/h speed limit be retained on Kitchener Road. Given the findings of the previous SLR and that there have been no changes to the adjacent land use since 2016, Council does not propose a new SLR. Therefore the existing 60 km/h speed limit on Kitchener Road is to be retained.

Further, 40 km/h school zones are installed in accordance with the Queensland Government’s School zone guidelines, published by TMR, which specify that 40 km/h reduced school zones are not permitted at tertiary institutions, kindergartens or day care centres.

Your concerns regarding pedestrian safety, and your request for a pedestrian crossing to be installed outside the C&K Ascot Community Kindergarten on Kitchener Road, has also been considered. Council investigates requests for pedestrian crossings in line with the guidelines outlined in the MUTCD and Australian Standard AS1742.10. There are specific guidelines as to where pedestrian crossings without signals or refuge buildouts are permitted to be installed, with consideration to approach speeds, consistency of pedestrian demand, available sight distance and local environmental factors. Under the current guidelines, zebra crossings cannot be installed on roads with speed limits of 60 km/h or above. There are two more formalised existing crossing facilities on Kitchener Road, a signalised crossing approximately 100 m south of the C&K Ascot Community Kindergarten at the signalised intersection of Lancaster Road, and a pedestrian refuge crossing approximately 170 m north near Oriel Road.

Council has reviewed the latest available data from the Queensland Government’s crash database, which revealed a good pedestrian safety record, with no recorded pedestrian related crashes along this section of Kitchener Road (between Lancaster Road and McGill Avenue) in the last five years. As crash history did not identify a pedestrian safety issue, and the existing crossing facilities are considered to be within reasonable walking distance for pedestrians crossing Kitchener Road to access the C&K Ascot Community Kindergarten, the community centre, Ascot Park and the dog park, the installation of an additional pedestrian crossing facility is not proposed at this time.

To further promote road safety, Speed Awareness Monitor (SAM) signs are installed on Council roads. SAMs are installed for a minimum of one month and increase motorist awareness of their travelling speed by acting as a reminder to adhere to the speed limit. The citywide program has seen a decrease in the number of motorists travelling over the speed limit when passing the signs, with an average speed reduction of more than 8 km/h across all sites since the program began in late 2013.

A SAM site is located on Kitchener Road for southbound traffic adjacent to Ascot Park. A SAM sign was previously installed at this location between 12 September and 26 December 2020, showing an average speed reduction of 9 km/h. During the same period, 241,832 vehicles were recorded by the SAM with 85% of motorists travelling at or below 54 km/h, indicating good compliance with the 60 km/h speed limit.

Speeding and reckless driving are considered to be poor driver behaviour and this occurs to some extent across the entire city. Council has no authority to enforce moving traffic violations which are under the jurisdiction of the QPS. As such, you are encouraged to raise any concerns with speeding directly with the QPS via the Hoon Hotline on 13 HOON (13 46 66).

Should you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact Ms Maheshi De Silva, Senior Transport Network Officer, Transport Planning and Operations, Brisbane Infrastructure, on (07) 3178 8841.

Thank you for raising this matter.

**ADOPTED**

Deputy Chair: Councillor ALLAN please.

### CITY PLANNING AND SUBURBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE

Councillor Adam ALLAN, Civic Cabinet Chair of the City Planning and Suburban Renewal Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Fiona HAMMOND, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 23 November 2021, be adopted.

Deputy Chair: Councillor ALLAN, is there any debate?

Councillor ALLAN: Thank you, Mr Chair. Before moving to the Committee presentation, I did want to touch upon a general city planning matter and in particular Councillor ADAMS’ comments regarding the City Centre Master Plan, and in particular her comments regarding affordable housing and indicating that Councillor CASSIDY opposed five storeys in Sandgate Village as part of the neighbourhood planning process. However, Councillor CASSIDY interjected and said, I didn’t. So, this is great to hear that Councillor CASSIDY has a position on this because to date he has not submitted feedback or stated his position in this regard, so great to hear Councillor CASSIDY.

Now, moving onto the Committee presentation, we had a terrific presentation on Council’s Public Art program. We have a terrific collection—and a valuable collection—of public art that’s displayed around the city, it’s very pleasing to see that this public art collection is growing and that Indigenous artists are being included in that. So, all I would say to the Chamber is it is a fantastic collection, have a look through the presentation and it would be great to see how this is enhanced over coming years.

In addition to the public art collection, we had a petition requesting Council alter the placement of the lift closest to the Story Bridge at Howard Smith Wharves and I’ll leave further debate to the Chamber.

Deputy Chair: Thank you Councillor ALLAN.

Is there any further debate?

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, I just rise to speak briefly on item A, Council’s public art collection. I’m really interested in where the public art might be.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: In the city? Oh, I guess that’s why Councillor ALLAN didn’t want to elaborate. There’s no public art out my way and we when we’ve tried to get some public art out my way, Council has wanted to charge $11,000 to undertake a $2,500 project. Interestingly, I have an update on the bit of public art that is being funded through the Suburban Enhancement Fund—not through capital in the Council budget—but I must thank the Queensland Ombudsman for investigating this matter—and they’re continuing to investigate—but Council suddenly had a change of heart as well, which is really good.

The Council’s policy is pretty clear that—unlike what they’ve been saying for the past nine months to me—there is no requirement that Council’s public art team must do the public art, there is no requirement—that’s exactly what’s been said in writing on multiple occasions. There is absolutely no requirement that for small projects like this that there have to be multiple quotes and Council has to charge fees and all the rest of it. The whole point of Council’s small procurement processes is to ensure that very small projects can be done in a cost-effective way.

The last letter I got about this indicated that Council is charging a set fee for the delivery of public works over the value of $11,000. Now, I think that probably breaches Council’s anti-competitive framework because I don’t think Council can charge a set fee for something; Council is required by law to charge a fee for service based on the delivery of that service. So, the last letter I got has also been sent off to the Ombudsman and I look forward to them reviewing whether or not Council’s breaching any anti-competitive provisions with respect to the latest response that’s come back.

But over the past nine months, Council has done everything it possibly can to block the delivery of a mural on a toilet block in Hefferan Park, Annerley, and it’s taken repeated complaints—including to outside agencies such as the Queensland Ombudsman for this Council—to get out of the way and allow the project to continue. Do you know the most entertaining part of this? Council went out to the artist and the last advice to me was, we have to check whether or not the original quote from February is still an accurate quote—February, that’s when the quote came in—and they went out to the artist and she came back and said, oh paint’s gone up a little bit, it’ll be $2,600.

This is a project that Council wanted to charge $11,000 to deliver. It’s a disgrace that this is going on, I hope that the Ombudsman’s investigation sheds some light on the practices of the Public Art team. I for one have been appalled by what’s happened this year for the delivery of such a small and valuable project to a park upgrade in Tennyson Ward. It does not reflect, in my view, value for money from Council, it doesn’t reflect the idea of trying to improve and beautify our urban pocket parks and it’s incredibly disappointing that Council hops up here and claims to be doing brilliant work on public art when that’s clearly not the case in suburbs.

Even where we attempt to do it as Councillors through the Suburban Enhancement Fund, this Council blocks genuine and legitimate attempts to undertake public art and that is disgraceful.

Deputy Chair: Any further speakers?

Councillor ALLAN?

Right, we’ll now put both items A and B.

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

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

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

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – PUBLIC ART COLLECTION

**355/2021-22**

1. The Design Brisbane Manager, City Planning and Economic Development, City Planning and Sustainability, attended the meeting to provide an update on Council’s public art collection. He provided the information below.

2. Council’s public art collection contains over 200 assets valued at approximately $30 million, comprising works of national and international significance dating back to 1867. The number and value of assets is continuing to appreciate, as new artworks are delivered by government projects, development applications, donations and loans of artworks. Other asset classes include urban design bespoke elements, public art infrastructure and temporary assets.

3. Council’s public art collection includes a diverse range of artworks, from contemporary new media works to traditional sculpture. Key artwork exemplars shown to the Committee include Arnaldo Pomodoro’s *Forme del Mito,* 1989; Stephen Hart’s *Rapture,* 2017; Richard Tipping’s *Watermark,* 2000; Belinda Smith’s *Pop!,* 2020; and Wolfgang Buttress’ *Venus Rising,* 2012.

4. Since 2015 Council has been actively managing and evolving its public art collection, ensuring it engages with the history of the city. In 2015 Council commenced a process of asset steering and identification. In 2018 the collection was photographed, the Vernon collection database was upgraded and collection management work undertaken. Major restoration projects and collection management practices were developed in 2020. In 2021 Council established a maintenance contract for public artworks, commissioned digital artworks, and developed processes and procedures. In 2022 the focus will be on policy, accessibility and education and engagement.

5. Three key focus areas to enhance and improve accessibility for the public art collection are maintenance and restorations, the launch of Council’s public art collection online, and the revision of public art trails and public engagement opportunities.

6. The Committee was shown images of public artworks undergoing maintenance and restoration. Major restoration projects and regular, pro-active and ongoing maintenance is integral to the sustained care and condition of artworks in the collection.

7. Council is currently working to improve accessibility for in-person and online visibility of the collection. By March or April 2022 Council will have information about the collection online, after investigating best-practice implementations of this around the world. Online viewing of works in the collection is also being investigated.

8. Council is working to revitalise art trails and public engagement opportunities to improve promotion of the public art collection. Immersive, engaging experiences with cultural heritage and artworks have demonstrated benefits in education, tourism and fostering connectivity and identity within cities. Opportunities to increase engagement with the public art collection include:

- identifying key partnerships with Brisbane Greeters, Museum of Brisbane, the Visitor Information Centre and the Brisbane Economic Development Agency

- artist talks

- tours

- commercial opportunities through artwork prints, licensed merchandise and souvenir items

- podcasts and digital online content

- revitalisation of public art trails including a ‘build your own trail’ made available through the searchable online collection, to enable self-guided trails, specific to locations, specific interests or artwork types.

9. The Committee was shown images of recent projections of digital artworks at an outdoor gallery location at Howard Smith Wharves. These have proven to be a very successful way of utilising and engaging with Council-owned artworks. Four female artists have been commissioned to produce digital artworks, which will be on rotation at Howard Smith Wharves from 22 November to 3 December 2021. The Committee was shown the animation ‘Subtropical Surreal’ by one of the commissioned artists, Phoebe Paradise.

10. Council has commissioned artworks from a wide spectrum of art and artists including Beth Mitchell, Sophie Beer, Sebastian Moody, Tony Albert and Vernon Ah Kee. The Committee was shown a video of an interview with Sophie Beer.

11. The Platform is a project arising from the 2018 Commonwealth Games, establishing a space within the Mt Coot-tha Botanic Gardens (the gardens) for artworks responding creatively to the site. Since its inception it has featured four artworks, which are now featured permanently in the gardens. The Platform project is currently in the concept design phase, with Brisbane-based indigenous artists Kyra Mancktelow, Tony Albert and Ryan Presley having been shortlisted for the next project phase. The project’s commissioning phase will run from December 2021 to June 2022 and will incorporate concept design assessment and commissioning. The delivery phase will occur in June and July 2022. The artwork will stay on the Platform for one to two years, before being permanently relocated with the gardens.

12. The outdoor gallery exhibition ‘Springfinity’ finished on 21 November 2021. It was curated by Haline Ly, and featured the work of 10 artists in 11 locations across the city. Walking tours for Carers’ Week and Grandparents’ Day were developed from the exhibition, as well as ongoing collaboration with Brisbane Greeters. Social media engagement was extremely successful, reaching over 308,000 views.

13. Botanica 2021 was extremely successful, activating sites in the city over 10 evenings and offering unique things to see and do for residents and visitors, while promoting a vibrant, creative city brand. The event presented attracted national interest, and visitor numbers exceeded expectations. Planning is currently underway for Botanica 2022 to run from 19– 29 May 2022, with the executive producer engaged and expressions of interest for artists opening on 25 November 2021.

14. Brisbane Canvas delivers artwork by high profile artists on large-scale, high visibility public sites. The Committee was shown images of previous commissions. Simon Degroot’s artwork ‘*Marginalia Wrapped*’ is at Toowong, and Kyle Jenkins’ ‘*Take Me Away to Bring Me Home*’ is at Morningside. The next site will be along Breakfast Creek Road in Newstead, a site along a major gateway to the city.

15. The Brisbane Street Art Festival is scheduled for May 2022, and sponsorship of the festival will provide an opportunity for Council to focus on cross-promotional opportunities. Three Council infrastructure sites are scheduled to be used, and two activations as part of Botanica 2022 are proposed.

16. Artforce Brisbane is a community arts project delivered by an external contractor, which has been reinvigorated during 2020-21. It has delivered 70 painted traffic signal boxes and 10 Energex pad‑mounted transformers. An awards night is scheduled for February 2022. The Artforce program, engagement and communications have been reinvigorated with a new webpage and app, and highlights have included successful collaborations with a number of schools and community groups.

17. Council currently has five public art walking trails focusing on different themes. These are art and the river, contemporary art and architecture, cultural heritage, Kingsford Smith Drive and Expo 88. The trails are currently being expanded and promoted on Council’s new app.

18. Following a number of questions from the Committee, the Civic Cabinet Chair thanked Design Brisbane Manager for his informative presentation.

19. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

#### B PETITION – REQUESTING COUNCIL ALTER THE PLACEMENT OF THE LIFT CLOSEST TO THE STORY BRIDGE (CLIFF LIFT 1) AT THE HOWARD SMITH WHARVES PRECINCT

**CA21/1030745**

**356/2021-22**

20. A petition from residents, requesting Council alter the placement of the lift closest to the Story Bridge (Cliff Lift 1) at the Howard Smith Wharves Precinct (HSW), was presented to the meeting of Council held on 31 August 2021, by Councillor Vicki Howard, and received.

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

22. The petition contains 190 signatures.

23. It is noted that the petitioners’ preference is for Council to reorientate the lift to provide a dedicated waiting area away from the existing active transport corridor, located at 5 Boundary Street, Brisbane City (latest application reference A005520561). The petitioners’ concerns include the following.

- The location and orientation of the lift exit causes conflict, confusion and congestion of the shared pathway.

- The lift exit directs members of the public directly onto the shared pathway.

- There is no queuing capacity around the lift due to the proximity to the shared pathway.

- Attempts by HSW operators to mitigate the situation through bollards has created a further hazardous situation.

- The lack of queuing capacity has resulted in safety and operational concerns.

24. The HSW Precinct comprises the redevelopment of the riverside holding of approximately 34,318 square metres, located on the land immediately under and to the east and west of the Story Bridge, identified as Howard Smith Wharves.

25. The development accommodates a hotel and an exhibition hall within HSW, in addition to the adaptive re-use of the existing heritage buildings. The remainder of the development site comprises publicly accessible space and parkland. The original development application over HSW, including all heritage structures, was approved on 23 December 2015 (development application A004162925). The two cliff lifts within HSW were approved through the development application and identified on the approved plans.

26. Since the original development approval was granted, HSW has been modified several times via minor change applications to accommodate changes including staging of the proposed development, as well as incorporating changes to facilitate flexibility in uses such as enabling Howard’s Hall (building 2) to be used as a Food and drink outlet in addition to the originally approved Function facility. The location and orientation of Cliff Lift 1 has not been modified through any change application and remains in accordance with the original development application.

27. During the assessment of the original development application, the applicant’s Traffic Engineering team demonstrated that the operation of the shared pathway and lift access for Cliff Lift 1 were able to operate safely. The engineering report demonstrated that the approved site layout and proximity to the shared pathway would ensure the appropriate operation of the area as a shared space.

28. Council leases the site to HSW Pty Ltd following the transfer of the land from the State Government to Council in 2004. The leased area covers a significant proportion of HSW and extends from within the perimeter fence along the top of the cliffs to the Brisbane River, from the entrance at Boundary Street to the New Farm end, near the Riverwalk and encompasses parkland areas. A right of way easement runs through the site to provide public access. Two leases are in place over HSW to manage the hotel, retail, parklands and car park precincts, which are due to expire at the end of 2117.

29. As part of the leasing agreements over the site, HSW Pty Ltd are required to refurbish the existing heritage structures and construct the additional improvements throughout HSW, including the lift structures. The lease further prescribes that HSW Pty Ltd maintains ownership of the improvements until the expiry of the lease term. As per these requirements, any further changes throughout HSW will require HSW Pty Ltd to construct and maintain any changes to the lifts at their own cost and consent. As the lifts and improvements over HSW are currently privately-owned and managed by HSW Pty Ltd until the expiration of the lease, Council does not have the right to modify the development approval.

30. Council is in regular communication with HSW Pty Ltd regarding on-going operational management under the lease and in accordance with the original development application. Council will also provide a copy of the petition and associated material to HSW via Council’s Asset Management team for their consideration and records. Were HSW Pty Ltd to lodge any further development applications, or a change to the existing development approvals, Council may use the opportunity to request consideration for changes to Cliff Lift 1 in response to the concerns raised.

31. Until a further development application is lodged, it is recommended that the petitioners be advised that the lift closest to the Story Bridge at HSW is constructed in accordance with the development approvals and Council cannot direct HSW Pty Ltd to reorient the lift.

32. Should any further applications be lodged over HSW, details of any proposed change application, including all documents relating to the application, will be accessible via Council’s Development.i website at https//developmenti.brisbane.qld.gov.au. Interested community members can save searches, properties, applications and set preferences to be automatically notified of new applications in the area, or on and around a property. Additionally, Development.i allows comments to be lodged on a development application for the Assessing Planning team to review.

Consultation

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

Customer impact

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

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

36. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A**

**Draft Response**

**Petition Reference:** CA21/1030745

Thank you for your petition requesting Council alter the placement of the lift closest to the Story Bridge (Cliff Lift 1) at the Howard Smith Wharves (HSW) Precinct.

It is noted that the petitioners’ preference is for Council to reorientate the lift to provide a dedicated waiting area away from the existing active transport corridor, located at 5 Boundary Street, Brisbane City (latest application reference A005520561). The petitioners’ concerns include the following.

- The location and orientation of the lift exit causes conflict, confusion and congestion of the shared pathway.

- The lift exit directs members of the public directly onto the shared pathway.

- There is no queuing capacity around the lift due to the proximity to the shared pathway.

- Attempts by HSW operators to mitigate the situation through bollards has created a further hazardous situation.

- The lack of queuing capacity has resulted in safety and operational concerns.

The HSW Precinct comprises the redevelopment of the riverside holding of approximately 34,318 square metres, located on the land immediately under and to the east and west of the Story Bridge.

The development accommodates a hotel and an exhibition hall within HSW, in addition to the adaptive re‑use of the existing heritage buildings. The remainder of the development site comprises publicly accessible space and parkland. The original development application over HSW, including all heritage structures, was approved on 23 December 2015 (development application A004162925). The two cliff lifts within HSW were approved through the development application and identified on the approved plans.

Since the original development approval was granted, the location and orientation of Cliff Lift 1 has not been modified through any change application and remains in accordance with the original development application.

During the assessment of the original development application, the applicant’s Traffic Engineering team demonstrated that the operation of the shared pathway and lift access for Cliff Lift 1 were able to operate safely. The engineering report demonstrated that the approved site layout and proximity to the shared pathway would ensure the appropriate operation of the area as a shared space.

Council leases the site to HSW Pty Ltd following the transfer of the land from the State Government to Council in 2004. As part of the leasing agreements over the site, HSW Pty Ltd are required to refurbish the existing heritage structures and construct the additional improvements throughout HSW, including the lift structures. The lease further prescribes that HSW Pty Ltd maintains ownership of the improvements until the expiry of the lease term. As per these requirements, any further changes throughout HSW will require HSW Pty Ltd to construct and maintain any changes to the lifts at their own cost and consent.

As the lifts and improvements over HSW are currently privately-owned and managed by HSW Pty Ltd until the expiration of the lease, Council does not have the right to modify the development approval.

Council is in regular communication with HSW Pty Ltd regarding on-going operational management under the lease and in accordance with the original development application. Council will provide a copy of the petition and associated material to HSW via Council’s Asset Management team for their consideration and records. Were HSW Pty Ltd to lodge any further development applications, or a change to the existing development approvals, Council may use the opportunity to request consideration for changes to Cliff Lift 1 in response to the concerns raised. Council will also provide a copy of the petition and associated material to HSW via Council’s Asset Management for their consideration and records.

Should any further applications be lodged over HSW, details of any proposed change application, including all documents relating to the application, will be accessible via Council’s Development.i website at https//developmenti.brisbane.qld.gov.au. Interested community members can save searches, properties, applications and set preferences to be automatically notified of new applications in the area, or on and around a property. Additionally, Development.i allows comments to be lodged on an application for the assessing planning team to review.

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

Should you have any further questions, please contact Mr Aidan Harvey-Hall, Urban Planner, Manager’s Office, Development Services, City Planning and Sustainability, on (07) 3178 7317.

Thank you for raising your concerns.

**ADOPTED**

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

Councillor DAVIS: Thank you, Deputy Chair.

### ENVIRONMENT, PARKS AND SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE

Councillor Tracy DAVIS, Civic Cabinet Chair of the Environment, Parks and Sustainability Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor James MACKAY, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 23 November 2021, be adopted.

Deputy Chair: Councillor DAVIS, is there any debate?

Councillor DAVIS: Thank you, Deputy Chair. On Tuesday we had a presentation outlining the progressive delivery of the City Botanic Gardens Master Plan. The City Botanic Gardens were opened in 1828 and are considered one of Brisbane’s most treasured parks. In 2015, the City Botanic Gardens Master Plan was released and identified ways to best showcase the Garden’s heritage values and protect them for future generations. Since the release of the Master Plan, the Schrinner Council has made a range of upgrades, and of particular interest to the Committee on Tuesday were the upgrades to the new Hills Avenue and children’s boardwalks.

The new boardwalks were constructed to provide access to all abilities to this significant area of the Gardens. Specialised equipment and techniques were used to preserve the integrity of the root structure, while safely constructing the boardwalks without disturbing the heritage vegetation. Significant upgrades were also made to the Gardens’ irrigation system including smart irrigation infrastructure. This will enable the rationalisation of water use in conservation of water into the future, ensuring that the Gardens remain green and healthy during all conditions, including drought.

New and refurbished bench seating has also been installed throughout the Gardens, including 44 bespoke designed benches and the removal of 20 old benches that had reached the end of their asset life. Seven drinking fountains were also removed and replaced during the project. Deputy Chair, the delivery of the City Botanic Gardens Master Plan will ensure the river edge and outdoor spaces in the Gardens are safe, inclusive and provide opportunities for recreation, reflection, entertainment and learning and I leave further debate to the Chamber.

Deputy Chair: Thank you Councillor DAVIS.

Is there any further debate?

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes. I rise to speak on item A, the City Botanic Gardens Master Plan. This report leaves out one important aspect of the Botanic Gardens, which is lighting for safety purposes and Councillor DAVIS is still fairly new in this place but it’s an issue I’ve raised in here many times, including when this master planning process first started many years ago.

It’s still concerning to me that lighting and safety issues are not being considered. I don’t know if that’s just because the report leaves them out or that they’re just not being addressed, but lighting is a big issue. I know that there are still lighting problems in the Botanic Gardens because I was at the art show in the Gardens earlier this year and there were thousands of people wandering around the Botanic Gardens in the dark. It was dead-set dark. You could not see between art installations, I had to get my phone out and turn my torch on so that I could find my way around.

So, I am very concerned that lighting issues have not been properly addressed as part of the process and I think that they should be. We have a huge amount of people who work and live in the city, we’re going to have another bridge coming straight across, people use it as a thoroughfare to go through over the bridge to South Bank as well, and it is particularly concerning to me that lighting to make sure we have safe and accessible pathways isn’t being addressed and it’s not even being referenced in this report. That is an oversight, and it needs to be corrected.

Deputy Chair: Thank you Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor DAVIS, right of reply? No.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Deputy Chair: We’ll now put item A.

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

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

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

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – CITY BOTANIC GARDENS – PROGRESSIVE DELIVERY OF THE MASTER PLAN

**357/2021-22**

1. The Major Project and Asset Coordination Manager, Major Projects and Asset Coordination, Natural Environment, Water and Sustainability, City Planning and Sustainability, attended the meeting to provide an update on the progressive delivery of the *City Botanic Gardens Master Plan* (the Master Plan). He provided the information below.

2. Brisbane’s City Botanic Gardens (the Gardens) is comprised of 18 hectares of parkland and 1.2 kilometres of river frontage. Opened in 1828 and considered one of Brisbane’s most treasured parks, the Gardens is home to the first public garden in Queensland.

3. The Master Plan was released in 2015. Design principles and opportunities identified in the Master Plan include:

- providing an exciting riverside public realm

- bringing Brisbane’s unique cultural heritage to life

- increasing accessibility and connection

- enhancing Brisbane’s subtropical lifestyle

- championing partnerships that increase Brisbane’s global reputation.

4. Works delivered since the release of the Master Plan include:

- new cycle racks, refuse bins and drinking fountains

- new and refurbished bench seating

- new wayfinding entry signage

- refurbishment of the historic rainforest rotunda

- new boardwalks and pathways at Hills Avenue, the rainforest and Edward Street

- a new water reticulation system

- new shade sails over the playground

- a new visitor information kiosk

- upgrades to the living collection

- significant irrigation system upgrades.

5. Images of new cycle racks, refuse and recycling bins, and wayfinding entry signs were shown to the Committee. When installing new refuse and recycling bins, the number of bins and their locations were rationalised to minimise the visual impact on the Gardens, while maximising functionality. Amenities were also co-located where possible and wayfinding signs placed within the Gardens now provide a consistent visual experience when utilising this signage.

6. The historical Rainforest rotunda was refurbished, undergoing lifting and restumping works. New timber boardwalks and pathways were also installed to provide greater accessibility and inclusion to the popular destination, which includes the first known cultivated macadamia nut tree.

7. New shade sails were installed over the all-abilities playground to provide an improved and safer experience for children enjoying this facility. Execution of this project required significant discussions with the State Government and careful consideration of heritage aspects of the Gardens.

8. A new water reticulation system was installed to service all of the Gardens, replacing the previous system, which was 100 years old. Installation of the system was achieved through both potable and non‑potable infrastructure, and a combination of direct boring and open trenching.

9. Images of the new Hills Avenue Boardwalk and the Children’s Boardwalk were shown to the Committee. Heritage vegetation at this site was planted in 1865. The new boardwalks were constructed to provide all-abilities access to this significant area of the Gardens. Specialised equipment and techniques were utilised to preserve the integrity of the root structure and safely construct the boardwalks without disturbing the heritage vegetation.

10. Images of upgrades made to the living collection within the Gardens were shown to the Committee. Upgrades to the living collection were carried out in partnership with Council’s Public Space Operations, City Standards, Brisbane Infrastructure, with apprentices engaged to complete the works.

11. Images of the new pathway adjacent to Queens Park Field and the location of the ‘Morning Star’ artwork were shown to the Committee. The Gardens’ ‘Morning Star’ artwork was relocated, providing improved visitor accessibility in the coming years, as visitation to the Gardens is anticipated to increase. New pathways were also installed adjacent to the Edward Street entry.

12. Images of the new visitor information kiosk were shown to the Committee. The construction of the new kiosk was completed in partnership with Multiplex and delivered through their Social Action Plan. The new structure provides upgraded and modern amenities to volunteer guides.

13. Significant upgrades were made to the Gardens’ irrigation system, including smart irrigation infrastructure. This will enable the rationalisation of water use and conservation of water into the future, ensuring that the Gardens remain green and healthy during all conditions, including drought.

14. New and refurbished bench seating has been installed throughout the Gardens, with the inclusion of 44 bespoke design benches and the removal of 20 old benches that had reached the end of their asset life. Seven drinking fountains were also removed and replaced during the project.

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

16. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

Deputy Chair: Councillor MARX, please.

### CITY STANDARDS COMMITTEE

Councillor Kim MARX, Civic Cabinet Chair of the City Standards Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Sandy LANDERS, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 23 November 2021, be adopted.

Deputy Chair: Councillor MARX, is there any debate?

Councillor MARX: Just one presentation that we had on the spatial systems used in City Standards’ Committee presentation which was very enlightening. There was a lot to it, and I know that the officer was a bit disappointed we had to cut some of the slides out because there was so much and there was a lot of questions from the Committee, so I’m happy to bring back further reports on it as time allows next year. Thank you.

Deputy Chair: Thank you, Councillor MARX.

Is there any further debate? No?

Councillor MARX, right of reply? No?

We’ll now put item A for the City Standards Committee report.

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

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

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

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – SPATIAL SYSTEMS USED IN CITY STANDARDS

**358/2021-22**

1. The Manager, Commercial Services Business Improvement, City Standards, Brisbane Infrastructure attended the meeting to provide an update on spatial systems used in City Standards. She provided the information below.

2. The objectives of the spatial systems include:

- informing customer and outcome focused reporting

- employing standard measures for success of product and service delivery

- capturing knowledge in the decision support tools

- using the accessible data to support service performance

- supporting the transition to customer facing spatial data

- employees leveraging technology to drive improvements

- responsive to managing risk and leveraging opportunities.

3. Council leverages the power of spatial systems to provide a high standard of product and service delivery to its customers. Spatial systems used by Council include the Brismap Portal, ArcGIS online and ArcGIS Pro. The Brismap portal is Council’s web based spatial system which is used for building maps and surveys. ArcGIS online and ArcGIS Pro are desktop tools which provide powerful map functionalities from the world leading spatial map system provider, Esri.

4. Council’s Brismap portal uses bin data to efficiently manage its waste and resource recovery services. For example, SUEZ bin data is used to map bins by type, size, waste stream and accessories. This editable data is maintained in the GIS (geographic information system) spatial system, instead of in a traditional spreadsheet.

5. The incorporated functionality of a navigating tool within ArcGIS Pro is used to drive service improvements in Council, including implementation of improved road routes which are used for road cleansing.

6. Council relies on data generated from spatial systems to implement its disaster response procedures. The Survey 123 application, which is incorporated into the Brismap portal, is an electronic form used by field officers to input real-time data into changing situations such as a flood event, which enables a situational report to be generated. For example, during a flood event calculation of the number of sandbags required at a particular location to protect an asset can be undertaken. A live map of the captured data can be generated using a QR code or a web link.

7. Audits of data contained in the Survey 123 application are undertaken to inform Council’s management of traffic network services using real time data. For example, portable speed warning signs around the city are tracked, and accidents which occur at traffic signals are recorded.

8. Council’s spatial systems technology is available to enable tracking of the status of works in progress, as well as identification and notification of issues previously reported to Council. Live updates on the status of Council managed trees can be obtained to inform decisions on tree management. Further, customer insights have informed business process reviews undertaken by City Standards.

9. StoryMaps is a story authoring web-based application used by Council which incorporates multiple features including a customer facing map, that serves as an interactive website to provide insight on specific products and services. Stories include data which can be displayed as maps, narrative text, lists, images, videos, embedded items, and other forms of media. For example, an event disaster may be viewed on StoryMaps to identify road closures. Customers may publish and share stories with the wider community via StoryMaps.

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

11. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

Deputy Chair: Councillor HOWARD.

Councillor HOWARD: Thank you, Mr Deputy Chair.

### 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 of the meeting of that Committee held on 23 November 2021, be adopted.

Deputy Chair: Councillor HOWARD.

Councillor HOWARD: Thank you, Mr Deputy Chair. Just before moving to the report, I just want to advise the Chamber on some of the fantastic things that have been happening around Brisbane this week. Councillor MACKAY and I attended the Brisbane Movie Makers Short Film Awards at the fantastic Elizabeth Theatre. It was just brilliant to see these wonderful short films being presented—and it’s a local group that meets in Councillor MACKAY’s area—but it was a fantastic evening and we had awards; it was almost like the Academy Awards. We had to open an envelope and hope that we got the right one and of course it was very good to see these movie makers being able to have that particular showing, so that was fantastic.

I also want to mention Gerard Bargo’s art exhibition that I attended on the weekend and Councillor SRI was there as well; again, another fantastic way to let some of our local artists put their works on display. The Queensland Ballet introduced a ballet called *Dracula*, which was very, very popular with young people and so again, it’s our local artists that are certainly trying to make the most of what we can do within the city.

So, Brisbane Living Heritage Network met at Miegunyah and had their Christmas event and—again—showcasing the marvellous historical buildings around Brisbane. Brisbane Living Heritage Network do a fantastic job, it was wonderful to have all of the organisations that are involved in that coming together at what is a most beautiful place such as Miegunyah.

I was then off to a local community drama which was The Wickhams: Christmas at Pemberley, and it was again a wonderful opportunity for a local community art group to get together and their performances are extra special. They’ve been going for quite a number of years but it’s always a fun thing to go along to that.

I also went along to the Big Summer Block Party which was held in Fortitude Valley, and I really want to thank QMusic. It was an opportunity for Brisbane City Council to support all of the artists and all of the live music people who were there; it was fantastic. We closed off Warner Street and it was an ability for us also to celebrate BIGSOUND’s 21st birthday. Now, BIGSOUND is an industry festival, and we haven’t been able to have it for the last two years but they’re planning a fantastic event next year. QMusic has partnered with Council over this year to inject more than $300,000 worth of value to our local artists and to put on things such as Valley Fiesta, Winter Sessions and then to end the year with this wonderful Big Summer Block Party was fantastic.

Finally, Mr Deputy Chair, I want to talk about the fact that I went along to the launch of a wonderful new song called, Brisbane River Song, and it was the—Brisbane Sings have put it together; it was launched at the Grange, so that was wonderful. But Brisbane Sings usually brings together about 500 choir people and of course with COVID they’ve not been able to do that. So, they put their heads together and one of their people—who wrote this wonderful song called River Song, and Kate Schirmer is their artistic director, she wrote the song, which is a fantastic opportunity to talk about Brisbane with its summer storms and its winter westerlies.

Of course, there’s even a reference to the thank you drivers and everybody was just so excited about that. We again launched it—yet again—today at the Lord Mayor’s Concert in City Hall and I was able to pop in just at the beginning and to see everyone just blown away by these wonderful choirs getting together to celebrate all that Brisbane is all about. So, I really want to thank each and every one of the people who put their heart and soul into making Brisbane even more special than we all think that it is, so it was really a great opportunity today to see the launch of that River Song.

So, moving to the report, Mr Deputy Chair, we had a Committee presentation on the Carindale Library extension. The library has serviced more than 4.5 million customers since first opening 22 years ago and it’s a much loved community space servicing the residents of Carindale and beyond. To ensure the facilities could meet community demand, Council identified an opportunity to acquire the building adjacent to the Carindale Library and to undertake an extension of the library. The extension has expanded the footprint through the addition of 460 square metres of floorspace and includes the ongoing evolution of library spaces to meet modern needs.

In the presentation, we heard about some of the interesting and new additions as a part of the Carindale Library, including the new media conversion station and Makerspace. The presentation kept all of our Councillors interested and informed and many questions were asked throughout. I’d just like to thank Nina for the great presentation and to thank all of our librarians for the fantastic work that they do, and I’ll leave the debate to the Chamber.

Deputy Chair: Thank you Councillor HOWARD.

Any further speakers? I see no one rising.

Councillor HOWARD, right of reply?

We’ll now put the report.

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

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

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

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – CARINDALE LIBRARY EXTENSION

**359/2021-22**

1. The Manager, Library Services, Lifestyle and Community Services, attended the meeting to provide an update on the Carindale Library extension. She provided the information below.

2. The Carindale Library has been delivering library services to the Carindale community for more than 22 years. The current library opened in 2012, and includes the following:

- more than 4.5 million customer visits

- open 58 hours per week, across seven days

- serves the eastern suburbs region

- a collection of more than 52,000 items including collections in Chinese, Greek and Afrikaans

- two library meeting rooms

- a popular events program, including early literacy and author events.

3. Council identified an opportunity to acquire the building adjacent to the Carindale Library and to undertake an extension of the library. The Carindale Library extension has expanded the library’s footprint through the addition of 460 square metres of floor space and includes the ongoing evolution of library spaces to meet modern needs. Additional space is provided for residents to read, learn, create, study, work, meet and connect. The extension is aligned with other improvements, including:

- customer self-service facilities

- expansion of the children’s library

- relocation of Council’s East Customer Centre to operate within the library.

4. The Carindale Library’s new flexible event space includes:

- supporting library programs including adult and children’s programs, sustainable living, and author talks

- an open area with good visual connection to existing space

- zoning and separation options with a new interoperable wall

- audio-visual equipment with a hearing loop

- a kitchenette

- flexible use options available as lounge or study space when not in use for events.

5. The media conversion station project commenced operations in April 2021. The project was supported by the State Library of Queensland Strategic Priorities Grant of $30,000. The multimedia station enables residents to digitise items of personal and historical significance and aims to:

- enable the ongoing preservation of memories and history for both individuals and the community

- build digital inclusion

- enhance libraries as community hubs for learning, making and creating.

6. During the first six months of operation, the media conversion station was used by 162 customers for more than 400 hours, and 30 group learning sessions were delivered to 255 attendees. The most popular projects were the conversion of VHS tapes and photographic slides. The project successfully delivered on the primary aim to assist residents in preserving their memories and history. Customer feedback received regarding the media conversion station has been extremely positive and includes expressions of gratitude for the facility.

7. The Carindale Library Makerspace facility is a small-scale multipurpose space that facilitates learning through hands-on making and creates a maker-culture through sharing knowledge and creating in a social and collaborative environment for adults. The Makerspace facility fosters learning and building connections between makers with shared interests. The current focus of the Makerspace facility is handmade craft. Weekly social sessions are available to provide residents with the opportunity to use crafting and sewing equipment including sewing machines, overlockers and laser cutters. This popular library asset is the first Makerspace offered by Council, with plans to offer expanded programming and engagement in the community from 2022.

8. Upcoming programs scheduled for December 2021 through to January 2022 include Makerspace events for young adults, including introduction to sashiko embroidery, beginner knitting class, and learn to crochet, and events for adults such as Makerspace social for adults and creating felted Christmas baubles. The program will also comprise:

- media conversion station sessions

- a sustainable living program: Gourmet edible flowers

- Live in the library: Sanctuary Quartet

- early literacy programs

- 2021-22 Summer Reading with the theme of “Where I read”.

9. Following a number of questions from the Committee, the Civic Cabinet Chair thanked the Manager, Library Services for her informative update.

10. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

Deputy Chair: Councillor HUANG, please.

### FINANCE AND CITY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

Councillor Steven HUANG, Deputy Chair of the Finance and City Governance Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Angela OWEN, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 23 November 2021, be adopted.

Deputy Chair: Councillor HUANG, is there any debate?

Councillor HUANG: Yes, thank you, Mr Deputy Chair. Last week’s Committee, we had a presentation from the Human Resources Manager about Council’s Employment Value Proposition, or EVP. We also had financial report for receivable rates payables provisions and malls, which was discussed in the Committee and I’ll leave debate to the Chamber.

Deputy Chair: Thank you Councillor HUANG.

Is there any further—

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, I rise to speak on item A, the Employee Value Proposition. It’s come to my attention that ward office staff are being paid less superannuation than other Council employees; this is unacceptable in my opinion. It is extremely concerning because for many years staff have—our ward office staff have had similar terms—or the same terms—as Council employees employed under the EBA (enterprise bargaining agreement), but my staff in recent days have discovered that they are being paid less than other Council officers.

This is unacceptable. Unacceptable. Our ward office staff act as customer service employees at the very coalface of Council, they have to deal with people from all walks of life and often in very difficult situations. I would like an explanation about why Council ward office staff are being paid less superannuation than other Council employees. To me, this is a slap in the face to those people who are doing a good job, who’ve worked very hard—many of them in ward offices—for a very long period of time.

So, this is an issue that my staff have been talking about it for some days and it strikes me that there should not be any difference between superannuation rates for ward office staff and Council staff generally.

Deputy Chair: Any further speakers?

Councillor HUANG, right of reply?

Councillor HUANG: Thank you, Mr Deputy Chair. What Councillor JOHNSTON has said actually has nothing to do with the presentation last week, however, if she has any questions feel free to write to the Chair and also feel free to ask during the Question Time. Thank you.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Deputy Chair: Thank you, Councillor HUANG.

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

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

Councillor Fiona Cunningham (Civic Cabinet Chair), Councillor Steven Huang (Deputy Chair), and Councillors Lisa Atwood, Angela Owen, Jonathan Sri and Charles Strunk.

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – EMPLOYEE VALUE PROPOSITION

**360/2021-22**

1. The Chief Human Resources Officer, Human Resources, Organisational Services, attended the meeting to provide an overview of Council’s employee value proposition (EVP). She provided the information below.

2. Council’s *Our People 2020-2024,* or People Plan, is the plan for Council’s future workforce. It guides Council to ensure employees are highly engaged and capable to help deliver the *Brisbane Vision 2031.*

3. The EVP is a set of strategic guiding principles defining Council’s strongest and most unique aspects of the employment experience. It is a valuable tool, instrumental in influencing how employees, including past, current and future, perceive Council as an employer, which directly impacts on behaviour and ultimately, the achievement of organisational objectives.

4. The EVP’s greatest benefits are outlined below.

- Retention, where employees are more engaged, motivated and committed to Council.

- Employer reputation, signalling to the market that Council is a great place to work.

- Competitive advantage, distinguishing Council from other organisations.

- Attraction, enticing talent likely to support Council’s brand and values.

- Advocacy, where employees act as brand ambassadors.

5. There are four strategic themes that define Council’s overall employment proposition and the strongest and most unique aspects of the employment experience.

- Serve the City of Brisbane.

- Benefits that matter.

- Skill development and career mobility.

- Large government employer.

6. Council’s EVP is expressed during key touchpoints in the employee lifecycle, from attraction, recruitment, retention and upon exiting, including:

- leveraging prior experience with Council and its employees

- candidate experience during interviews

- career development opportunities

- exit interviews and communication after the last day of employment.

7. Following a number of questions from the Committee, the Civic Cabinet Chair thanked the Chief Human Resources Officer for her informative presentation.

8. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

#### B COMMITTEE REPORT – FINANCIAL REPORTS (RECEIVABLE, RATES, INVENTORY, PAYABLE, PROVISIONS AND MALLS) FOR THE PERIOD ENDED SEPTEMBER 2021

**134/695/317/1235**

**361/2021-22**

9. The Chief Financial Officer, Corporate Finance, Organisational Services, provided a detailed report, submitted on file, on Council’s position relating to accounts receivable, rates, inventory, accounts payable, provisions and malls for the period ended September 2021.

10. The Civic Cabinet Chair and the Committee noted the report. The financial report on Council’s position relating to accounts receivable, rates, inventory, accounts payable, provisions and malls for the period ended September 2021 is now presented for noting by Council.

11. **RECOMMENDATION:**

**THAT THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THE REPORT**,as submitted on file, **BE NOTED.**

**ADOPTED**

## PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS:

Deputy Chair: Councillors, are there any petitions?

Councillor HOWARD.

Councillor HOWARD: Yes, Mr Deputy Chair, I have a petition requesting Council improve the intersection of Brunswick Street, Bowen Bridge Road and Gregory Terrace, Bowen Hills.

Deputy Chair: Councillor OWEN.

Councillor OWEN: Thank you. I have 62 signed letters in support of a proposed memorial in Calamvale Ward.

Deputy Chair: Councillor LANDERS can I have a motion please

**362/2021-22**

It was resolved on the motion of Councillor Sandy LANDERS, seconded by Councillor Jared CASSIDY, 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** |
| 137/220/594/46 | Vicki Howard | Requesting Council modify the intersection of Brunswick Street, Bowen Bridge Road, and Gregory Terrace, Bowen Hills, by removing uncontrolled slip lanes and improving safety measures for active transport users. |
| 137/220/594/48 | Angela Owen | Requesting Council support the construction of a memorial in Calamvale District Park, Calamvale. |

## GENERAL BUSINESS:

Deputy Chair: Councillors, are there any statements required as the result for the Office of the Independent Assessor or Council Ethics Committee Order?

I see no one standing.

Councillors, are there any items of General Business?

Councillor HUANG.

Councillor HUANG: Thank you, Mr Deputy Chair. I rise to speak on the PRET Awards Dinner and also their contributions to Brisbane’s charitable causes. Mr Chair, I’d like to take this opportunity to congratulate PRET, and its CEO, Paul Shih, for a successful awards event and fundraiser on Sunday night. Mr Deputy Chair, PRET stands for Professional Real Estate Training. They are a professional training organisation for those who wish to pursue a career in real estate.

On Sunday night, PRET held their annual awards event to celebrate and acknowledge the outstanding achievers in the industry. LORD MAYOR Adrian SCHRINNER and Lady Mayoress had both attended and they were joined by the Former Lord Mayor Graham Quirk and Mrs Anne Quirk, as well as Sister Angela Mary of The Mater Foundation.

Mr Deputy Chair, this year’s PRET Awards Night was more than just an awards event. The CEO of PRET, Paul Shih, has designed the event to include the opportunity for their members to support three very worthy causes in our city. They are Small Steps for Hannah, Lord Mayor’s Charitable Trust and The Mater Foundation. On the night, a total of $72,880 were raised to support these three worthy organisations. I’d like to congratulate and thank Paul Shih for his thoughtful kindness in including a fundraiser in the PRET Awards Night to support our local charities.

Yes, that’s it, thank you.

Deputy Chair: Thank you Councillor HUANG.

**Resolution to continue the meeting after the automatic seven-hour adjournment**

**363/2021-22**

The Deputy Chair then advised the Chamber that as it was nearing 8pm, the meeting would automatically stand adjourned unless it was agreed to continue the sitting. The Deputy Chair put the question of whether it was the will of Council that the meeting continue past 8pm, and the Chamber voted in favour of the continuation of the meeting until all business had been completed.

Deputy Chair: The meeting will now continue.

Councillor COOK.

Councillor COOK: Thank you, Mr Chair. I just want to speak briefly to give a vote of thanks to my Regional Manager for the East Region, Keren Sweeney. Today, Mr Deputy Chair, Keren has notified Councillors that she will be retiring at the end of this year, and I just wanted to pay my thanks to Keren for her service, certainly to the Morningside Ward but also to Council over the past 31 years. Keren has indicated that she is now transitioning to retirement, but I wanted to note that I’ve appreciated very much her honesty and integrity and her service to Council, as well as her incredible knowledge of plants, Council processes, playgrounds; you name it, and Keren knows about it.

Her ability to give pretty frank and fearless advice on anything and everything to do with Council has been much appreciated by me in this role, she’s been an incredible asset to Council, and I wish her very well in her retirement. I would certainly welcome her during retirement to any of my bushcare groups or community gardens, I’m sure she still has a lot of value to add, but I know that team will miss her, and I just wanted to thank her before we go on the Christmas break this year. Thank you, Mr Deputy Chair.

Deputy Chair: Thank you Councillor COOK.

Are there any further items of General Business?

Councillor STRUNK.

Councillor STRUNK: Thank you, Deputy Chair. I’d like to speak tonight on about four events that happened over the weekend—or from Friday through to the weekend. The first was the Sri Lankan Buddhist Monastery’s Annual Cultural Concert which unfortunately was cancelled last year because of COVID. The Buddhist Monastery has been in my ward probably for over 20 years, they do some terrific job in the community and the concert actually happened at the Lighthouse Event Centre in Woogaroo Street, which is one of the premier venues for events in my ward. It’s a terrific centre that was built probably less than 10 years ago, it has all that infrastructure that you really need to put on a great concert or event.

There were 23 performances, singing, dancing and theatre as well actually, which was quite interesting. Cultural theatre can be really comical, and it was; it was designed and written that way. It was just good to see the kids being able to perform again in their costumes which were just spectacular. I said to the Honorary Consulate for Sri Lanka sitting next to me, Anton—I said, do most of the costumes get imported and he says, no, they’re all made local. All the materials are sourced locally pretty much as well—I’m sure they do import some of the materials, but it’s just really great just to see that the community is able to go out and hold this annual concert that the general community looks forward to.

Milton Dick, the Member for Oxley, was there as well of course, and it was hosted by Pastor Joshua and his wife, Helen, who head up the Hosanna Church, which actually built the Centre itself.

The next item is the Oxley Golf Club opened its mini-golf course actually, called TopStroke. I didn’t know what mini-golf was until that night and Milton and myself went out and tried to putt around it a bit but neither of us are really good golfers, so we were shown up of course by the rest of the patrons that were there. The clubhouse also had a major upgrade so the whole thing cost about $2.5 million which is a great investment when you look at the golf courses that were struggling—or had been struggling, over the last few years, to find a club that actually will invest $2.5 million.

They don’t have a big membership at this course, but I tell you what, for what they’re doing—and I just want to pay special mention to Aaron Muirhead, the General Manager, who has only been with them for around about 18 months and the turnaround has been spectacular through COVID; to be able to accomplish all that he did with his team was spectacular. Of course, the President there, Glenn Sellick, paid tribute to Aaron and his team because what they have been able to accomplish, they really transformed a clubhouse that looked very much in the 1970s, with a few upgrades—into the 21st century. It’s really good, and I’m sure they’re going to build their membership accordingly.

The next one was a tree planting that was happening by one of our bushcare groups in the Kev Hooper Park. The reason I want to mention this is because John Maelich, who actually heads up the bushcare group, they always struggle to try to find enough volunteers to do a large planting. It was 250 trees and the Church of God Global Volunteer Group, which has done a number of projects in my ward, usually litter clean-ups—and I now they’ve done them also in the Ward of Runcorn and probably others as well.

But this was the first tree planting they undertook as a group in Brisbane which we’re very honoured that they came out and helped our community. They were also assisted by the Bahá’í Faith Church as well. They sent along a couple of—well about half a dozen of their members as well. While I’m mentioning the Bahá’í Faith, I really want a big shout out to Michael Smith who heads up the Bahá’í Faith Group out in my ward.

They’ve been working with youth at risk now for probably about half a dozen years and they have about 16 leaders all set up in the various parks around Inala and they work with the refugee children that can get into a little bit of trouble from time to time if they’re not given something else to do. So, the Faith Group itself actually does some terrific work. I mean we do have the Inala Youth Service as well in the area, but this group really works with those emerging refugee groups and the kids, and they do some terrific work with them.

Honestly, I went to a celebration for the Báb, which was a birthday for their spiritual leader who passed away just on a hundred years ago actually. Honestly, the kids all got up and ran the whole thing, the adults didn’t go near the microphone. The kids actually are taught how to run, and we had 10 readings, we had songs, we had everything, and it went on for about two hours and the kids did it all. It’s just amazing to see what a group—what an organisation like this, can do with our youth and give them structure and give them purpose. So, I just want to make special mention again for Michael Smith and his family who were all involved with this group. They’ve got a big church, actually, just here at Milton. I’ve been there a couple of times. Quite a substantial facility there. They’re really hands-on, they really are, so I don’t know, if you’ve got one of those groups in your area, I would engage them because I’ll tell you what, they do some wonderful work with the youth. Thank you.

Deputy Chair: Thank you, Councillor STRUNK.

Is there any further General Business?

Councillor CUMMING.

Councillor CUMMING: Thanks. I’ll be quick. I’d just like to also pay tribute to Keren Sweeney, who’s been the Manager of a couple of years of Asset Services, Field Services, whatever they’re called these days. She’s always been a very straight shooter, very fair, and I’d also say quite frankly it was good to have a woman in the position because there’s been lots of men over the years in that position and I haven’t been a fan of some of them, but I was a fan of Keren’s. I’d urge her to reconsider, actually, because I reckon she’s too young to retire.

Deputy Chair: Thank you, Councillor CUMMING.

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, just briefly on Council meeting procedure, just for some of the newer Councillors here. I’ve been thinking about what to do with respect to the LNP Councillors voting against my request for an extension of time earlier today. The LORD MAYOR seemed to imply in his speech that I was asking for something that’s not appropriate, but under the rules we can ask for an extension of time and to be fair, they’ve voted down my request for an extension of time previously, but as Councillor CUNNINGHAM and the LORD MAYOR say, we can contribute to the debate on every item.

That’s my absolute intention to do so and I look forward to discussing it next week and I’ll try and keep it up as long as I can. There’s a time probably going about a decade ago now, Margaret de Wit was the Chair, and there’s a few Councillors here who will remember this. Councillor de Wit used to say that I could only speak about what was in the report, so I took to reading the reports. That went on for about six months.

So, I’d just say to the LNP Councillors, the easy way to do this is you could be courteous and let me have a few extra minutes to speak about something that I want to speak about, or I’ll speak about every single item seriatim and thoroughly enjoy doing it. I look forward to the debate next week.

Deputy Chair: Thank you, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Any further General Business? No one’s standing.

## CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADJOURNED MOTION:

Deputy Chair: Okay, we’ll move to item 8 of the report, the continuation of the adjourned motion. Councillors, we’ll now move to that adjourned motion moved by Councillor CASSIDY and seconded by Councillor COOK.

I’ll read the motion, Councillor CASSIDY, before you rise, if you don’t mind. Brisbane City Council commits $200,000 to a jointly funded precinct study with the State Government and engage in a community consultation for the potential upgrade of the Banyo Rail Crossing and surrounding road network.

Councillor CASSIDY, is there any debate?

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Deputy Chair. This rail crossing is dangerous and a serious traffic issue for the residents of Banyo and motorists who use this section of road daily who pass through the Banyo Village area. It’s an area I’m very familiar with as a northsider and it’s no secret that something needs to be done, but this LNP Council continues to drag the chain.

We thought last week that they might have made a little slip-up when they adjourned the motion to the following week because what the LNP have done in recent months is to support our urgency motions then immediately delay them until the end of the meeting. Councillor LANDERS, I thought she’d had a few slip-ups in the role as Whip, she might have accidentally slipped up to put this one an entire week later.

However, we have figured out why, we have figured out why they wanted a whole week to debate this motion rather than doing that last week, and that’s because the local LNP Councillor, Adam ALLAN, not only had to pull together a response for this debate—I certainly hope he’s going to contribute to this debate so his community can hear him answer some questions about it, but he also needed time to pull together a fake community consultation on the Banyo open level crossing himself.

Because it was only just this week—it was actually last night that he said he was going to send out letters this week to try and get some form of feedback from the community, so up until last week or actually up until yesterday, Deputy Chair, the local LNP Council, despite running around and saying to the community and saying in online forums that he was personally working behind the scenes with TMR (Department of Transport and Main Roads) to find a solution to this problem, none of that had happened.

It’s quite clear none of that had happened and now the local LNP Councillor needed to buy himself some time from last week to start putting out some consultation letters, or certainly say he’s going to put them out into the community as well. This rail crossing, which crosses Council roads, and the road network surrounding this rail crossing is entirely controlled by Council, has been an issue for years and years and years now and it’s only now that this LNP Councillor has bothered—or at least said he’s going to bother to consult with local residents about it.

So, it’s such a shame, Deputy Chair, that it takes a Labor State Member, the Labor Council on this side of the Chamber—we’ll take the LORD MAYOR’s definitions of that—the Labor Council on this side of the Chamber and residents all working together to drag this LNP Administration kicking and screaming to actually at least talk about doing something and hopefully they will do something.

So, what’s more embarrassing, I think, Deputy Chair, is that they use this spontaneous community consultation to promote themselves again, of course, and every letter that went out of course featured photos of not just Councillor ALLAN but the LORD MAYOR as well, claiming that they were—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: That’s right, all of a sudden the LORD MAYOR’s involved in that as well, so you really can’t make this stuff up, Deputy Chair. But the State Government are sitting there with their funding ready to go to get this project moving, but this LNP Administration are sitting on their hands holding this process up and now pretending to care about community consultation only well and truly after the fact, Deputy Chair.

So, this local LNP Councillor, as I said, initially tried to save face with the community by claiming that he was in fact working with TMR and the State Government on this proposal that the State Member has recently talked about. He told his constituents that there was some vague arrangement between the LORD MAYOR and the Transport Minister but this simply is not true.

I have here a letter from Minister for Transport and Main Roads, Mark Bailey, which I’ll table shortly. This letter’s to the State Member for Nudgee, Leanne Linard, and outlines there is no such agreement in place and in fact there never was. It says in here the Queensland Government continues to work with the Australian and local governments to prioritise critical level crossings, station, and park-and-ride upgrades.

Last year—this is the letter from Minister Bailey—he says last year, I wrote several letters to the Right Honourable, the LORD MAYOR of Brisbane, Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER, BCC (Brisbane City Council), to invite BCC to jointly fund a feasibility study to undertake a strategic analysis of the Banyo rail station precinct, including the St Vincents Road level crossing, and to address community concerns about intersection safety and local road congestion.

The study was estimated to cost $400,000 with the Queensland Government agreeing to contribute $200,000, subject to BCC matching the contribution. To date, my offer to the LORD MAYOR in my most recent letter of 22 September 2020 seeking BCC support to equally contribute to the feasibility study had not been agreed to by BCC. So, they can confirm here that Councillor ALLAN has been telling porkies out in the community that Council has not been working with the State Government and I will table that letter. Thanks very much.

That confirms that Brisbane City Council, this Schrinner Administration here in Council, has not been working with the State Government to come up with a solution to this problem here, and in fact, all that the local LNP Councillor has been doing has been playing politics on this issue locally. So, it’s appalling that this local LNP Councillor would first spread mistruths, then drum up fake community consultation at the eleventh hour and continue all the while, Deputy Chair, continuing to block any progress on this rail crossing upgrade.

So, this LNP—what we know now is this LNP Council is refusing to match the State Government’s funding of $200,000. They’re refusing to cooperate in any way with this feasibility study where funding is sitting on the table and they’re running around somehow claiming through their local LNP representative Councillor Adam ALLAN that they’re doing their own study on their own roads, which is in complete isolation from the open level crossing, which is a real problem out there.

So, what this LNP LORD MAYOR and this LNP Councillor for Northgate need to do is to put up or shut up when it comes to the Banyo open level crossing. There is a—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: Yes, really. Yes, really. People are sick and tired, people are sick and tired of this LNP Administration, which has been in for 20 long years, 20 long years of doing nothing, doing absolutely nothing about upgrading and fixing that Banyo open level crossing. So, what this LNP Administration and City Hall need to do is stop spending so much time and money on advertising themselves and advertising apps and shoving Living in Brisbane newsletters into people’s letterboxes and actually start getting on with the job at hand.

Residents of Brisbane deserve so much better than what this LNP Administration is dishing up to them day in, day out, Deputy Chair.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Deputy Chair: Are there any further speakers?

Councillor MATIC: Thank you, Mr Deputy Chairman. I rise to speak against this—firstly, big round of applause for Councillor CASSIDY. Wonderful fairy tale. I was fully entertained for the almost 10 minutes that you spoke. I loved that story. That work of fiction was so good you should seriously take up writing because your time in this Chamber is wasted. Look, Mr Deputy Chairman, before we get in, I have to say to Councillor CASSIDY, I really feel very sorry for him. I really do.

He’s in a terrible position as Leader of the Opposition because last week we were all talking about how potentially Councillor COOK was going to take over the leadership from him, this week he’s got to stand up—

Councillor STRUNK: Point of order, Mr Deputy Chair.

Deputy Chair: Point of order, Councillor STRUNK.

Councillor STRUNK: I don’t think what Councillor MATIC is saying has anything to do with the motion, so could you bring him back to the motion, please?

Deputy Chair: Can we draw it back to the motion, please.

Councillor MATIC: I was just about to, but I thank Councillor STRUNK for his comments. This week, the poor, poor Leader of the Opposition has to stand here with his prepared speech, with his letter from the Minister which was dated 20 November of this year, in preparation for last week, perhaps, when you were going to debate the whole thing—and have to put up this furphy. The saddest part of all is that he knows it’s a furphy.

He knows that this whole thing is nothing more than just an ALP political stunt because Mr Deputy Chairman, you have to actually look at the history of this entire matter going back to 2004 with the then Lord Mayor Campbell Newman. The can‑do man. Over 2004 to 2008 invested so much of Council’s resources into that Banyo crossing precinct to try and solve the problem. He actually came forward with three different proposals at the time of an overpass, road improvements.

He threw literally everything and the kitchen sink at it and it was knocked back by the community and politically opposed by the then Councillor Kim Flesser. Good old Kim. Kim, who didn’t want anything to ruin the local community. He supported the concerns of residents around the local shopping precinct and whatever else they were concerned about but didn’t actually come up with any solutions.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor MATIC: He was Labor, yes, he was an ALP Councillor who at the time decided that he’d rather play the politics than find the solution. So, he came into this Chamber at various times, he wrote to his local community, Mr Deputy Chair, with his own correspondence about the overpass making it quite clear that he did not support what was then the $100 million proposal, $100 million of Council funds at that time to solve the Banyo Precinct problem with an overpass.

Not $200,000, not $400,000, but $100 million back in about 2008, 2009. The answer was no from the local Councillor, who chose not to participate in that process. He brought a motion to this Chamber on his own solution, which couldn’t have been supported by the officers. He spoke about widening roads and doing other crazy things, as he did. His solution was right up there with Gambusia and I know that the Chairman is sitting outside.

His favourite topic is Councillor Flesser and his solution to the mosquitos in his ward by infesting the waterways with a pest fish. That’s the brilliance of what Councillor Flesser spoke about. Then, because his particular proposal was not supported, which technically couldn’t have been supported, we literally from 2008, 2009 heard nothing from him on the Banyo Crossing right up until when he ran full-term in 2016, and then Councillor ALLAN came in.

So, so much for the ALP and their genuine concern for that area. So much for the local Councillor and all his supposed efforts to find the solution between Council and government. Everything that Council could put towards this problem was put towards it and the answer from the local Councillor was no. He didn’t even go out to fight for it. He didn’t go out to even look for solutions.

He didn’t stand there with Campbell Newman and go, okay, we’re on opposite sides but let’s agree on this, let’s find a solution. The answer was no and it was $100 million. It wasn’t $200,000, it was $400,000, it wasn’t a study, it was a solution. So then, Mr Chairman, we get to 20 March 2020 where we get a letter from the Minister to LORD MAYOR Adrian SCHRINNER and this is the fascinating part.

So, he offers $200,000, he sets the criteria and then for that particular $200,000, plus the extra $200,000 he wants from Council, this is what he’s going to do. I’m going to—he wants a proposal to look at providing an enormous study of all the precincts. This is how wide it’s going to be.

The study will deliver a thorough and strategic analysis of the Banyo rail station precinct, including the St Vincents Road level crossing, local street network, traffic and pedestrian movements, precinct and rail station accessibility—so he wants the money for QR, for the rail station, bus and rail operations—so he wants the money again for more work for QR—active transport connections, park and ride facilities—so he wants the $400,000, he wants money from Council, again for a State Government asset, and get this: potential station improvements.

I note a grade separated rail overpass is not intended to be in the scope for this project. So, the very problem, the rail crossing, the Banyo precinct, all of the varying issues that are generating these problems, are not on the table. Don’t want to know about it, let’s just look for something else that’s cheaper than Council can carry. On top of that, let’s take Council’s money and put it into a QR asset. Let’s have a look and see what other things we can do to improve the rail station, oh, and by the way, we’ll also look at the road network around the site.

$400,000 for that, and he wouldn’t even commit to it unless Council suddenly put in $200,000. So, here’s $200,000 and by the way, Council, here’s a gun to your head, give me the other $200,000 and if you don’t, you’re the bad guy. So, they set the rules, they set the terms, they set what’s in and out and then they tell us that we’ll do you a favour by taking your $200,000 and if you don’t, it’s your fault.

So, what did the LORD MAYOR do? He responded appropriately and informed the Minister of the background, of the work that was undertaken between 2004 and 2008, of the unacceptable solution by Councillor Flesser. Then the LORD MAYOR said, but let’s move forward. We’ve done a substantial amount of work in this area. We’ve literally covered it every which way we possibly can. We will provide TMR with all the reports.

We will give your offices a briefing on anything they need to assist you in this study. So, we’re doing the work for them already and then, the LORD MAYOR makes the suggestion that we should include Queensland Rail because, get this, Mr Deputy Chairman, in March 2017, I understand QR confirmed that more trains would be travelling through the local Banyo community to the stabling yard that QR constructed at the Banyo rail station.

While Council does not have access to the feasibility and planning studies that Council assumes would have been done as part of this $116 million rail stabling program, you may like to consider QR assisting, both through participation and in co-funding of TMR’s Banyo rail station feasibility study. Sounds perfectly reasonable. The answer from the Minister was no. He actually came back and said, no, no, we’re going to go with what we’ve got and we’re waiting on your $200,000. Then nothing happened.

So, Minister Bailey sits there and again sets the terms but cares so little that he doesn’t actually do anything. Now, when you think about the feasibility study—and it’s really important when he talks about accessibility and potential station improvements because then then State Member in September of 2020, Leanne Linard, does a Facebook post which she says: in case you missed the news recently, Banyo station is getting an accessibility makeover.

The station is set to receive a new lift, raised platform sections, new security cameras, and lighting to improve commuter accessibility. So, at one point, the Minister asks in April of 2020 for money and then in September 2020 they actually deliver the accessibility there. So, they want money to do an accessibility study as part of the overall strategy and then oh, by the way, here it is. They’ve already done the work.

It’s a furphy, Mr Deputy Chairman. They talk about wanting to deliver these outcomes but they don’t really want to. Then we have the State Member, Leanne Linard, who says that since 2015, since she was elected, she’s been very concerned about this local issue and in recent budget in 2020 she was able to get $200,000. So, you’re talking about a State Government with literally billions of dollars within the budget and congratulations, State Member, you’ve worked so hard.

It took you five years to get $200,000 and not to actually deliver anything but to do a study, and again, Brisbane City Council, we want you to come along because she couldn’t get the $400,000 for the study. No, no, no, Council’s got to deliver. If Council doesn’t bring the $200,000, this thing’s not on. Then she has the temerity to write to Councillor ALLAN saying to him, it’s time to take the politics out of this and let the community’s voice be heard. That’s on 1 October of this year, Mr Chairman.

So, all of the politics sitting right here and she says, it’s time to take the politics out. But you know what? She’s right. It is time to take the politics out. It’s time to take the politics out by Minister Bailey, it’s time to take the politics out by Leanne Linard, it’s time to take the politics out by Councillor CASSIDY. It’s actually time to come to the table and deal with this in a real way like Councillor ALLAN is doing, the work that he and the Chair Councillor WINES were already preparing, the work that Councillor WINES spoke to you about in this Chamber last week which you chose to ignore, all of the work that’s being done around the east precinct, the west precinct next week.

Deputy Chair: Councillor MATIC, your time has expired.

Any further speakers?

Councillor WINES.

Councillor WINES: Thank you, Mr Deputy Chair. I rise to also contribute to this and I thank the contribution of Councillor MATIC who made so many accurate points about this proposal. He rightly recognises that Council is already doing a great deal of work in this neighbourhood, that the Royal Parade East precinct will occur this year, the work in that intersection will occur this year. We’re preparing work on Royal Parade West.

There will be consultation both led by the Councillor and done by Council officers to prepare work going on in the future for that very intersection. I note with interest some of Councillor CASSIDY’s points and I had the deep sense that when this urgency motion was moved last week that it was a bit of a stitch-up, but I didn’t realise that the person being stitched up was Councillor CASSIDY.

His argument today was that we should build an open level crossing and every piece of correspondence from the State Government rules that out. The vast bulk of his contribution today was about an increase in improvement, a massive overpass, and they explicitly reject it. Here, Leanne Linard, 1 October: while residents have understandably previously rejected an overpass due to the resulting loss of the shopping precinct, resumption of local homes, likely increase in truck traffic, the people of Banyo, and indeed ratepayers who use the road, want us to seek an alternate solution’.

The Minister in his letter dated 12 March 2020: I note a grade separated rail overpass is not intended in the scope of this project, yet that was fundamentally what Councillor CASSIDY was arguing for, for his whole presentation, was that the people of Banyo deserve this rail overpass to be addressed. Also, interestingly, the correspondence from Minister Linard speaks to traffic congestion.

She says: ‘I am writing again to raise with your ongoing problems of traffic congestion in Banyo’ and she explicitly rejects what Councillor CASSIDY proposes. Now, I appreciate that Councillor CASSIDY seeks to make this some sort of new Beams Road. I appreciate he’s trying to make that link but we are already doing work in this space. We did a study, Councillor MATIC rightfully recognised that this Council did a study and proposed a huge solution to this and a number of options which did in fact include an overpass at the open level crossing, and a number of other locations.

This was actually two decades ago in the mid to late 2000s. That was campaigned against heavily by the Labor Councillor, Councillor Flesser, for the objective of, I believe, undermining the then-LORD MAYOR Newman, and promoting Councillor Flesser’s position, a position he held tenuously for many years but he did hold on by his fingernails across a number of elections until he gave up, knowing that the wave was coming for him.

Now, what that wave meant that would have taken out Councillor Flesser—I have no doubt Councillor ALLAN would have beaten him—was the fact that we as an organisation, we as a Council, are doers, while the Labor team, they want to do studies and they want to undermine proposals. That’s effectively what Minister Linard and Councillor Flesser did for many years.

Now, this proposal—the reality of the proposal that Minister Linard puts forward to us is yet again another study while we at Council are already doing the work. I would argue that this proposal by the Minister is once again an attempt to postpone work for the community, under the guise of a study, as Councillor MATIC rightly identified, a threat to Council that if you don’t cooperate, we’ll embarrass you, that if we do not cooperate with their study, they will say that we don’t want to address traffic congestion in that particular neighbourhood while we actually are right at this moment doing work for them.

So, there was an interesting injection by Councillor MACKAY, but why does the Labor Party work so hard to keep Banyo down? It’s a serious question. Why do they work so hard to keep that community—which is a very, very nice Brisbane community, they have their own village out there, their own little enclave that is a wonderful place and many people move to Banyo as first homebuyers and will never leave because it is such a nice place to live, but why does Labor work so hard to keep them down?

Why does the Minister wish to postpone work that we’re already doing? It’s a fair question. Similarly, why does the Leader of the Opposition come into this place and put forward a proposal that none of the State figures that I imagine he’s working as a surrogate for have proposed? It doesn’t make any sense. Once again, I say this Council is committed to doing things and we have already completed studies in this area some decades ago.

**MOTION FOR AMENDMENT TO MOTION:**

|  |
| --- |
| **364/2021-22**  It was moved by Councillor Andrew WINES, seconded by Councillor Sandy LANDERS that the motion be **amended** by the removal and insertion of such words so that the motion would read as follows:  *Brisbane City Council commits to support a precinct study with the State Government and provide our reports from past community consultation for the potential upgrade of the Banyo Rail Crossing and surrounding road network.* |

Deputy Chair: Councillor WINES.

Councillor WINES: Thank you. To the amendment, I propose this amendment to the Council because I believe that it better reflects the true state of things, it better reflects Council’s longstanding commitment to this community and the work we’ve already done, which is substantial. It has in fact been offered to the Department of Transport already. I’m reading from a letter from the LORD MAYOR to the Minister Bailey and I’m quoting: I have asked for all of the 2004 to 2008 studies that Council undertook to be provided to your department.

I’ve also asked for Council officers to offer a briefing to your department representatives on those studies so as to facilitate their understanding, close quotes. This Council is already proposing to work with the State on this. We are providing—once again, just like Beams Road, we’re coming in with our technical expertise to save the day. When you look at State projects, the amount of times that Council is required to be the cavalry that saves the day is too, too often.

This morning’s Committee heard of our work on Lindum rail crossing, paid for by the Federal Government, completed by Council. All of it should have been by the State. All of it should have been done by the State, but we do it because it’s the right thing to do. But the problem is, when other people start demanding what the comparatively limited ratepayer dollar that we receive to achieve an outcome for another level, that’s when it becomes, in my opinion, wrong.

So, the work done by Lindum was a Federally-funded work done by the City Council, so Council can do the work, but why would the State choose to—in the words of Councillor MATIC—hold a gun to our head like this? Why would Councillor CASSIDY frame it this way? We are always prepared. We have offered a whole range of things, whether it be reports from the last decade undermined by former Councillor Flesser, ongoing commitments, but even here, you look at Leanne Linard—Minister Linard’s paperwork about Banyo crossing in her November 2021 newsletter.

Even there, she speaks to addressing traffic congestion created by her open level crossing, the Queensland Rail—Queensland Government open level crossing. I’m reading again from her newsletter: Unfortunately, there are no easy solutions. As a long-term resident, I remember the heated town hall meeting in 2007 when then Lord Mayor Newman put forward proposals to build an overpass to reduce congestion, an idea rejected by the public at the time when offered to them, yet once again, the Leader of the Opposition either doesn’t understand the issue or was badly informed by people who should have had his interests at heart rather than send him in not understanding what it was that the Minister was actually asking for.

That’s why once again, we will be—as I say, we often save State Labor through our works. Beams Road is an example where we’ve saved them, Lindum’s another example of where we’ve saved them, and here today, I’m happy to move this proposal to assist Councillor CASSIDY to once again save him from the lack of information provided to him by his State colleagues. We continue to support traffic congestion reduction initiatives in Banyo, no doubt, and we are working and we are more than happy to provide our technical skill and historic investigations, which are substantial, to the department.

That offer is actually 18 months old and still stands. So, we want to see some action because that’s what this group of people’s all about. That’s what the Brisbane City Council Administration is all about. It’s about action on combating traffic congestion, not studies. It’s about doing something, and that’s why we’re going to put forward this proposal today. One more point before I yield the microphone. Spending money is not an action. That argument will come in time later tonight.

Spending money is not an action in itself. You have to actually do something for the public, for the greater good, to actually combat it and spending money on a study does not actually materially benefit the people of Banyo.

Deputy Chair: Thank you, Councillor WINES.

Further speakers to the amendment?

Councillor CASSIDY: Point of order, Chair? A point of order.

Deputy Chair: A point of order or you’re speaking to the amendment?

Councillor CASSIDY: No, I just said point of order, Chair. Section 40 of the Meetings Local Law about amending a motion says that amendment to a motion shall be—the identity of the original motion. The original motion talks about a very specific jointly funded precinct study and community consultation. That’s what this motion’s about. If the LNP want to move a separate motion, they can do that, Chair, but Councillor WINES’ amendment doesn’t retain the identity of the original motion, which talks specifically about a feasibility study, so this amendment shouldn’t proceed.

Deputy Chair: Councillor WINES.

Councillor WINES: Point of order to you, Mr Chair. I would argue that—

Deputy Chair: Thank you, Councillor CASSIDY. I honestly believe, listening to the argument, that this motion is around participation and this is what this amendment is offering. Given that there is substantial information that the Council is willing to facilitate to the State Government for that, I’m willing to agree that the intent of this motion stands.

Councillor WINES?

Councillor WINES: No further comment.

Deputy Chair: Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Well, in that case, I’ll speak on the amendment, and this is a do-nothing amendment because what Councillor WINES is talking about—he even knows what I’m about to say or he is extremely ill-informed in his role, but all of those studies are already in TMR’s possession. That has already been done. Everything that Councillor WINES just talked about has already been done and therein lies the problem.

What we heard from Councillor MATIC over there—and I think they’ve actually made a mistake, you performed much better than Councillor SCHRINNER. What did you get? Eight votes in the party room? You should have won that thing. He should have been Mayor. He absolutely should have been Mayor, Deputy Chair.

Deputy Chair: Councillor CASSIDY, to—

Councillor CASSIDY: That was so much better than any—that bloke.

Deputy Chair: Councillors. Councillors. Councillor CASSIDY, to the amendment, please.

Councillor CASSIDY: But what he talked about, what Councillor MATIC talked about was 2004, he kept talking about the past, at a time when Brisbane had 500,000 less residents. He keeps harking back to the glory days when he was standing in the barricades with Campbell Newman. That’s what he talked about. What Councillor WINES talked about—he obviously wasn’t listening to what I said because I at no point talked about a grade separated overpass at Banyo whatsoever.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: No, absolutely not.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Deputy Chair: Councillor WINES, we’re going to let Councillor CASSIDY speak in silence, thank you.

Councillor—

Councillor CASSIDY: Yeah, I let you go with enough rope—

Deputy Chair: Councillor CASSIDY, through the Chair, please.

Councillor CASSIDY: —Councillor WINES. What I talked about was the open level crossing. I didn’t say an overpass, I didn’t say grade separated, I said there is an open level crossing. It has been there since the rail line went through those roads. It has been there since 1880. There has always been an open level crossing. That is not in dispute. I didn’t talk about building an overpass. You might have heard me say open level crossing and assumed I talked about an overpass, but I certainly didn’t.

What Councillor WINES is talking about in this amendment, Chair, is doing absolutely nothing because all that he talks about in the amendment is providing some studies that have already been done. I presume through Councillor ALLAN’s eleventh hour letterbox drop to some local residents saying from 29 November he was going to start some local consultation process that maybe they intend—maybe, we don’t know, we haven’t heard from Councillor ALLAN yet—maybe they intend on doing some consultation.

But what this was specifically about and what this amendment now changes was finding some solutions and taking some action to remedy those problems around the Banyo open level crossing. Listen to me carefully, around the Banyo open level crossing. It exists, it’s there. I’m not sure how many times you’ve been out there, Councillor WINES, through you, Deputy Chair.

Deputy Chair: Thank you.

Councillor CASSIDY: But what we moved and what the LNP supported last week to go to debate was the motion that Brisbane City Council commits $200,000 to a joint funded precinct study with the State Government and engage in community consultation for the potential upgrade of the Banyo rail crossing and surrounding road network. It’s a State Government train line that runs through Council roads.

I don’t understand why this LNP Administration finds it so difficult to engage in that community consultation. That’s what this is talking about. It’s talking about finding those solutions. We know that the overpass solution was rejected, that Campbell Newman’s overpass solution was rejected by the community. It wasn’t just rejected by Councillor Flesser, it was overwhelmingly rejected by that community. That’s why no one has been talking about an overpass in Banyo.

It would absolutely destroy that community. We all know that. But where you’ve got an LNP Council Administration, even behind closed doors—and that’s proof in all of the correspondence—even behind closed doors is seeking to stymie this project and then out in the public puts out—Councillor ALLAN’s got his flyer there on the desk—goes and puts out that and says they’re doing something about it while trying to stop a coordinated approach which takes all of Council’s previous studies and works with TMR and Queensland Rail in identifying solutions to all those problems around that open level crossing and then engages the community.

Are we supposed to—so this is the Schrinner Administration’s idea of community consultation we’ve just heard today. One example is a Facebook poll on Adrian SCHRINNER’s LNP Lord Mayor page. That’s their idea of comprehensive community consultation. Another one is to—we’ve seen it at the East Brisbane Bowls Club over at Mowbray Park where they don’t like what the community says, they go and alter the results of that and remove things from the report on community consultation.

So, how can the people of the Northgate Ward and Banyo trust Councillor ALLAN’s so-called community consultation won’t do those things, won’t ignore what that community wants? What this motion was about is bringing Council together with the State Government to find those solutions to fix that problem and again, after all these years, we see the LNP standing in the way once again.

Councillor WINES says Councillor ALLAN rode in on some great wave in the 2016 and 2020 election. From memory, it was a couple of hundred votes and I don’t recall him winning a single booth in the Banyo area, and I wonder why, when he stands in the way of local upgrades like this. I think your time is coming, Councillor ALLAN, through you, Deputy Chair, and so are the rest of yours as well, because this is just more evidence that you continue to ignore the community.

You don’t really care about genuine community consultation and you’re not actually genuine about finding a solution to this. You’d rather tinker around with motions and say, oh well, we’ll do something, we’ll send you some reports that you’ve already got, and then the LNP can say that box is ticked, we’ve done all we can to fix this problem. It’s not what the people of Brisbane deserve, it’s not what the people of the Northgate Ward deserve, but unfortunately until 2024, I’m pretty sure that’s what they’re going to get.

Deputy Chair: Thank you, Councillor CASSIDY.

Further speakers on the amended motion?

Councillor ALLAN: Thank you, Mr Deputy Chair. I rise to join the debate. Since being elected in March 2016, I’ve been aware that the Banyo rail crossing and the surrounding roads are a challenging location. There are opposing give way signs and traffic movements that cause confusion. Unfortunately, many of the challenges around the rail crossing are exacerbated by poor driver behaviour. They do not observe the road rules, particularly related to give way signs, and do not use their indicators.

Additionally, there is congestion that occurs when trains are active at the station. This gives rise to long delays and exacerbates the issues I’ve already mentioned. Most of the challenges at the rail crossing have been in existence for decades and to some extent have become more pronounced over time. A range of potential improvements have been considered in the past, though these have been rejected by the community or not supported by Council’s traffic officers.

One thing that is apparent is that the State rail crossing is a key contributor to a number of the issues at and around the rail crossing and just tonight, Councillor CASSIDY said, and I quote, the open level crossing is the real problem out there. How true that is. It is the key contributor to congestion and creates key safety issues with vehicles, pedestrians and trains at the same grade. It has been evident for many years that the best outcome is a grade separated solution to remove the rail crossing.

While an overpass has not been supported in the past, there are a number of options that could be considered to eliminate or relocate the rail crossing or deliver a grade separated solution. Unfortunately, the State, despite holding the seat of Nudgee for most of the past four decades, has not committed to removal or relocation of the State rail crossing. This is despite progressing similar projects in Carseldine and Coopers Plains.

Accordingly, that has been left to Council to maintain and enhance the road environment where possible. We have improved the line markings and undertaken a review of the pedestrian crossing locations. I’ve been able to enhance some signage and install larger give way signs to aid driver awareness and behaviour. We have made requests for the Department of Transport and Main Roads, seeking bespoke indicator signs and videos at the rail crossing to encourage better driver behaviour, however these initiatives were not supported.

Earlier this year, I requested that Council undertake traffic counts and video at intersections around the rail crossing and further afield to gather data and inform potential improvements around the rail crossing. One such improvement is the realignment and widening of the northbound lane on Royal Parade East near the intersection with Tufnell Road. This will make it easier for cars heading north on St Vincents Road to continue through while vehicles are turning right onto Tufnell Road.

This will improve safety and congestion at this intersection. Another improvement, which is currently the subject of a community feedback exercise, is the potential removal of the through movement from Royal Parade heading south to St Vincents Road. Now, this is the community consultation letter and I guess I’m proud and delighted that Councillor CASSIDY thinks that I could gather the data that has informed this particular flyer—

Deputy Chair: Sorry, Councillor ALLAN, we’re debating the amendment to the motion.

Councillor ALLAN: Okay. So, one such improvement is the subject of a community feedback exercise. This is one of the troublesome movements at the intersection. Removal of this movement will improve safety as well as remove a confusing traffic flow and will also take traffic volumes away from the intersection. At this stage, we are seeking community feedback until the end of January and we’ll consider the way forward when we have collated the feedback.

Council will continue to look for reasonable improvements to the road network around the rail crossing, though any change, it needs to be recognised that there are inevitably knock-on impacts that need to be considered. In finishing, I’d like to note that there has been considerable debate about the State’s proposal to have a jointly funded precinct study. The way forward with consideration of such a study has already been conveyed by the LORD MAYOR to the Minister for Transport and Main Roads.

The LORD MAYOR has proposed that data, studies and a briefing be provided to TMR officers by Council officers. Now, I am aware that this is occurring. I’ve never said that I would be involved in this particular deliberation. I’ve seen the letters between the LORD MAYOR and the Minister. I’ve seen emails between Council staff and TMR staff, so I can assure you that the engagement is there.

I’ve never said that I would be directly engaged and I think that once this briefing has taken place, we can determine the way forward with respect to any future study and as Councillor CASSIDY indicated tonight, any future study would have to focus on the real problem, which is the open level crossing. Thank you.

Deputy Chair: Thank you, Councillor ALLAN.

Any further speakers on the amendment of the motion?

Councillor WINES, right of reply.

Councillor WINES: Just briefly, I just wanted to make mention in response to Councillor CASSIDY’s comments, he quite rightly recognised in his notes that the Brisbane City Council is already cooperating, which poses the question, why did he put that resolution forward last week if he already knew we were working together, if he already knew that we were doing work in that community? An honest question: if he knew what he said in his earlier speech, why did he—

Councillor CASSIDY: Point of order.

Councillor WINES: —move this resolution at all, knowing full well that we were already—

Deputy Chair: Councillor WINES.

Point of order, Councillor CASSIDY?

Councillor CASSIDY: Claim to be misrepresented.

Deputy Chair: Noted.

Councillor WINES.

Councillor WINES: When he knew full well we were already cooperating and he also after questions without notice last week was given an explanation that we’d done quite a bit of work already. Not tinkering, the word he chose, but actual, substantive work that would make a material improvement to the people, to the lives and reduce the traffic congestion for the people of Banyo. Not tinkering, something meaningful and material. Councillor CASSIDY knew we were doing that work. He knew that we were cooperating with the State, so the real question: why are we here?

Deputy Chair: Thank you, Councillor WINES.

Councillor CASSIDY, your misrepresentation?

Councillor CASSIDY: Because it’s your job to be here, Councillor WINES.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Deputy Chair: Councillor WINES. Councillor WINES. Councillor WINES. Councillor WINES.

Councillor CASSIDY: Don’t talk over him, Councillor WINES.

Deputy Chair: Councillor CASSIDY, if you’re going to direct any comments to other Councillors, please do it through the Chair. You’ve been pretty good tonight up until now.

Councillor CASSIDY: What I said, Deputy Chair, was that the State Government already had all of the old studies that were done by Council. I certainly didn’t say they’d been cooperating.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Deputy Chair: Councillor WINES, let him finish, please.

Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Council has all of those old studies and that’s not in dispute. What this motion was about was committing to a new jointly funded feasibility study. We’re talking about the future, not the past like the LNP.

Deputy Chair: Councillor CASSIDY, you don’t debate misrepresentation. To the point, please. That’s all we’re asking. It’s not much. Thank you.

Now, we will put the new amendment to the vote.

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

Thereupon, Councillor Jared CASSIDY and the DEPUTY MAYOR immediately rose and called for a division, which resulted in the motion being declared **carried**.

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 15 - The DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Krista ADAMS, and Councillors Greg ADERMANN, Adam ALLAN, Tracy DAVIS, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Sarah HUTTON, Sandy LANDERS, James MACKAY, Kim MARX, Peter MATIC, David McLACHLAN, Angela OWEN, Steven TOOMEY and Andrew WINES.

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

Deputy Chair: Councillor WINES, would you like to speak on the substantive motion? No? No, okay.

Councillor ALLAN.

Councillor ALLAN: Thank you, Mr Chair. I will rise to speak briefly on the amended motion and I think the amended motion reflects the intent of the LORD MAYOR’s offer to the Minister. He did indicate that he was prepared to share information and reports with TMR officers and that at that point, would consider the way forward, so I do think that the motion accurately reflects the expectation and I would support the motion.

Deputy Chair: Thank you, Councillor ALLAN.

Any further speakers? We will now put the substantive motion.

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

Deputy Chair: Councillors, as that’s the last item on the agenda, I declare the 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 on 25 November 2021**

**Q1.** What is the number of ferry services per terminal per day for each below, before the 2021 Ferry Network Review and after the 2021 Ferry Services Review?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TERMINAL** | **NUMBER OF CITYCAT SERVICES BEFORE 2021 FERRY NETWORK REVIEW** | **NUMBER OF CITYCAT SERVICES AFTER 2021 FERRY NETWORK REVIEW** | **NUMBER OF SPEEDYCAT SERVICES BEFORE 2021 FERRY NETWORK REVIEW** | **NUMBER OF SPEEDYCAT SERVICES AFTER 2021 FERRY NETWORK REVIEW** | **NUMBER OF CROSS RIVER CITYFERRY SERVICES BEFORE 2021 FERRY NETWORK REVIEW** | **NUMBER OF CROSS RIVER CITYFERRY SERVICES AFTER 2021 FERRY NETWORK REVIEW** | **NUMBER OF CITYHOPPER SERVICES BEFORE 2021 FERRY NETWORK REVIEW** | **NUMBER OF CITYHOPPER SERVICES AFTER 2021 FERRY NETWORK REVIEW** |
| UQ St Lucia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| West End |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Guyatt Park |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Regatta |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Milton |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| North Quay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| South Bank 1 & 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| South Bank 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maritime Museum |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Eagle Street Pier |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Riverside |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Holman Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dockside |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sydney Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mowbray Park |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New Farm Park |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Norman Park |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hawthorne |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bulimba |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teneriffe |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brett’s Wharf |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Apollo Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Northshore Hamilton |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ` |
| Howard Smith Wharves |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Q2.** What is the number of ferry services per ferry line per day for each below, before the 2021 Ferry Network Review and after the 2021 Ferry Services Review?

| **FERRY LINE** | **NUMBER OF SERVICES BEFORE 2021 FERRY NETWORK REVIEW** | **TOTAL ANNUAL COST OF FERRY LINE BEFORE 2021 FERRY NETWORK REVIEW** | **NUMBER OF SERVICES AFTER 2021 FERRY NETWORK REVIEW** | **TOTAL ANNUAL COST OF FERRY LINE AFTER 2021 FERRY NETWORK REVIEW** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Bulimba to Teneriffe Cross River Ferry |  |  |  |  |
| CityCat |  |  |  |  |
| CityHopper |  |  |  |  |
| Kangaroo Point Cross River Ferry |  |  |  |  |
| Holman Street, Riverside and Howard Smith Wharves Cross River Ferry |  |  |  |  |
| Howard Smith Wharves Cross River Ferry (in addition to above service) |  |  |  |  |
| Howard Smith Wharves CityHopper |  |  |  |  |
| NightCat |  |  |  |  |
| Norman Park to New Farm Cross River Ferry |  |  |  |  |

**Q3.** What is the total number of CityCat services per week (prior to the implementation of the 2021 Ferry Services Review)?

**Q4.** List all open footpath maintenance works (identified but not yet completed), including the total length of street:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **STREET** | **SUBURB** | **TOTAL LENGTH OF STREET** | **WARD** |
|  |  |  |  |

**Q5.** What is the cost estimate for the completion of all open footpath maintenance works (identified but not yet completed)?

**Q6.** How many complaints about broken or damaged footpaths has Council received for the following financial years (broken down by suburb):

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SUBURB** | **2021-2022 (TO DATE)** | **2020-2021** | **2019-2020** | **2018-2019** | **2017-2018** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Q7.** How many injuries have been reported to Council as a result of tripping and falling due to a broken or damaged footpaths for the following financial years (broken down by suburb):

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SUBURB** | **2021-2022 (TO DATE)** | **2020-2021** | **2019-2020** | **2018-2019** | **2017-2018** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Q8.** How many illegal dumping complaints were received during the 2020-2021 financial year, and how many have been received so far in the 2021-2022 year (broken down by suburb):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SUBURB** | **NUMBER OF ILLEGAL DUMPING REPORTS:**  **2020-2021** | **NUMBER OF ILLEGAL DUMPING REPORTS:**  **2020-2021** |
|  |  |  |

**Q9.** What is the total number of fines for illegally dumped items for the following months by these categories:

| **MONTH** | **UNDER 200L** | **BETWEEN 200L – 2,500L TOTAL** | **OVER 2,500L** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| May 2021 |  |  |  |
| June 2021 |  |  |  |
| July 2021 |  |  |  |
| August 2021 |  |  |  |
| September 2021 |  |  |  |
| October 2021 |  |  |  |
| November 2021 |  |  |  |

**Q10.** What is the total amount of the infringement notices issued by Council for illegally dumped waste for the following months:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **MONTH** | **TOTAL** |
| May 2021 |  |
| June 2021 |  |
| July 2021 |  |
| August 2021 |  |
| September 2021 |  |
| October 2021 |  |
| November 2021 |  |

**Q11.** List the number of complaints of illegal dumping received by suburb for the timeframes below:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SUBURB** | **FEB – JUNE 2021** | **SINCE JULY 2021** |
|  |  |  |

**Q12.** How many jobs were completed under the Good Neighbour Program in the 2020-2021 financial year?

**Q13.** How many jobs were completed under the Good Neighbour Program in the 2021-2022 financial year (to date)?

**Q14.** Which Ward Offices asked for additional Dump Vouchers for residents during the 2020-2021 financial year, and how many did each Ward Office receive.

**Q15.** Which Ward Offices have asked for additional Dump Vouchers for residents during the 2021-2022 financial year (to date), and how many did each Ward Office receive.

**Q16.** How many Waste voucher booklets were issued to households and Ward Offices in the 2021/22 financial year?

## ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS OF WHICH DUE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

*(Answers to questions of which due notice has been given are printed as supplied and are not edited)*

**Submitted by Councillor Nicole Johnston (from meeting on 23 November 2021)**

**Q1.** Please provide a list of water parks/water play constructed in Council parks including park name and suburb, cost of construction and year of construction for the past five years?

***A1.*** *The Ferny Grove Aqua Park was delivered in 2018 at a cost of $1.5 million.*

**Q2.** Please provide a list of water parks/water play constructed at Council pools including pool name and suburb, cost of construction and year of construction for the past five years?

***A2.***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Pool name*** | ***Suburb*** | ***Year of Construction*** | ***Cost of Construction*** |
| *Sandgate Aquatic Centre* | *Sandgate* | *2017* | *$750,000* |
| *Runcorn Swimming Pool* | *Runcorn* | *2019* | *$500,000* |
| *Langland’s Park Memorial Pool* | *Stones Corner* | *2019* | *$450,000* |

**Q3.** Have any water parks/water play been constructed using the Suburban Enhancement Fund or its predecessor trust funds by local Councillors? If so, please provide a list including location, cost of construction and year of construction?

***A3.*** *Hercules Street Park, Hamilton was delivered in the 2015/16 financial year at a cost of $41,147.*

**Submitted by Councillor Steve Griffiths (from meeting on 23 November 2021)**

**Q1.** Please provide details of commercial bookings for the New Farm Park River Hub:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Total number of uses/ moorings for 2019/20 FY** | **Total number of uses/ moorings for 2020/21 FY** | **Total number of uses/ moorings for 2021/22** |
|  |  |  |

***A1.*** *Council is unable to provide a breakdown of the numbers as this would require a manual check which could not be completed within a timeframe that accords with the Meetings Local Law 2001. The below figures are numbers for both the New Farm River Hub and the City Botanic Gardens River Hub.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Total number of uses/ moorings for 2019/20 FY*** | ***Total number of uses/ moorings for 2020/21 FY*** | ***Total number of uses/ moorings for 2021/22*** |
| *646* | *1,005* | *464 (to date)* |

**Q2.** Please provide the total amount in fees paid to Brisbane City Council for use of the New Farm Park River Hub by commercial operators:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Amount received in fees for use of pontoon for 2019/20 FY (Broken down by type of use)** | **Amount received in fees for use of pontoon for 2020/21 FY (Broken down by type of use)** | **Amount received in fees for use of pontoon for 2021/22 FY (to date) (Broken down by type of use)** |
|  |  |  |

***A2.*** *Council is unable to provide a breakdown of the amount of fees as this would require a manual check which could not be completed within a timeframe that accords with the Meetings Local Law 2001. The below figures are fees received for both the New Farm River Hub and the City Botanic Gardens River Hub.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Amount received in fees for use of pontoon for 2019/20 FY (Broken down by type of use)*** | ***Amount received in fees for use of pontoon for 2020/21 FY (Broken down by type of use)*** | ***Amount received in fees for use of pontoon for 2021/22 FY (to date) (Broken down by type of use)*** |
| *$5,125.50* | *$6,117.45* | *$5,427.89 (to date)* |

**Q3.** Please provide a breakdown of the following information regarding organisations with a lease agreement with Brisbane City Council for the 2019‑2020 financial year.

| **WARD** | **TOTAL NUMBER OF LEASES** | **TOTAL AMOUNT PAID IN RENT TO COUNCIL** | **TOTAL AMOUNT PAID IN RATES TO COUNCIL** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Bracken Ridge Ward |  |  |  |
| Calamvale Ward |  |  |  |
| Central Ward |  |  |  |
| Chandler Ward |  |  |  |
| Coorparoo Ward |  |  |  |
| Deagon Ward |  |  |  |
| Doboy Ward |  |  |  |
| Enoggera Ward |  |  |  |
| Forest Lake Ward |  |  |  |
| Hamilton Ward |  |  |  |
| Holland Park Ward |  |  |  |
| Jamboree Ward |  |  |  |
| Macgregor Ward |  |  |  |
| Marchant Ward |  |  |  |
| McDowall Ward |  |  |  |
| Moorooka Ward |  |  |  |
| Morningside Ward |  |  |  |
| Northgate Ward |  |  |  |
| Paddington Ward |  |  |  |
| Pullenvale Ward |  |  |  |
| Runcorn Ward |  |  |  |
| Tennyson Ward |  |  |  |
| The Gabba Ward |  |  |  |
| The Gap Ward |  |  |  |
| Walter Taylor Ward |  |  |  |
| Wynnum Manly Ward |  |  |  |

***A3.*** *Council officers advise they are unable to collate the information within a timeframe that accords with the Meetings Local Law 2001.*

**Q4.** Please provide a breakdown of the following information regarding organisations with a lease agreement with Brisbane City Council for the 2020‑2021 financial year.

| **WARD** | **TOTAL NUMBER OF LEASES** | **TOTAL AMOUNT PAID IN RENT TO COUNCIL** | **TOTAL AMOUNT PAID IN RATES TO COUNCIL** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Bracken Ridge Ward |  |  |  |
| Calamvale Ward |  |  |  |
| Central Ward |  |  |  |
| Chandler Ward |  |  |  |
| Coorparoo Ward |  |  |  |
| Deagon Ward |  |  |  |
| Doboy Ward |  |  |  |
| Enoggera Ward |  |  |  |
| Forest Lake Ward |  |  |  |
| Hamilton Ward |  |  |  |
| Holland Park Ward |  |  |  |
| Jamboree Ward |  |  |  |
| Macgregor Ward |  |  |  |
| Marchant Ward |  |  |  |
| McDowall Ward |  |  |  |
| Moorooka Ward |  |  |  |
| Morningside Ward |  |  |  |
| Northgate Ward |  |  |  |
| Paddington Ward |  |  |  |
| Pullenvale Ward |  |  |  |
| Runcorn Ward |  |  |  |
| Tennyson Ward |  |  |  |
| The Gabba Ward |  |  |  |
| The Gap Ward |  |  |  |
| Walter Taylor Ward |  |  |  |
| Wynnum Manly Ward |  |  |  |

***A4.*** *Council officers advise they are unable to collate the information within a timeframe that accords with the Meetings Local Law 2001.*

**Q5.** Please provide a breakdown of the following information regarding organisations with a licence (year-round) agreement with Brisbane City Council for the 2019-2020 financial year.

| **WARD** | **TOTAL NUMBER OF LEASES** | **TOTAL AMOUNT PAID IN RENT TO COUNCIL** | **TOTAL AMOUNT PAID IN RATES TO COUNCIL** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Bracken Ridge Ward |  |  |  |
| Calamvale Ward |  |  |  |
| Central Ward |  |  |  |
| Chandler Ward |  |  |  |
| Coorparoo Ward |  |  |  |
| Deagon Ward |  |  |  |
| Doboy Ward |  |  |  |
| Enoggera Ward |  |  |  |
| Forest Lake Ward |  |  |  |
| Hamilton Ward |  |  |  |
| Holland Park Ward |  |  |  |
| Jamboree Ward |  |  |  |
| Macgregor Ward |  |  |  |
| Marchant Ward |  |  |  |
| McDowall Ward |  |  |  |
| Moorooka Ward |  |  |  |
| Morningside Ward |  |  |  |
| Northgate Ward |  |  |  |
| Paddington Ward |  |  |  |
| Pullenvale Ward |  |  |  |
| Runcorn Ward |  |  |  |
| Tennyson Ward |  |  |  |
| The Gabba Ward |  |  |  |
| The Gap Ward |  |  |  |
| Walter Taylor Ward |  |  |  |
| Wynnum Manly Ward |  |  |  |

***A5.*** *Council officers advise they are unable to collate the information within a timeframe that accords with the Meetings Local Law 2001.*

**Q6.** Please provide a breakdown of the following information regarding organisations with a licence (year-round) agreement with Brisbane City Council for the 2020-2021 financial year.

| **WARD** | **TOTAL NUMBER OF LEASES** | **TOTAL AMOUNT PAID IN RENT TO COUNCIL** | **TOTAL AMOUNT PAID IN RATES TO COUNCIL** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Bracken Ridge Ward |  |  |  |
| Calamvale Ward |  |  |  |
| Central Ward |  |  |  |
| Chandler Ward |  |  |  |
| Coorparoo Ward |  |  |  |
| Deagon Ward |  |  |  |
| Doboy Ward |  |  |  |
| Enoggera Ward |  |  |  |
| Forest Lake Ward |  |  |  |
| Hamilton Ward |  |  |  |
| Holland Park Ward |  |  |  |
| Jamboree Ward |  |  |  |
| Macgregor Ward |  |  |  |
| Marchant Ward |  |  |  |
| McDowall Ward |  |  |  |
| Moorooka Ward |  |  |  |
| Morningside Ward |  |  |  |
| Northgate Ward |  |  |  |
| Paddington Ward |  |  |  |
| Pullenvale Ward |  |  |  |
| Runcorn Ward |  |  |  |
| Tennyson Ward |  |  |  |
| The Gabba Ward |  |  |  |
| The Gap Ward |  |  |  |
| Walter Taylor Ward |  |  |  |
| Wynnum Manly Ward |  |  |  |

***A6.*** *Council officers advise they are unable to collate the information within a timeframe that accords with the Meetings Local Law 2001.*

**Q7.** Please provide a breakdown of the following information regarding organisations with a seasonal licence agreement with Brisbane City Council for the 2019-2020 financial year.

| **WARD** | **TOTAL NUMBER OF LEASES** | **TOTAL AMOUNT PAID IN RENT TO COUNCIL** | **TOTAL AMOUNT PAID IN RATES TO COUNCIL** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Bracken Ridge Ward |  |  |  |
| Calamvale Ward |  |  |  |
| Central Ward |  |  |  |
| Chandler Ward |  |  |  |
| Coorparoo Ward |  |  |  |
| Deagon Ward |  |  |  |
| Doboy Ward |  |  |  |
| Enoggera Ward |  |  |  |
| Forest Lake Ward |  |  |  |
| Hamilton Ward |  |  |  |
| Holland Park Ward |  |  |  |
| Jamboree Ward |  |  |  |
| Macgregor Ward |  |  |  |
| Marchant Ward |  |  |  |
| McDowall Ward |  |  |  |
| Moorooka Ward |  |  |  |
| Morningside Ward |  |  |  |
| Northgate Ward |  |  |  |
| Paddington Ward |  |  |  |
| Pullenvale Ward |  |  |  |
| Runcorn Ward |  |  |  |
| Tennyson Ward |  |  |  |
| The Gabba Ward |  |  |  |
| The Gap Ward |  |  |  |
| Walter Taylor Ward |  |  |  |
| Wynnum Manly Ward |  |  |  |

***A7.*** *Council officers advise they are unable to collate the information within a timeframe that accords with the Meetings Local Law 2001.*

**Q8.** Please provide a breakdown of the following information regarding organisations with a seasonal licence agreement with Brisbane City Council for the 2020-2021 financial year.

| **WARD** | **TOTAL NUMBER OF LEASES** | **TOTAL AMOUNT PAID IN RENT TO COUNCIL** | **TOTAL AMOUNT PAID IN RATES TO COUNCIL** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Bracken Ridge Ward |  |  |  |
| Calamvale Ward |  |  |  |
| Central Ward |  |  |  |
| Chandler Ward |  |  |  |
| Coorparoo Ward |  |  |  |
| Deagon Ward |  |  |  |
| Doboy Ward |  |  |  |
| Enoggera Ward |  |  |  |
| Forest Lake Ward |  |  |  |
| Hamilton Ward |  |  |  |
| Holland Park Ward |  |  |  |
| Jamboree Ward |  |  |  |
| Macgregor Ward |  |  |  |
| Marchant Ward |  |  |  |
| McDowall Ward |  |  |  |
| Moorooka Ward |  |  |  |
| Morningside Ward |  |  |  |
| Northgate Ward |  |  |  |
| Paddington Ward |  |  |  |
| Pullenvale Ward |  |  |  |
| Runcorn Ward |  |  |  |
| Tennyson Ward |  |  |  |
| The Gabba Ward |  |  |  |
| The Gap Ward |  |  |  |
| Walter Taylor Ward |  |  |  |
| Wynnum Manly Ward |  |  |  |

***A8.*** *Council officers advise they are unable to collate the information within a timeframe that accords with the Meetings Local Law 2001.*

**Q9.** Please provide the following information regarding Brisbane City Council’s casual bus drivers:-

| **FINANCIAL YEAR** | **NUMBER OF NEW CASUAL BUS DRIVERS** | **TOTAL COST OF TRAINING NEW DRIVERS TO ATTAIN THEIR HEAVY VEHICLE LICENCE** | **NUMBER OF CASUAL BUS DRIVERS WHO RESIGNED** | **NUMBER OF CASUAL BUS DRIVERS WHO RESIGNED AFTER WORKING LESS THAN A YEAR** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2021-2022 (YTD) |  |  |  |  |
| 2020-2021 |  |  |  |  |
| 2019-2020 |  |  |  |  |
| 2018-2019 |  |  |  |  |

***A9.***

| ***FINANCIAL YEAR*** | ***NUMBER OF NEW CASUAL BUS DRIVERS*** | ***TOTAL COST OF TRAINING NEW DRIVERS TO ATTAIN THEIR HEAVY VEHICLE LICENCE*** | ***NUMBER OF CASUAL BUS DRIVERS WHO RESIGNED*** | ***NUMBER OF CASUAL BUS DRIVERS WHO RESIGNED AFTER WORKING LESS THAN A YEAR*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *2021-2022 (YTD)* | *97* | *$242,072,20* | *35* | *18* |
| *2020-2021* | *281* | *$562,568.50* | *81* | *33* |
| *2019-2020* | *149* | *$250,992.10* | *46* | *17* |
| *2018-2019* | *241* | *$267,039.62* | *77* | *27* |

**Q10.** Please advise how many women became bus drivers and how many resigned broken down as follows:

| **FINANCIAL YEAR** | **NUMBER OF NEW WOMEN CASUAL BUS DRIVERS** | **NUMBER OF NEW WOMEN PART-TIME PERMANENT BUS DRIVERS** | **NUMBER OF WOMEN FULL TIME BUS DRIVERS WHO RESIGNED** | **NUMBER OF WOMEN BUS DRIVERS WHO RESIGNED** | **NUMBER OF WOMEN BUS DRIVERS WHO RESIGNED AFTER WORKING LESS THAN A YEAR** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2021-2022 (YTD) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2020-2021 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019-2020 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2018-2019 |  |  |  |  |  |

***A10.***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***FINANCIAL YEAR*** | ***NUMBER OF NEW WOMEN CASUAL BUS DRIVERS*** | ***NUMBER OF NEW WOMEN PART-TIME PERMANENT BUS DRIVERS*** | ***NUMBER OF WOMEN FULL TIME BUS DRIVERS WHO RESIGNED*** | ***NUMBER OF WOMEN BUS DRIVERS WHO RESIGNED*** | ***NUMBER OF WOMEN BUS DRIVERS WHO RESIGNED AFTER WORKING LESS THAN A YEAR*** |
| *2021-2022 (YTD)* | *9* | *0* | *4* | *9* | *4* |
| *2020-2021* | *33* | *0* | *10* | *23* | *4* |
| *2019-2020* | *11* | *0* | *8* | *15* | *2* |
| *2018-2019* | *30* | *0* | *9* | *19* | *3* |

**Q11.** Please provide the following information regarding the 5 KittyCats operating the CityHopper service:-

| **MONTH** | **TOTAL NUMBER OF TIMES A KITTY CAT BROKE DOWN ON THE CITYHOPPER SERVICE** | **TOTAL NUMBER OF KITTYCAT CITYHOPPER SERVICES ORIGINALLY SCHEDULED** | **TOTAL NUMBER OF KITTYCAT CITYHOPPER SERVICES CANCELLED** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| November 2020 |  |  |  |
| December 2020 |  |  |  |
| January 2021 |  |  |  |
| February 2021 |  |  |  |
| March 2021 |  |  |  |
| April 2021 |  |  |  |
| May 2021 |  |  |  |
| June 2021 |  |  |  |
| July 2021 |  |  |  |
| August 2021 |  |  |  |
| September 2021 |  |  |  |
| October 2021 |  |  |  |
| November 2021 (to date) |  |  |  |

***A11.***

| ***MONTH*** | ***TOTAL NUMBER OF TIMES A KITTY CAT BROKE DOWN ON THE CITYHOPPER SERVICE*** | ***TOTAL NUMBER OF KITTYCAT CITYHOPPER SERVICES ORIGINALLY SCHEDULED*** | ***TOTAL NUMBER OF KITTYCAT CITYHOPPER SERVICES CANCELLED*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *November 2020* | *0* | *2,220* | *0* |
| *December 2020* | *2* | *2,294* | *2* |
| *January 2021* | *5* | *2,294* | *7* |
| *February 2021* | *2* | *2,072* | *2* |
| *March 2021* | *2* | *2,294* | *5* |
| *April 2021* | *3* | *2,220* | *4* |
| *May 2021* | *3* | *2,294* | *19* |
| *June 2021* | *2* | *2,220* | *8* |
| *July 2021* | *2* | *2,294* | *8* |
| *August 2021* | *5* | *2,294* | *12* |
| *September 2021* | *1* | *2,220* | *1* |
| *October 2021* | *0* | *2,294* | *0* |
| *November 2021 (to date)* | *2* | *1,406* | *61* |

**Q12.** Please provide the following information regarding the 5 KittyCats operating the Cross River CityFerry service:-

| **MONTH** | **TOTAL NUMBER OF TIMES A KITTY CAT BROKE DOWN ON THE CROSSRIVER CITYFERRY SERVICE** | **TOTAL NUMBER OF KITTYCAT CROSSRIVER CITYFERRY SERVICES ORIGINALLY SCHEDULED** | **TOTAL NUMBER OF KITTYCAT CROSSRIVER CITYFERRY SERVICES CANCELLED** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| November 2020 |  |  |  |
| December 2020 |  |  |  |
| January 2021 |  |  |  |
| February 2021 |  |  |  |
| March 2021 |  |  |  |
| April 2021 |  |  |  |
| May 2021 |  |  |  |
| June 2021 |  |  |  |
| July 2021 |  |  |  |
| August 2021 |  |  |  |
| September 2021 |  |  |  |
| October 2021 |  |  |  |
| November 2021 (to date) |  |  |  |

***A12.***

| ***MONTH*** | ***TOTAL NUMBER OF TIMES A KITTY CAT BROKE DOWN ON THE CROSSRIVER CITYFERRY SERVICE*** | ***TOTAL NUMBER OF KITTYCAT CROSSRIVER CITYFERRY SERVICES ORIGINALLY SCHEDULED*** | ***TOTAL NUMBER OF KITTYCAT CROSSRIVER CITYFERRY SERVICES CANCELLED*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *November 2020* | *3* | *2,176* | *89* |
| *December 2020* | *2* | *2,248* | *19* |
| *January 2021* | *2* | *2,252* | *5* |
| *February 2021* | *4* | *2,032* | *11* |
| *March 2021* | *2* | *2,248* | *10* |
| *April 2021* | *3* | *2,178* | *12* |
| *May 2021* | *1* | *2,250* | *1* |
| *June 2021* | *1* | *2,176* | *1* |
| *July 2021* | *1* | *2,252* | *1* |
| *August 2021* | *7* | *6,844* | *23* |
| *September 2021* | *1* | *6,636* | *2* |
| *October 2021* | *4* | *6,852* | *18* |
| *November 2021 (to date)* | *3* | *4,218* | *140* |

**Q13.** Please provide the locations of each Council building or lease site with solar.

***A13.*** *Please note the below is not an exhaustive list, as solar panels have been funded through a number of funding sources, and a complete list could not be collated within a timeframe that accords with the Meetings Local Law 2001.*

|  |
| --- |
| *Acacia Ridge Community Support Inc.* |
| *Acacia Ridge F.C. Inc.* |
| *Acacia Ridge Meals on Wheels Inc.* |
| *AFL Queensland Ltd* |
| *Algester Branch Little Athletics Centre Inc.* |
| *Algester Sports Inc.* |
| *All Hallows School/St Joseph’s Nudgee College (Tenants in Common)* |
| *Anglican Church Grammar School* |
| *Arana Contract Bridge Club Inc.* |
| *Arana Leagues Club Ltd.* |
| *Ashgrove Library* |
| *Ashgrove Memorial Preschool and Kindergarten Assoc. Inc.* |
| *Aspley East Kindergarten and Preschool Assoc. Inc.* |
| *Aspley Little Athletics Centre Inc.* |
| *Banyo Rugby League Club Inc.* |
| *Banyo Library* |
| *Bardon Bowls Club Inc.* |
| *Bardon Community Kindy Inc.* |
| *Baseball Queensland* |
| *Bayside United Sports and Recreation Club Inc.* |
| *Bayside Woodturners and Woodcrafters Club Inc.* |
| *Beelarong Community Farm Association Inc.* |
| *Bellbowrie Kindergarten and Preschool Association Inc.* |
| *Belmont Services Bowls Club Inc.* |
| *Beyond DV* |
| *Bracalba Quarry Rooftop* |
| *Bracken Ridge District Cricket Club Inc.* |
| *Brighton District Soccer Club Inc.* |
| *Brighton Roosters Junior Rugby League Club Inc.* |
| *Brisbane Bears-Fitzroy Football Club Ltd* |
| *Brisbane Hockey Management Group* |
| *Brisbane Jazz Club Inc.* |
| *Brisbane Racing Club Limited (Sub lessee - Souths Acacia Leagues Club Ltd)* |
| *Brisbane Riverstage* |
| *Brisbane Rugby League Referees Association Inc.* |
| *Brisbane Sailing Squadron Inc.* |
| *Brisbane Table Tennis Association Inc.* |
| *Brisbane Visual Arts Community Inc.* |
| *Brisbane Women’s Hockey Association Inc.* |
| *Bulimba Library* |
| *Bulimba Memorial Bowls & Community Club Inc.* |
| *Burnie Brae Ltd. (previously Chermside & District Senior Citizens Centre Inc.)* |
| *Calamvale Leopards Junior Australian Football Club* |
| *Cannon Hill Community Sports Club Inc.* |
| *Carina & Districts Committee on the Ageing* |
| *Carina Bus Depot* |
| *Carina Kindergarten & Pre-School Association Inc.* |
| *Carina Library* |
| *Carindale PCYC* |
| *Centenary Rowing Club Inc.* |
| *Centenary Stormers F.C. Inc.* |
| *Centenary Suburbs Men’s Shed Inc.* |
| *Chandler RRC* |
| *Chelmer Graceville Kindergarten Association Inc.* |
| *Chermside Meals on Wheels Inc.* |
| *Communify Qld Inc.* |
| *Community Living Association Inc.* |
| *Coopers Plains Library* |
| *Corinda Bowls Club Inc.* |
| *Craigslea Kindergarten Association Inc.* |
| *Crosby Park Meals on Wheels Inc.* |
| *Crushers Leagues Club Limited* |
| *Cubberla Witton Catchment Group* |
| *Darra Field Services Depot* |
| *Department of Emergency Services - Queensland Ambulance Services* |
| *Durack-Inala Bowls Club Inc.* |
| *Eagle Farm Bus Depot* |
| *Eastern Suburbs Soccer Club Ltd.* |
| *Easts Mt Gravatt Junior Rugby League Football Club Inc.* |
| *Emily Foord Memorial Kindy & Preschool* |
| *Everton Districts Cricket Club Inc.* |
| *Everton Districts Sporting Club* |
| *Everton Park Bowls Club & Community Club Inc.* |
| *Everton Park Kindergarten & Preschool* |
| *Everton Park Library* |
| *Ferny Grove Bowls, Sports and Community Club Inc.* |
| *Ferny Grove RRC* |
| *Garden City Bus Depot* |
| *Gaythorne Bowls Club Inc.* |
| *Geebung Bowls Club Inc.* |
| *Geebung Kindergarten & Preschool Association Inc.* |
| *Geebung Meals on Wheels Inc.* |
| *Gibson Park Committee (Trustees for the Brothers Jnr RLFC)* |
| *Graceville Normanby United Sports Club Ltd* |
| *Grange Bowls Club Inc.* |
| *Grange Library* |
| *Grange Thistle Soccer Club* |
| *Greening Australia* |
| *Guides Queensland Algester* |
| *Guides Queensland Aspley* |
| *Guides Queensland Bulimba* |
| *Guides Queensland Carindale* |
| *Guides Queensland Everton Park* |
| *Guides Queensland Kenmore* |
| *Guides Queensland The Gap* |
| *Guides Queensland Wynnum* |
| *Guides Queensland Yeronga* |
| *Hand Learning and Leisure Centre Centrecare Disability Services* |
| *Hands on Art Inc.* |
| *Hawks Sporting Club Inc.* |
| *Holland Park & District Meals on Wheels Inc.* |
| *Holland Park Kindergarten Association Inc.* |
| *Holland Park Library* |
| *Holland Park Sports and Community Club Inc.* |
| *Holland Park-Mt Gravatt Sub Branch The Returned Services League of Australia* |
| *Horizon Foundation Inc.* |
| *Inala Community House* |
| *Inala Community Kindergarten Inc.* |
| *Indooroopilly Men’s Shed Inc.* |
| *Jamboree Community Kindergarten & Pre-School Association Inc.* |
| *Jindalee Bowls Club Inc.* |
| *Karawatha Forest Discovery Centre* |
| *Kedron Football Club Inc.* |
| *Kedron Heights Community Kindergarten Association Inc.* |
| *Kedron Wavell Services Club Inc.* |
| *Kedron Wavell Services Club Inc. (Main Club & Hockey Fields)* |
| *Kenmore District Australian Football Club Inc.* |
| *Kenmore District Kindergarten & Pre-School Association Inc.* |
| *King George Square* |
| *Koobara Aboriginal & Islander Family Resource Centre Inc.* |
| *Lady Gowrie Child Care Inc.* |
| *Link Vision Inc.* |
| *Lutwyche-Windsor Kindergarten & Pre School Association* |
| *Manly Community Kindergarten Association Inc.* |
| *Marchant Park Kindergarten Association Inc.* |
| *Meals on Wheels (Western Suburbs) Inc.* |
| *Merthyr Bowls Club* |
| *Metropolitan Districts Netball Association Inc.* |
| *Mitchelton & District Senior Citizens Club* |
| *Mitchelton Library* |
| *Mitchelton Sports Club* |
| *Montessori School Ltd.* |
| *Moorooka Districts Australian Football Club Inc* |
| *Morningside Australian Football Club Ltd.* |
| *Mt Coot-tha Library* |
| *Mt Crosby Bowls Club Inc.* |
| *Mt Gravatt Bowls Club Inc. (Sub-Lessee to Southside Sport Community Club)* |
| *Mt Gravatt Cemetery New Depot* |
| *Mt Gravatt Kindergarten and Pre-School Association Inc.* |
| *Mt Gravatt Youth & Recreation Club Inc.* |
| *Multicultural Development Association Inc.* |
| *New Bracken Ridge Library* |
| *New Farm Library* |
| *Newmarket SES Depot* |
| *Norman Creek Catchment Coordination Committee* |
| *North Brisbane Football Club Inc* |
| *North Brisbane Lapidary Club Inc.* |
| *North Brisbane Rugby Union Club Inc.* |
| *North Regional Business Centre* |
| *North Star Football Club Inc.* |
| *Northern Suburbs Bowls Club Inc.* |
| *Northern Suburbs Bridge Club Inc.* |
| *Northern Suburbs District Cricket Club Inc.* |
| *Northern Wetlands Environment Centre* |
| *Northey Street City Farm Association Inc.* |
| *Nudgee RRC* |
| *Nundah Library* |
| *Oxley Bowls Club Inc.* |
| *Oxley Sailing Club* |
| *Oxley United Soccer & Sporting Club Inc.* |
| *Pinnaroo Cemetery Administration* |
| *Queensland Country Women’s Association (Oxley Branch)* |
| *Queensland Gaelic Football Association Inc.* |
| *Queensland Jewish Kindergarten Association Inc. (Gan Gani Community Kindergarten)* |
| *Queensland Lions Football Club* |
| *Queensland Miniature Race Car Club Inc.* |
| *Queensland Police Service* |
| *Red Hill Community Sports Club Inc.* |
| *Returned Services League of Australia (South Eastern District Branch)* |
| *Ridge Hills United Football Club Inc.* |
| *Rochedale Solar Carport* |
| *Salisbury & District Senior Citizens Welfare Association Inc.* |
| *Salisbury Bowls Club* |
| *Sandgate & District Meals on Wheels Inc.* |
| *Sandgate Kids Early Education Inc.* |
| *Sandgate Library* |
| *Sandgate-Redcliffe District Cricket Club Inc.* |
| *Scouts Association of Australia (Queensland Branch) Aspley* |
| *Scouts Association of Australia (Queensland Branch) Bald Hills* |
| *Scouts Association of Australia (Queensland Branch) Bellbowrie* |
| *Scouts Association of Australia (Queensland Branch) Bracken Ridge* |
| *Scouts Association of Australia (Queensland Branch) Chermside West* |
| *Scouts Association of Australia (Queensland Branch) Graceville* |
| *Scouts Association of Australia (Queensland Branch) Karana Downs* |
| *Scouts Association of Australia (Queensland Branch) Pamphlett Sea Scouts* |
| *Scouts Association of Australia (Queensland Branch) Sunnybank* |
| *Scouts Association of Australia (Queensland Branch) Yeronga* |
| *Seikukan Karate Club Wavell Heights Brisbane Inc.* |
| *Sherwood Bus Depot* |
| *Sherwood Community Kindergarten Inc.* |
| *Sherwood Football Club Ltd.* |
| *Somerville House* |
| *South Brisbane District Cricket Club Inc.* |
| *Southern Suburbs Rugby League Football Club Brisbane Ltd.* |
| *Souths Sunnybank Rugby League Football Club* |
| *Souths United Soccer Club Inc.* |
| *Southside Eagles Soccer Club Inc.* |
| *Spanish Centre Ltd* |
| *St Catherine’s United Football Club Inc.* |
| *St Lucia Bowls Club Inc.* |
| *St Paul’s Uniting Soccer Club Inc.* |
| *St Thomas’s Riverview Kindergarten Inc.* |
| *Stafford & District Meals on Wheels Association* |
| *Stones Corner Community Kindergarten Inc.* |
| *Sunnybank Contract Bridge Club Inc.* |
| *Sunnybank Rugby Union Club* |
| *Taringa Rovers Soccer Football Club* |
| *Tarragindi Churches Tigers Sporting Association Inc.* |
| *Tarragindi War Memorial Preschool & Kindergarten* |
| *The Community Place Inc.* |
| *The Creche and Kindergarten Association Ltd.* |
| *The Creche and Kindergarten Association Ltd. (Gundoo Mirra)* |
| *The Creche and Kindergarten Association Ltd. Mt Crosby* |
| *The Gap Pastime Club Inc.* |
| *The Half a Dozen Group of Artists Inc.* |
| *The Lakes District Dragon Boat Association Inc and Springfield Centenary Canoe Club Inc* |
| *The Lions Rugby Union Club Inc.* |
| *The Pacific Islands Council Qld Inc.* |
| *The Pacific Islands Council Qld Inc.* |
| *The Young Men’s Christian Association of Brisbane (YMCA) - Early Childhood Centre* |
| *Tingalpa Model Aero Club Inc.* |
| *Toombul Bowls Club* |
| *Toombul Croquet Club Inc.* |
| *Toombul District Cricket Club Inc.* |
| *Toowong Bridge Club Inc.* |
| *Toowong Bus Depot Workshop 1* |
| *Toowong Bus Depot Workshop 2* |
| *Toowong Rowing Club* |
| *Trade Coast FSG Depot* |
| *Upper Mt Gravatt Community Kindergarten Association* |
| *Valley Hockey Club Inc.* |
| *Vintage Speedcar Association (Queensland) Inc.* |
| *Virginia Bus Depot* |
| *Warehouse Cricket Association Queensland Inc.* |
| *Waterloo Bay Leisure Centre Inc.* |
| *Wavell Heights Kindergarten Inc.* |
| *Wellers Hill Bowls Club Inc.* |
| *West Arana Hills Rugby League Football Club* |
| *Western Districts Baseball Club Inc.* |
| *Western Districts Netball Association Inc.* |
| *Western Districts Rugby Football Club Inc.* |
| *Wests Mitchelton Rugby League Football Club Inc.* |
| *Willawong Bus Depot* |
| *Willawong RRC* |
| *Wilston Grange Australian Football Club Inc.* |
| *Wilston Grange Kindergarten & Preschool Association Inc.* |
| *Windsor Bowls Club* |
| *Windsor Croquet Club Inc.* |
| *Woodturners Society of Queensland Inc.* |
| *Wynnum & District Rugby Union Club Inc.* |
| *Wynnum Croquet Club* |
| *Wynnum Manly Junior Rugby League Football Club Ltd.* |
| *Wynnum Table Tennis Association* |
| *Wynnum Tennis Association Inc.* |
| *Wynnum Vikings Australian Football & Sporting Club* |
| *Wynnum Wolves Football Club (Moreton Bay Sports Club)* |
| *Yeronga Park Kindergarten Association Inc* |
| *Yeronga Tennis Club Inc.* |

**Q14.** Please provide the locations of each Council building or lease site without solar.

***A14.*** *Council officers advise we are unable to collate the list in a timeframe that accords with the Meetings Local Law 2001.*

**Q15.** Please provide the locations of each Council playground with shade sails.

***A15.***

| ***PROPERTY NAME*** | ***SUBURB*** | ***TOTAL*** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *7TH BRIGADE PARK* | *CHERMSIDE* | *2* |
| *A.R.C.HILL PARK* | *VIRGINIA* | *1* |
| *ABBEVILLE STREET PARK* | *UPPER MOUNT GRAVATT* | *1* |
| *ABBOTT STREET PARK* | *CAMP HILL* | *1* |
| *ALBERT BISHOP PARK* | *NUNDAH* | *1* |
| *ALEXANDER MACPHERSON PARK* | *NUDGEE* | *1* |
| *ALEXANDER PARK* | *MOOROOKA* | *1* |
| *ALGOORI STREET PARK* | *MORNINGSIDE* | *1* |
| *AMAZONS PLACE PARK* | *JINDALEE* | *1* |
| *ANNA SMITH OBE QUOTA PARK* | *CARINDALE* | *1* |
| *ANZAC ROAD PARK* | *CARINA HEIGHTS* | *1* |
| *ARENGA STREET PARK* | *WAKERLEY* | *1* |
| *ARTHUR POSTLE PARK* | *ACACIA RIDGE* | *1* |
| *ASCOT PARK* | *ASCOT* | *1* |
| *BADRICK PARK* | *THE GAP* | *1* |
| *BALIS STREET PARK* | *HOLLAND PARK WEST* | *1* |
| *BANKS CRESCENT PARK* | *WYNNUM WEST* | *1* |
| *BANYO MEMORIAL PARK* | *BANYO* | *1* |
| *BARBOUR ROAD PARK* | *BRACKEN RIDGE* | *1* |
| *BASSETT STREET PARK* | *HOLLAND PARK* | *1* |
| *BAYSIDE PARK* | *MANLY* | *1* |
| *BECCARIA PARK* | *DOOLANDELLA* | *1* |
| *BEDFORD PLAYGROUND PARK* | *SPRING HILL* | *1* |
| *BELLOY STREET PARK* | *WAVELL HEIGHTS* | *1* |
| *BELMONT RECREATION RESERVE* | *CARINA* | *1* |
| *BEN LOMOND STREET PARK* | *ASPLEY* | *1* |
| *BENELONG PARK* | *KEDRON* | *1* |
| *BENNETT’S BUSHLAND PARK* | *MORNINGSIDE* | *1* |
| *BERYL ROBERTS PARK* | *COOPERS PLAINS* | *2* |
| *BILL BROWN SPORTS RESERVE* | *FITZGIBBON* | *1* |
| *BILL CASH MEMORIAL PARK* | *CANNON HILL* | *1* |
| *BILL MOORE PARK* | *SALISBURY* | *1* |
| *BISSET PLACE PARK* | *MCDOWALL* | *1* |
| *BOLES STREET PARK* | *STAFFORD* | *1* |
| *BOLTON STREET PARK* | *EIGHT MILE PLAINS* | *1* |
| *BOOKER PLACE PARK* | *BELLBOWRIE* | *2* |
| *BOORAL STREET PARK* | *SUNNYBANK HILLS* | *1* |
| *BOORALA CRESCENT PARK* | *EIGHT MILE PLAINS* | *1* |
| *BOWDEN PARK* | *GEEBUNG* | *1* |
| *BOYD PARK* | *NUNDAH* | *1* |
| *BRIDGNORTH STREET PARK (NO.71)* | *CARINDALE* | *1* |
| *BRISTOL PARK* | *WAVELL HEIGHTS* | *1* |
| *BRUSHBOX PARK* | *UPPER MOUNT GRAVATT* | *1* |
| *BUCKINGHAM PLACE PARK* | *EIGHT MILE PLAINS* | *1* |
| *BULIMBA MEMORIAL PARK* | *BULIMBA* | *1* |
| *BULIMBA RIVERSIDE PARK* | *BULIMBA* | *1* |
| *BURN STREET PARK* | *CAMP HILL* | *1* |
| *BURNIE BRAE PARK* | *CHERMSIDE* | *1* |
| *C.J.GREENFIELD COMPLEX PARK* | *RICHLANDS* | *1* |
| *C.T.WHITE PARK* | *KANGAROO POINT* | *1* |
| *CADOGAN STREET PARK* | *CARINDALE* | *1* |
| *CALAMVALE DISTRICT PARK* | *CALAMVALE* | *1* |
| *CALLIOPE CIRCUIT PARK* | *MURARRIE* | *1* |
| *CAMOOLA STREET PARK* | *KEPERRA* | *1* |
| *CANNES STREET PARK* | *WAKERLEY* | *1* |
| *CANTERBURY PARK* | *BALD HILLS* | *1* |
| *CAPTAIN BURKE PARK* | *KANGAROO POINT* | *1* |
| *CARINDALE RECREATION RESERVE* | *CARINDALE* | *1* |
| *CAROLE PARK COMMUNITY PARK* | *ELLEN GROVE* | *1* |
| *CASSIA PLACE PARK* | *TAIGUM* | *1* |
| *CAWONGA PARK* | *OXLEY* | *1* |
| *CECCATO PARK* | *CARSELDINE* | *1* |
| *CHALK STREET PARK* | *LUTWYCHE* | *1* |
| *CHATEAU STREET PARK* | *CARSELDINE* | *1* |
| *CITY BOTANIC GARDENS* | *BRISBANE CITY* | *1* |
| *CLARE AVENUE PARK* | *WYNNUM WEST* | *1* |
| *CLEM MASTERS PARK* | *DEAGON* | *1* |
| *CLIFTON HILL PEACE PARK* | *ANNERLEY* | *1* |
| *COL BENNET PARK* | *ALGESTER* | *1* |
| *COLLINGROVE PLACE PARK* | *FOREST LAKE* | *1* |
| *COLMSLIE BEACH RESERVE* | *MURARRIE* | *1* |
| *CONSIDEN PLACE PARK* | *BELLBOWRIE* | *1* |
| *COOCHIN PLACE PARK* | *TINGALPA* | *1* |
| *COONARA STREET PARK* | *HOLLAND PARK* | *1* |
| *CORRAMULLING PARK* | *THE GAP* | *1* |
| *COX PARK* | *LOTA* | *1* |
| *CREEKSIDE STREET PARK* | *KENMORE HILLS* | *1* |
| *CRIBB ROAD PARK* | *CARINDALE* | *1* |
| *CROMARTY STREET PARK* | *KENMORE* | *1* |
| *CUBBERLA CREEK RESERVE* | *CHAPEL HILL* | *1* |
| *CURLEW PARK* | *SANDGATE* | *1* |
| *CURRAJONG STREET PARK* | *CALAMVALE* | *1* |
| *D.J.SHERRINGTON PARK* | *INALA* | *1* |
| *D.M.HENDERSON PARK* | *MACGREGOR* | *1* |
| *DAIRY SWAMP ROAD PARK* | *TINGALPA* | *1* |
| *DALKEITH PARK* | *KALINGA* | *1* |
| *DASH STREET PARK* | *KEPERRA* | *1* |
| *DEAGON SPORTSGROUND PARK* | *DEAGON* | *1* |
| *DECKER PARK* | *BRIGHTON* | *1* |
| *DELAVAN STREET PARK* | *WISHART* | *1* |
| *DELFIN STREET PARK* | *MACGREGOR* | *1* |
| *DESOTO PLACE PARK* | *FOREST LAKE* | *1* |
| *DONNA PHILP PARK* | *BOONDALL* | *1* |
| *DOULTON STREET PARK* | *CALAMVALE* | *1* |
| *DR VALENTINE McDOWALL PARK* | *MCDOWALL* | *2* |
| *DUCIE STREET PARK* | *DARRA* | *1* |
| *DUMBARTON DRIVE PARK* | *KENMORE* | *1* |
| *DUNLOP PARK* | *CORINDA* | *1* |
| *DUNMORE PARK* | *AUCHENFLOWER* | *1* |
| *DUNVEGAN STREET PARK* | *HEATHWOOD* | *1* |
| *DURELLA STREET PARK* | *DURACK* | *1* |
| *DURRINGTON PARK* | *WYNNUM WEST* | *1* |
| *DUTTON PARK* | *DUTTON PARK* | *1* |
| *E C BACKWELL PARK* | *ARCHERFIELD* | *1* |
| *ED DEVENPORT ROTARY PARK* | *LOTA* | *1* |
| *ED KUEPPER PARK* | *OXLEY* | *1* |
| *EDENBROOKE PARK* | *SEVENTEEN MILE ROCKS* | *1* |
| *EDWARDS PARK* | *CARINDALE* | *1* |
| *EKIBIN PARK SOUTH* | *ANNERLEY* | *1* |
| *ELANORA PARK* | *WYNNUM* | *1* |
| *ELIZABETH BRUCE PLAYGROUND PARK* | *INALA* | *1* |
| *EMMETT STREET PARK* | *WYNNUM WEST* | *1* |
| *ENBROOK PARKLAND* | *BRACKEN RIDGE* | *1* |
| *ENOGGERA MEMORIAL PARK* | *ENOGGERA* | *2* |
| *ERIC SHAW PARK* | *WYNNUM* | *1* |
| *EUGENIA STREET PARK* | *RICHLANDS* | *1* |
| *FALLON PARK* | *EVERTON PARK* | *1* |
| *FARMERS STREET PARK* | *ROCHEDALE* | *1* |
| *FAULKNER PARK* | *GRACEVILLE* | *1* |
| *FAUNA PARADE PARK* | *ROCKLEA* | *1* |
| *FAVERSHAM STREET PARK* | *WOOLLOONGABBA* | *1* |
| *FEDERATION STREET PARK* | *WYNNUM WEST* | *1* |
| *FENWICK PARK* | *MITCHELTON* | *1* |
| *FERGUSON PARK (BRACKEN RIDGE)* | *BRACKEN RIDGE* | *2* |
| *FLYNN OVAL PARK* | *WINDSOR* | *1* |
| *FOREST LAKE SPORTS FIELDS* | *FOREST LAKE* | *1* |
| *FRANCHINA FAMILY PARK* | *BOONDALL* | *1* |
| *FRANK SLEEMAN PARK* | *BOONDALL* | *1* |
| *FRED CAMPBELL PARK* | *ASPLEY* | *1* |
| *FRED FRANCIS PARK* | *BRACKEN RIDGE* | *1* |
| *FREDERICK ANNAND PARK* | *CHERMSIDE WEST* | *1* |
| *FREMONT STREET PARK* | *SEVENTEEN MILE ROCKS* | *1* |
| *FRENEY STREET PARK* | *ROCKLEA* | *1* |
| *GAGARRA STREET PARK* | *EIGHT MILE PLAINS* | *1* |
| *GARRETT PARK* | *RUNCORN* | *1* |
| *GEMSTONE CRESCENT PARK* | *ACACIA RIDGE* | *1* |
| *GEORGE CLAYTON PARK* | *MANLY* | *1* |
| *GEORGE SCARLETT PARK* | *CORINDA* | *1* |
| *GEORGE TUCKETT PARK* | *ROCKLEA* | *1* |
| *GILBERT PARK* | *RED HILL* | *1* |
| *GIRAWEEN PARK* | *GRACEVILLE* | *1* |
| *GLINDEMANN PARK* | *HOLLAND PARK WEST* | *1* |
| *GOLDEN OAK CRESCENT PARK* | *CARINDALE* | *1* |
| *GORDON PARK PLAYGROUND PARK* | *GORDON PARK* | *1* |
| *GOULD ROAD PARK* | *HERSTON* | *1* |
| *GRACEVILLE MEMORIAL PARK* | *GRACEVILLE* | *1* |
| *GRACEVILLE RIVERSIDE PARKLANDS* | *GRACEVILLE* | *1* |
| *GREENDALE PARK* | *CARINDALE* | *1* |
| *GREENWAYS ESPLANADE PARK* | *PARKINSON* | *1* |
| *GREGORY PARK* | *MILTON* | *1* |
| *GRENIER PARK* | *ACACIA RIDGE* | *1* |
| *GREY GUMS PARK* | *KELVIN GROVE* | *1* |
| *GRINSTEAD PARK* | *ALDERLEY* | *1* |
| *GROUNDBERRY CRESCENT PARK* | *MOGGILL* | *1* |
| *GROVE PARK* | *RUNCORN* | *1* |
| *GUS DAVIES PARK* | *BALD HILLS* | *1* |
| *GUYATT PARK* | *ST LUCIA* | *1* |
| *HANCOCK PARK - PINE VILLAGE PARK* | *FOREST LAKE* | *1* |
| *HAROLD DEAN PARK* | *BRACKEN RIDGE* | *1* |
| *HAROLD KIELLY PARK* | *BALD HILLS* | *1* |
| *HATHERTON CRESCENT PARK* | *CARINDALE* | *1* |
| *HAWTHORNE PARK* | *HAWTHORNE* | *1* |
| *HAYWAL STREET PARK* | *TAIGUM* | *1* |
| *HEATH PARK* | *EAST BRISBANE* | *1* |
| *HEINER PARK* | *KEPERRA* | *1* |
| *HEINRICH GERNS PARK* | *WAVELL HEIGHTS* | *1* |
| *HERBERT STREET PARK* | *LOTA* | *1* |
| *HERCULES STREET PARK* | *HAMILTON* | *1* |
| *HICKEY PARK* | *STAFFORD* | *2* |
| *HOLMEAD PARK* | *EIGHT MILE PLAINS* | *1* |
| *HONEYEATER STREET PARK* | *UPPER KEDRON* | *1* |
| *HONEYSUCKLE WAY PARK* | *CALAMVALE* | *1* |
| *HUNTER STREET PARK* | *MANLY WEST* | *1* |
| *HYDE ROAD PARK* | *YERONGA* | *1* |
| *IAN PAGE PARK* | *CARINA* | *1* |
| *IRIS PLACE PARK* | *FITZGIBBON* | *1* |
| *JACARANDA PARK* | *YERONGA* | *1* |
| *JACK PYLE PARK* | *SUNNYBANK HILLS* | *1* |
| *JAMBOREE PARK* | *JAMBOREE HEIGHTS* | *1* |
| *JINDALEE BOAT RAMP PARK* | *JINDALEE* | *1* |
| *JINDALEE PARK* | *JINDALEE* | *1* |
| *JOE FOSTER PARK* | *CAMP HILL* | *1* |
| *JOHN GOSS RESERVE* | *CHERMSIDE WEST* | *1* |
| *JOHN PATTERSON PARK* | *CHERMSIDE* | *1* |
| *JOHN STEWART MEMORIAL PARK* | *BALD HILLS* | *1* |
| *JOHN WALKER PLACE* | *YERONGA* | *1* |
| *JOSEPH LEE PARK* | *ZILLMERE* | *1* |
| *JUDITH COURT PARK* | *RUNCORN* | *1* |
| *JULATTEN PLACE PARK* | *UPPER KEDRON* | *1* |
| *JURAYELBA PLACE PARK* | *KEPERRA* | *1* |
| *KAOHSIUNG PARK* | *EIGHT MILE PLAINS* | *1* |
| *KARAWATHA FOREST SOUTH* | *DREWVALE* | *1* |
| *KARELLA STREET PARK* | *FIG TREE POCKET* | *1* |
| *KARHULA PARK* | *EIGHT MILE PLAINS* | *1* |
| *KARUMBA PLACE PARK* | *RIVERHILLS* | *1* |
| *KATHLEEN STREET PARK* | *RICHLANDS* | *1* |
| *KEATING PARK* | *INDOOROOPILLY* | *1* |
| *KEATLEY STREET PARK* | *BELLBOWRIE* | *1* |
| *KEITH PAYNE PARK* | *STAFFORD* | *1* |
| *KELVIN CLOSE PARK* | *FOREST LAKE* | *1* |
| *KEN FLETCHER PARK* | *TENNYSON* | *1* |
| *KENNEWELL PARK* | *INDOOROOPILLY* | *1* |
| *KEPERRA PICNIC GROUND PARK* | *FERNY GROVE* | *2* |
| *KERALGERIE PARK* | *MORNINGSIDE* | *1* |
| *KERRIA STREET PARK* | *BELLBOWRIE* | *1* |
| *KEV HOOPER MEMORIAL PARK* | *INALA* | *1* |
| *KIANAWAH PARK* | *TINGALPA* | *1* |
| *KIANAWAH ROAD PARK (NO.330)* | *WYNNUM WEST* | *1* |
| *KINGFISHER PARK* | *KENMORE* | *1* |
| *KINGS PARK* | *KEPERRA* | *1* |
| *KINTA STREET PARK* | *KURABY* | *1* |
| *KOKODA PARK* | *GORDON PARK* | *1* |
| *KOOKABURRA PARK - WEST* | *KARANA DOWNS* | *1* |
| *KOOKABURRA RESERVE* | *KURABY* | *1* |
| *KOOLA STREET PARK* | *WISHART* | *1* |
| *KURINGGAI PARK* | *FITZGIBBON* | *1* |
| *LAMBERT MCBRIDE PARK* | *ZILLMERE* | *1* |
| *LANGLANDS PARK* | *COORPAROO* | *1* |
| *LANGLEY AVENUE PARK* | *WILSTON* | *1* |
| *LANHAM PARK* | *GRANGE* | *2* |
| *LAPFORD PARK* | *DREWVALE* | *1* |
| *LAVARACK PARK* | *CAMP HILL* | *1* |
| *LECKMY STREET PARK* | *FERNY GROVE* | *1* |
| *LEICESTER STREET PARK* | *COORPAROO* | *1* |
| *LEN TREZONA PARK* | *ZILLMERE* | *1* |
| *LES ATKINSON PARK* | *SUNNYBANK* | *2* |
| *LEYSHON PARK* | *YERONGA* | *1* |
| *LOCKROSE STREET PARK* | *MITCHELTON* | *1* |
| *LORIKEET PARK* | *MOUNT OMMANEY* | *1* |
| *LOTA CAMPING RESERVE* | *LOTA* | *1* |
| *LOTA POINT PARK (ROAD RESERVE)* | *LOTA* | *1* |
| *LYDIA PLACE PARK* | *GUMDALE* | *1* |
| *LYONS PLAYGROUND PARK* | *HIGHGATE HILL* | *1* |
| *M. Z. HOLLAND MEMORIAL PARK* | *WACOL* | *1* |
| *MACARANGA CRESCENT PARK* | *CARSELDINE* | *1* |
| *MACKENZIE PARK* | *MACKENZIE* | *1* |
| *MACLEAY CRESCENT PARK* | *TINGALPA* | *1* |
| *MAGGS STREET PARK* | *WAVELL HEIGHTS* | *1* |
| *MAISIE DIXON PARK* | *EIGHT MILE PLAINS* | *1* |
| *MANGO STREET PARK* | *RUNCORN* | *1* |
| *MARCHANT PARK* | *ASPLEY* | *2* |
| *MARGARET STREET PARK* | *MCDOWALL* | *1* |
| *MARMINDIE STREET PARK* | *CHAPEL HILL* | *1* |
| *MATISSE STREET PARK* | *CARSELDINE* | *1* |
| *MATTHEW GARDINER PARK* | *CARSELDINE* | *1* |
| *MAYNARD PLACE PARK* | *RUNCORN* | *1* |
| *MCCASKILL RD PARK* | *PULLENVALE* | *1* |
| *MCCOOK PARK* | *NEWMARKET* | *1* |
| *MCCORMACK AVENUE PARK (ROAD RESERVE)* | *ASHGROVE* | *1* |
| *MCDOWALL RESERVE* | *MCDOWALL* | *1* |
| *MCKOY STREET PARK* | *COOPERS PLAINS* | *1* |
| *MELALEUCA GREEN PARK* | *CHERMSIDE WEST* | *1* |
| *MELROSE PARK* | *WOOLOOWIN* | *1* |
| *MERCER PARK* | *KEDRON* | *1* |
| *MERRIWA PARK* | *SUNNYBANK HILLS* | *1* |
| *MERTHYR PARK* | *NEW FARM* | *1* |
| *MING-SHAN PARK* | *CALAMVALE* | *2* |
| *MIRBELIA STREET PARK* | *KENMORE HILLS* | *1* |
| *MITCHELTON PARK* | *MITCHELTON* | *1* |
| *MOGGILL DISTRICT SPORT PARK* | *MOGGILL* | *1* |
| *MONIER ROAD PARK (NOS.44-84)* | *DARRA* | *1* |
| *MONTEREY CIRCUIT PARK* | *TINGALPA* | *1* |
| *MOOLABIN PARK* | *MOOROOKA* | *1* |
| *MOOROOKA LIONS BICENT. PICNIC GRND PARK* | *YEERONGPILLY* | *1* |
| *MORETON BAY LIONS PARK* | *WYNNUM* | *1* |
| *MORTIMER ROAD PARK* | *ACACIA RIDGE* | *1* |
| *MOWBRAY PARK* | *EAST BRISBANE* | *1* |
| *MT COOT-THA BOTANIC GARDEN* | *MOUNT COOT-THA* | *1* |
| *MT COOT-THA RESERVE* | *MOUNT COOT-THA* | *1* |
| *MURARRIE RECREATION GROUND* | *MURARRIE* | *1* |
| *MURARRIE ROAD PARK (NOS.315-327)* | *TINGALPA* | *1* |
| *MUSGRAVE PARK* | *SOUTH BRISBANE* | *1* |
| *NEAL MACROSSAN PLAYGROUND PARK* | *PADDINGTON* | *1* |
| *NEW FARM PARK* | *NEW FARM* | *1* |
| *NEWCOMB PARK* | *RIVERHILLS* | *1* |
| *NICHOLAS PARK* | *THE GAP* | *1* |
| *NORMAN BUCHAN PARK* | *BARDON* | *2* |
| *NORTHGATE RESERVE* | *NORTHGATE* | *1* |
| *NORTHSHORE RIVERSIDE PARK* | *HAMILTON* | *1* |
| *NOSWORTHY PARK* | *CORINDA* | *1* |
| *NUDGEE BEACH RESERVE* | *NUDGEE BEACH* | *1* |
| *NUNDAH MEMORIAL PARK* | *NUNDAH* | *1* |
| *OAKMAN PARK* | *TARINGA* | *1* |
| *ORLEIGH PARK* | *WEST END* | *1* |
| *ORSOVA ROAD PARK* | *YERONGA* | *1* |
| *OUTLOOK PARK* | *DUTTON PARK* | *1* |
| *PALM STREET PARK* | *KENMORE* | *1* |
| *PALMWOODS CRESCENT PARK* | *RUNCORN* | *1* |
| *PAMAROO CRESCENT PARK* | *JINDALEE* | *1* |
| *PARKINSON RECREATIONAL RESERVE* | *PARKINSON* | *1* |
| *PARKLAND STREET PARK* | *CALAMVALE* | *1* |
| *PASK FAMILY PARK* | *ROCHEDALE* | *1* |
| *PAT RAFTER PARK* | *CARSELDINE* | *1* |
| *PATERSON PARK* | *SUNNYBANK HILLS* | *1* |
| *PATREA STREET PARK* | *BANYO* | *1* |
| *PEGG’S PARK* | *MOOROOKA* | *1* |
| *PERRIN PARK* | *TOOWONG* | *1* |
| *PERRY PARK* | *BOWEN HILLS* | *1* |
| *PERTH STREET PARK* | *CAMP HILL* | *1* |
| *PINNACLE PLACE PARK* | *BELMONT* | *1* |
| *PINNIBAR STREET PARK* | *HEMMANT* | *1* |
| *PLAISTED PLACE PARK* | *NORTHGATE* | *1* |
| *PORTER’S PADDOCK PARK* | *TINGALPA* | *1* |
| *PRESTON ROAD PARK* | *CARINA* | *1* |
| *PRIMROSE PARK* | *WYNNUM WEST* | *1* |
| *PROGRESS PARK* | *NORTHGATE* | *1* |
| *PURTELL PARK* | *BARDON* | *1* |
| *QUARRY PARK* | *ALDERLEY* | *1* |
| *QUINN PARK* | *TOOWONG* | *1* |
| *RAEBURN STREET PARK* | *MANLY* | *1* |
| *RAESIDE STREET PARK* | *WESTLAKE* | *1* |
| *RAINBOW FOREST PARK* | *INDOOROOPILLY* | *1* |
| *RAINBOW LORIKEET PARK* | *ASPLEY* | *1* |
| *RAINWORTH PARK* | *BARDON* | *1* |
| *RAVEN STREET RESERVE* | *CHERMSIDE WEST* | *1* |
| *RAY LYNCH PARK* | *HOLLAND PARK* | *1* |
| *RAYMOND PARK* | *KANGAROO POINT* | *1* |
| *REAL PARK* | *EAST BRISBANE* | *1* |
| *REGENCY PLACE PARK (NO.16)* | *STRETTON* | *1* |
| *REGENT PARK* | *CANNON HILL* | *1* |
| *REGENTS CIRCUIT PARK* | *FOREST LAKE* | *1* |
| *RIVERSTON COURT PARK (ROAD RESERVE)* | *CARINDALE* | *1* |
| *ROBERTSON PARK* | *TARINGA* | *1* |
| *ROBINSON PARK (TINGALPA)* | *TINGALPA* | *1* |
| *ROCKS RIVERSIDE PARK* | *SEVENTEEN MILE ROCKS* | *1* |
| *RON GOELDNER PARK* | *YERONGA* | *1* |
| *RON WOOLLEY PLACE* | *MANSFIELD* | *1* |
| *RORY STREET PARK* | *RICHLANDS* | *1* |
| *ROSEBANK SQUARE* | *SALISBURY* | *1* |
| *ROWLINSON PARK* | *YERONGA* | *1* |
| *SALISBURY RECREATION RESERVE* | *SALISBURY* | *1* |
| *SANDGATE FORESHORES PARK* | *SANDGATE* | *2* |
| *SANDGATE SECOND LAGOON RESERVE* | *SANDGATE* | *3* |
| *SANDGATE THIRD LAGOON RESERVE* | *BRIGHTON* | *1* |
| *SANDY CREEK PARK* | *TARRAGINDI* | *1* |
| *SATELLITE STREET PARK* | *COORPAROO* | *1* |
| *SCURR PARK* | *MOUNT GRAVATT EAST* | *1* |
| *SEABROOK CIRCUIT PARK* | *WESTLAKE* | *1* |
| *SEDGLEY PARK* | *ALDERLEY* | *1* |
| *SETTLER STREET PARK* | *EIGHT MILE PLAINS* | *1* |
| *SETTLERS PARK* | *SINNAMON PARK* | *1* |
| *SEVILLE PARK* | *HOLLAND PARK* | *1* |
| *SHAFIK TORBEY PARK* | *DARRA* | *1* |
| *SHAFTESBURY STREET PARK* | *TARRAGINDI* | *1* |
| *SHAND STREET PARK (NO.131)* | *ENOGGERA* | *2* |
| *SHAW ESTATE PARK* | *WAVELL HEIGHTS* | *2* |
| *SHE-OAK PARK* | *TINGALPA* | *1* |
| *SHERIFF PARK* | *WAKERLEY* | *1* |
| *SHERWOOD ARBORETUM* | *SHERWOOD* | *1* |
| *SHIRLEY SESTER PARK* | *RUNCORN* | *1* |
| *SHOWGROUND PARK* | *NUDGEE* | *1* |
| *SILKYOAK CIRCUIT PARK* | *FITZGIBBON* | *1* |
| *SILVERTOP STREET PARK* | *KEPERRA* | *1* |
| *SIR JAMES KILLEN RESERVE* | *SUNNYBANK HILLS* | *1* |
| *SIR JOHN CHANDLER PARK* | *INDOOROOPILLY* | *1* |
| *SLEAFORD STREET PARK* | *CHAPEL HILL* | *1* |
| *SOLFERINO PLACE PARK* | *THE GAP* | *1* |
| *SONGBIRD WAY PARK* | *TAIGUM* | *1* |
| *SPRINGWATER PLACE PARK (NO.27)* | *ALGESTER* | *1* |
| *ST ANDREWS AVENUE PARK* | *FOREST LAKE* | *1* |
| *ST JOHNS AVENUE PARK (NOS.7-27)* | *ASHGROVE* | *1* |
| *ST LUCIA PLAYGROUND PARK* | *ST LUCIA* | *1* |
| *ST VINCENTS ROAD PARK* | *NUDGEE* | *1* |
| *STANLEY PARK* | *DEAGON* | *1* |
| *STANWORTH ROAD PARK* | *BOONDALL* | *1* |
| *STRAWBERRY FARM PARK* | *CARSELDINE* | *1* |
| *STRICKLAND TERRACE PARK* | *SHERWOOD* | *1* |
| *STUDLEY PARK* | *WAVELL HEIGHTS* | *1* |
| *SUMMIT STREET PARK* | *BELMONT* | *1* |
| *SUTLING STREET PARK* | *CHAPEL HILL* | *1* |
| *SVOBODA PARK* | *KURABY* | *1* |
| *SYMONS ROAD PARK* | *SUNNYBANK HILLS* | *1* |
| *TALISKER PLACE PARK* | *PARKINSON* | *1* |
| *TARANA STREET PARK* | *CAMP HILL* | *1* |
| *TAYLOR BRIDGE RESERVE* | *CHELMER* | *1* |
| *TENERIFFE PARK* | *TENERIFFE* | *2* |
| *TENTH AVENUE PARK* | *BRIGHTON* | *1* |
| *TERALBA PARK* | *EVERTON PARK* | *1* |
| *THE BEIRNE PARK* | *HENDRA* | *1* |
| *THE COMMON PARK* | *EAST BRISBANE* | *1* |
| *THE JOHNSON FLORA RESERVE* | *ROBERTSON* | *1* |
| *THE LAKE PARKLANDS* | *FOREST LAKE* | *3* |
| *THE RAFTING GROUND PARK* | *BROOKFIELD* | *1* |
| *THOMAS GRAY PARK* | *BALD HILLS* | *1* |
| *THOMAS McBRIDE PARK* | *PINKENBA* | *1* |
| *THREDBO PLACE PARK* | *BELMONT* | *1* |
| *THURSTON STREET PARK* | *TINGALPA* | *1* |
| *TIGRIS STREET PARK* | *RIVERHILLS* | *1* |
| *TILLACK PARK* | *MANSFIELD* | *1* |
| *TILQUIN STREET PARK* | *THE GAP* | *1* |
| *TINCHI TAMBA WETLANDS RESERVE* | *BALD HILLS* | *1* |
| *TOM O’NEIL PARK* | *OXLEY* | *2* |
| *TONKS STREET PARK* | *MOOROOKA* | *1* |
| *TOOWONG MEMORIAL PARK* | *TOOWONG* | *2* |
| *TORRENS CRESCENT PARK* | *WAKERLEY* | *1* |
| *TRAVORTEN DRIVE PARK* | *BRIDGEMAN DOWNS* | *1* |
| *TRISTANIA WAY PARK* | *MOUNT GRAVATT EAST* | *1* |
| *TURLEY STREET PARK* | *FAIRFIELD* | *1* |
| *UPPER KEDRON RECREATION RESERVE* | *UPPER KEDRON* | *1* |
| *USTINOV CRESCENT PARK* | *MCDOWALL* | *1* |
| *V.MCN.PEACHEY PARK* | *OXLEY* | *1* |
| *VALLELY STREET PARK* | *ANNERLEY* | *1* |
| *VERDELHO STREET PARK* | *EIGHT MILE PLAINS* | *1* |
| *VETERANS PARK* | *MOOROOKA* | *1* |
| *W. J. SCOTT PARK* | *HOLLAND PARK* | *1* |
| *WAKEFIELD PARK* | *BRIGHTON* | *1* |
| *WAKERLEY PARK (RUNCORN)* | *RUNCORN* | *1* |
| *WALLAROO WAY PARK* | *DOOLANDELLA* | *1* |
| *WALTON BRIDGE RESERVE* | *THE GAP* | *1* |
| *WARRIL PARKLAND* | *LARAPINTA* | *1* |
| *WATERFRONT PARK* | *NEWSTEAD* | *1* |
| *WENDON WAY PARK* | *BRIDGEMAN DOWNS* | *1* |
| *WENDY TURNBULL PARK* | *BRACKEN RIDGE* | *1* |
| *WESTAWAY PARK (MOGGILL)* | *MOGGILL* | *1* |
| *WESTBROOK PARK* | *TOOWONG* | *1* |
| *WESTON PLACE PARK* | *OXLEY* | *1* |
| *WHIPBIRD PARK* | *MACGREGOR* | *1* |
| *WHITES HILL RESERVE* | *CAMP HILL* | *1* |
| *WILHELMINE KRUGER PARK* | *NUDGEE* | *1* |
| *WILLARD STREET PARK* | *CARINA HEIGHTS* | *1* |
| *WILLIAMS PARK* | *RUNCORN* | *1* |
| *WILLMINGTON PARK* | *ALDERLEY* | *1* |
| *WILSTON RECREATION RESERVE* | *WILSTON* | *1* |
| *WINSTANLEY STREET PARK* | *CARINDALE* | *1* |
| *WIRILDA STREET PARK* | *MIDDLE PARK* | *1* |
| *WISHART COMMUNITY PARK* | *WISHART* | *2* |
| *WITTON BARRACKS PARK* | *INDOOROOPILLY* | *1* |
| *WITTONGA PARK* | *THE GAP* | *1* |
| *WOOD AVENUE PARK* | *CANNON HILL* | *1* |
| *WOOLCOCK PARK* | *RED HILL* | *1* |
| *WOOLLOONGABBA ROTARY PARK* | *EAST BRISBANE* | *1* |
| *YERONGA MEMORIAL PARK* | *YERONGA* | *1* |
| *YIMBUN PARK* | *SUNNYBANK* | *1* |
| ***GRAND TOTAL*** |  | ***457*** |

**Q16.** Please provide the locations of each Council playground without shade sails.

***A16.***

| ***Property Name*** | ***Suburb*** | ***Total*** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *7TH BRIGADE PARK* | *CHERMSIDE* | *2* |
| *ACACIA PARK* | *ST LUCIA* | *1* |
| *ADVANX STREET PARK* | *KENMORE HILLS* | *1* |
| *AKUNA STREET PARK* | *KENMORE* | *1* |
| *ALAN WILLING PLACE PARK* | *THE GAP* | *1* |
| *ALBANY CREEK ROADSIDE PARK* | *BRIDGEMAN DOWNS* | *1* |
| *ALBERT BISHOP PARK* | *NUNDAH* | *2* |
| *ALCHERINGA PLACE PARK* | *ROBERTSON* | *2* |
| *ALDREN STREET PARK* | *STAFFORD HEIGHTS* | *1* |
| *ALGESTER ROAD PARK (NO.515)* | *PARKINSON* | *1* |
| *ALLAMANDA STREET PARK* | *THE GAP* | *1* |
| *ALLARA PLACE PARK* | *EIGHT MILE PLAINS* | *1* |
| *ALLAWAH STREET PARK* | *YEERONGPILLY* | *1* |
| *AMARINA AVENUE PARK (ROAD RESERVE)* | *ASHGROVE* | *1* |
| *AMAZONS PLACE PARK* | *JINDALEE* | *1* |
| *AMBERJACK STREET PARK* | *MANLY WEST* | *1* |
| *AMELIA PARK* | *GORDON PARK* | *1* |
| *AMOTT STREET PARK* | *STAFFORD HEIGHTS* | *1* |
| *ANTRIM STREET PARK* | *ACACIA RIDGE* | *1* |
| *ANZAC PARK* | *MOUNT COOT-THA* | *1* |
| *APPIA AVENUE PARK* | *SEVEN HILLS* | *1* |
| *ARGYLE PLACE PARK* | *FOREST LAKE* | *1* |
| *ASCOT PARK* | *ASCOT* | *1* |
| *ASHGROVE SPORTSGROUND PARK* | *ASHGROVE* | *1* |
| *ASPLEY REST PARK* | *CARSELDINE* | *1* |
| *AUSTIN UHLMANN PARK* | *MORNINGSIDE* | *1* |
| *AVONDALE PARK* | *SINNAMON PARK* | *1* |
| *BACTON ROAD PARK* | *CHANDLER* | *1* |
| *BALLINDERRY STREET PARK* | *EVERTON PARK* | *1* |
| *BALMORAL PARK* | *MORNINGSIDE* | *1* |
| *BANCROFT PARK* | *KELVIN GROVE* | *1* |
| *BANGALOW STREET PARK (NO.192)* | *BRIDGEMAN DOWNS* | *1* |
| *BANKSIA VILLAGE PARK* | *FOREST LAKE* | *1* |
| *BARLOW PLACE PARK* | *BOONDALL* | *1* |
| *BARRAMUNDI STREET PARK* | *MANLY WEST* | *1* |
| *BARRETT STREET PARK (WATER RESERVE)* | *BRACKEN RIDGE* | *1* |
| *BARSTON PLACE PARK* | *COORPAROO* | *1* |
| *BARWIN STREET PARK* | *WAKERLEY* | *1* |
| *BECKETT ROAD PARK* | *MCDOWALL* | *1* |
| *BEDGOOD PARK* | *MILTON* | *1* |
| *BEHAN CRESCENT PARK* | *WAKERLEY* | *1* |
| *BEKKER PLACE PARK* | *KURABY* | *1* |
| *BELDALE PARK* | *SUNNYBANK HILLS* | *1* |
| *BELLEVUE TERRACE PARK* | *ST LUCIA* | *1* |
| *BENBEK CIRCUIT PARK* | *SUNNYBANK HILLS* | *1* |
| *BENDELL PARK* | *SUNNYBANK HILLS* | *1* |
| *BENJAMINA PLACE PARK* | *THE GAP* | *1* |
| *BENSARA PLACE PARK* | *CARSELDINE* | *1* |
| *BERKSHIRE CRESCENT PARK* | *WISHART* | *1* |
| *BERT WOLFE PARK* | *BALD HILLS* | *1* |
| *BERYL MCKENZIE PARK* | *HOLLAND PARK WEST* | *1* |
| *BIAMI YUMBA PARK* | *FIG TREE POCKET* | *1* |
| *BILL HEWITT RESERVE* | *CAMP HILL* | *1* |
| *BILL KEY LOCK PLACE PARK* | *INALA* | *1* |
| *BILL LAMOND PARK* | *LOTA* | *2* |
| *BILL MCFARLANE PARK* | *WAKERLEY* | *1* |
| *BILLABONG PLACE PARK* | *PARKINSON* | *2* |
| *BLISS STREET PARK (NO.39)* | *GAYTHORNE* | *1* |
| *BLUE GUM PARK* | *ZILLMERE* | *1* |
| *BLUE RANGE DRIVE PARK* | *ALGESTER* | *1* |
| *BOGNOR STREET PARK* | *TINGALPA* | *1* |
| *BOOKER PLACE PARK* | *BELLBOWRIE* | *1* |
| *BOOLOUMBA CRESCENT PARK* | *FOREST LAKE* | *1* |
| *BOONDALL PARK* | *BOONDALL* | *1* |
| *BOORABBIN PICNIC GROUND* | *WISHART* | *1* |
| *BORAGE PLACE PARK* | *CALAMVALE* | *1* |
| *BORDEAUX STREET PARK* | *EIGHT MILE PLAINS* | *1* |
| *BORELLA ROAD PARK* | *SUNNYBANK HILLS* | *1* |
| *BORONIA PARK* | *FOREST LAKE* | *1* |
| *BOWIE’S FLAT PARK* | *CAMP HILL* | *1* |
| *BOWMAN PARK* | *BARDON* | *2* |
| *BOYD TERRACE PARK* | *BROOKFIELD* | *1* |
| *BRADBURY PARK* | *KEDRON* | *1* |
| *BRADSHAW PARK* | *LUTWYCHE* | *1* |
| *BRADY BUSHLAND PARK* | *RUNCORN* | *1* |
| *BRAMPTON STREET PARK* | *EIGHT MILE PLAINS* | *1* |
| *BREENE COURT PARK* | *CARINDALE* | *1* |
| *BRETON STREET PARK* | *SUNNYBANK* | *1* |
| *BROADWATER PICNIC GROUND PARK* | *MANSFIELD* | *1* |
| *BROOKFIELD RECREATION RESERVE* | *BROOKFIELD* | *1* |
| *BROULA PARK* | *STAFFORD HEIGHTS* | *1* |
| *BRUNA STREET PARK* | *RUNCORN* | *1* |
| *BRUSH BOX PLACE PARK* | *HEATHWOOD* | *1* |
| *BUCKLEY STREET PARK* | *CARINA HEIGHTS* | *1* |
| *BUNDABAH DRIVE PARK* | *CALAMVALE* | *1* |
| *BUNDARA PARK* | *KEPERRA* | *1* |
| *BURANDA PLAYGROUND PARK* | *WOOLLOONGABBA* | *1* |
| *BURNIE BRAE PARK* | *CHERMSIDE* | *1* |
| *BUSHY PARK* | *SUNNYBANK HILLS* | *1* |
| *BYRON STREET PARK* | *RUNCORN* | *1* |
| *C. SLAUGHTER PARK* | *BRACKEN RIDGE* | *1* |
| *C.A.O SULLIVAN PARK* | *ACACIA RIDGE* | *1* |
| *C.B.MOTT PARK* | *HOLLAND PARK* | *2* |
| *C.J.GREENFIELD COMPLEX PARK* | *RICHLANDS* | *1* |
| *C.P.BOTTOMLEY PARK* | *NORMAN PARK* | *2* |
| *C.T.WHITE PARK* | *KANGAROO POINT* | *1* |
| *CAMELOT PARK* | *MIDDLE PARK* | *1* |
| *CANNON HILL BUSHLAND RESERVE* | *CANNON HILL* | *1* |
| *CAPITOL DRIVE PARK* | *JINDALEE* | *1* |
| *CARAVONICA COURT PARK* | *CALAMVALE* | *1* |
| *CARINYA STREET PARK* | *INDOOROOPILLY* | *1* |
| *CARL STREET PARK* | *WOOLLOONGABBA* | *1* |
| *CARNARVON WAY PARK* | *MURARRIE* | *1* |
| *CASCADE DRIVE PARK (NO.20)* | *FOREST LAKE* | *1* |
| *CATANIA STREET PARK* | *WISHART* | *1* |
| *CAVAY PLAYGROUND PARK* | *SUNNYBANK HILLS* | *1* |
| *CENTRAL STREET PARK* | *FOREST LAKE* | *1* |
| *CHERMSIDE HILLS RESERVE* | *MCDOWALL* | *1* |
| *CHESTER PARK RESERVE* | *MOUNT GRAVATT EAST* | *3* |
| *CHESTERFIELD CRESCENT PARK* | *KURABY* | *1* |
| *CHRISTIAN AND MARGARET NIELSEN PARK* | *THE GAP* | *1* |
| *CHURCHILL CIRCUIT PARK* | *BANYO* | *1* |
| *CICADA PARK* | *CHAPEL HILL* | *1* |
| *CLAREMONT PARADE PARK* | *FOREST LAKE* | *1* |
| *CLARINA STREET PARK* | *CHAPEL HILL* | *1* |
| *CLARK PARK* | *WINDSOR* | *1* |
| *CLEMBURY PLACE PARK* | *CALAMVALE* | *1* |
| *CLIVEDEN PARK* | *FIG TREE POCKET* | *1* |
| *COCKATOO PLACE PARK* | *ROCHEDALE* | *1* |
| *COL BENNET PARK* | *ALGESTER* | *1* |
| *COLMSLIE BEACH RESERVE* | *MURARRIE* | *1* |
| *COLMSLIE RESERVE* | *MORNINGSIDE* | *1* |
| *CONFERTA PLACE PARK* | *FOREST LAKE* | *1* |
| *CONONDALE PARK* | *EIGHT MILE PLAINS* | *2* |
| *CONSTELLATION WAY PARK* | *WYNNUM* | *1* |
| *COOLABAH CRESCENT PARK* | *BRIDGEMAN DOWNS* | *1* |
| *COORA STREET PARK* | *WISHART* | *1* |
| *CORBIE STREET PARK* | *ASHGROVE* | *1* |
| *CORMORANT STREET PARK* | *INALA* | *1* |
| *CORRAMULLING PARK* | *THE GAP* | *1* |
| *COWIE ROAD PARK* | *CARSELDINE* | *1* |
| *CRACKNELL’S GULLY PARK* | *TARRAGINDI* | *1* |
| *CRAWFORD ROAD PARK* | *WYNNUM WEST* | *1* |
| *CRESTHAVEN PARK* | *MANSFIELD* | *1* |
| *CRIBB ROAD PARK* | *CARINDALE* | *1* |
| *CROSBY PARK* | *ALBION* | *1* |
| *CROYDON ROAD PARK* | *PADDINGTON* | *1* |
| *CUBBERLA CREEK RESERVE* | *CHAPEL HILL* | *1* |
| *CYRIL SIMS PARK* | *CALAMVALE* | *1* |
| *DAINTREE DRIVE PARK (NO.65)* | *PARKINSON* | *1* |
| *DAMON ROAD PARK* | *LUTWYCHE* | *1* |
| *DASYURE PLACE PARK* | *WYNNUM WEST* | *1* |
| *DEAGON SPORTSGROUND PARK* | *DEAGON* | *1* |
| *DELAVAN STREET PARK* | *WISHART* | *1* |
| *DENNIS WEBB PARK* | *UPPER MOUNT GRAVATT* | *1* |
| *DENT PARK* | *NUDGEE* | *1* |
| *DEVITT PARK* | *COOPERS PLAINS* | *1* |
| *DEWBERRY CLOSE PARK* | *EIGHT MILE PLAINS* | *1* |
| *DIANTHUS STREET (SOUTH) PARK* | *WAKERLEY* | *1* |
| *DICKINSON CLOSE PARK* | *COOPERS PLAINS* | *1* |
| *DIDBROOK STREET PARK* | *ROBERTSON* | *1* |
| *DIOSMA STREET PARK* | *BELLBOWRIE* | *1* |
| *DITTMER PARK* | *UPPER MOUNT GRAVATT* | *1* |
| *DONNINGTON STREET PARK SOUTH* | *CARINDALE* | *1* |
| *DORRINGTON PARK* | *ASHGROVE* | *1* |
| *DOWNEY PARK* | *WINDSOR* | *1* |
| *DOWNFALL CREEK RESERVE* | *VIRGINIA* | *1* |
| *DUCIE STREET PARK* | *DARRA* | *1* |
| *DURELLA STREET PARK* | *DURACK* | *2* |
| *E. E. MCCASKIE OVAL* | *KELVIN GROVE* | *1* |
| *EARLSDON PLACE* | *CORINDA* | *1* |
| *EASTWOOD DRIVE PARK* | *MANSFIELD* | *1* |
| *EDEN ELM STREET PARK* | *CALAMVALE* | *1* |
| *EDENBROOKE PARK* | *SEVENTEEN MILE ROCKS* | *1* |
| *EDWARD KELK PARK* | *WYNNUM WEST* | *1* |
| *EDWARDS PARK* | *CARINDALE* | *2* |
| *EFFIE JOHNSON PARK* | *SUNNYBANK HILLS* | *1* |
| *EINBUNPIN LAGOON PARK* | *SANDGATE* | *1* |
| *EKIBIN MEMORIAL PARK* | *TARRAGINDI* | *1* |
| *EKIBIN PARK EAST* | *GREENSLOPES* | *1* |
| *ELINGA STREET PARK* | *JINDALEE* | *1* |
| *EPALA STREET PARK* | *CARINA* | *1* |
| *ERIC SIVELL PARK* | *COORPAROO* | *1* |
| *ERIDANUS STREET PARK* | *INALA* | *1* |
| *ESSEX ROAD PARK* | *INDOOROOPILLY* | *1* |
| *EUNGELLA TERRACE PARK* | *FOREST LAKE* | *2* |
| *EWAN PLACE PARK* | *BRACKEN RIDGE* | *1* |
| *F.R.CATERSON PARK* | *MANSFIELD* | *1* |
| *FAIRFIELD PARK* | *FAIRFIELD* | *1* |
| *FAULKNER PARK* | *GRACEVILLE* | *1* |
| *FEHLBERG PARK* | *FAIRFIELD* | *1* |
| *FELDT STREET PARK* | *MOOROOKA* | *1* |
| *FELSPAR STREET PARK* | *EIGHT MILE PLAINS* | *1* |
| *FERGUSON PARK (ENOGGERA)* | *ENOGGERA* | *1* |
| *FERNY GROVE PICNIC GROUND PARK* | *FERNY GROVE* | *1* |
| *FIDDLEWOOD CRESCENT PARK* | *BELLBOWRIE* | *1* |
| *FIFTEEN MILE CORNER* | *CORINDA* | *1* |
| *FIG TREE COMMON PARK* | *FIG TREE POCKET* | *1* |
| *FIG TREE POCKET RIVERSIDE RESERVE* | *FIG TREE POCKET* | *1* |
| *FINNEY ROAD PARK* | *INDOOROOPILLY* | *1* |
| *FISHERMAN’S BEND PARK* | *BALMORAL* | *1* |
| *FLAMETREE STREET PARK* | *BRIDGEMAN DOWNS* | *1* |
| *FLETCHER PARADE PARK (NOS.161-231)* | *BARDON* | *1* |
| *FLOCKTON STREET PARK* | *STAFFORD HEIGHTS* | *1* |
| *FLORENCE PLACE PARK* | *OXLEY* | *1* |
| *FLORIBUNDA PLACE PARK* | *SUNNYBANK HILLS* | *1* |
| *FORBES PARK* | *INALA* | *1* |
| *FOREST LAKE LIONS PARK* | *FOREST LAKE* | *1* |
| *FRANK ROBERTS PARK* | *WAVELL HEIGHTS* | *1* |
| *FRANK WATERS PARK* | *ASHGROVE* | *1* |
| *FREE STREET PARK* | *NEWMARKET* | *1* |
| *FREW PARK* | *MILTON* | *1* |
| *FRINTON STREET PARK* | *WISHART* | *1* |
| *GAGER STREET PARK* | *SUNNYBANK* | *1* |
| *GARTH WEBB PARK* | *CAMP HILL* | *1* |
| *GEOFF TOAKLEY PARK* | *MOUNT GRAVATT EAST* | *1* |
| *GIBBINS STREET PARK* | *SUNNYBANK HILLS* | *1* |
| *GIBSON CRESCENT PARK* | *BELLBOWRIE* | *1* |
| *GIBSON PARK* | *STAFFORD* | *1* |
| *GIBSON PLACE PARK* | *HOLLAND PARK WEST* | *1* |
| *GLADSTONE STREET PARK (NOS 48-58)* | *COORPAROO* | *1* |
| *GLENALWYN STREET PARK* | *HOLLAND PARK* | *1* |
| *GLINDEMANN PARK* | *HOLLAND PARK WEST* | *2* |
| *GLORIOUS WAY PARK* | *FOREST LAKE* | *1* |
| *GOLDBERG PLACE PARK* | *BRIDGEMAN DOWNS* | *1* |
| *GORDON CRESCENT PARK* | *WAKERLEY* | *1* |
| *GORDON THOMSON PARK* | *CHELMER* | *1* |
| *GORMAN CRINNEN PARK* | *RUNCORN* | *1* |
| *GOWER STREET PARK* | *TOOWONG* | *1* |
| *GRACEVILLE RIVERSIDE PARKLANDS* | *GRACEVILLE* | *1* |
| *GRAHAM LORD PARK* | *MOUNT GRAVATT EAST* | *1* |
| *GRANDVIEW PLACE PARK* | *CARINDALE* | *1* |
| *GRANGE FOREST PARK* | *GRANGE* | *2* |
| *GREENE PARK* | *WYNNUM* | *1* |
| *GREENHILLS PARK* | *ALDERLEY* | *1* |
| *GREVILLEA PARK* | *MANSFIELD* | *1* |
| *GREY GUM PARK* | *STAFFORD HEIGHTS* | *1* |
| *GRINSTEAD PARK* | *ALDERLEY* | *1* |
| *GUM NUT NOOK* | *MCDOWALL* | *1* |
| *GUYATT PARK* | *ST LUCIA* | *1* |
| *HABITAT PLACE SOUTH PARK* | *DREWVALE* | *1* |
| *HAIR PARK* | *RUNCORN* | *1* |
| *HALFORD PARK* | *GRANGE* | *1* |
| *HAMISH STREET PARK* | *CALAMVALE* | *1* |
| *HANCOCK PARK - PINE VILLAGE PARK* | *FOREST LAKE* | *2* |
| *HANLON PARK* | *GREENSLOPES* | *2* |
| *HARDCASTLE PARK* | *HAWTHORNE* | *1* |
| *HARRISON CRESCENT PARK* | *FOREST LAKE* | *1* |
| *HARRY KIRBY PARK* | *ASPLEY* | *1* |
| *HAUGHTON PARK* | *OXLEY* | *1* |
| *HAWERA CRESCENT PARK* | *ASPLEY* | *1* |
| *HAZEL STREET PARK* | *HEATHWOOD* | *1* |
| *HEATH STREET PARK* | *FOREST LAKE* | *1* |
| *HEATHWOOD PARK* | *HEATHWOOD* | *1* |
| *HEDLEY BARKER PARK* | *ASPLEY* | *1* |
| *HEERS PARK* | *MANLY WEST* | *1* |
| *HEFFERAN PARK* | *ANNERLEY* | *1* |
| *HEMMANT RECREATION RESERVE* | *HEMMANT* | *1* |
| *HERB HOLZ PARK* | *DEAGON* | *1* |
| *HERITAGE PARK* | *KARANA DOWNS* | *1* |
| *HICKEY PARK* | *STAFFORD* | *1* |
| *HINCHINBROOK CIRCUIT PARK* | *FOREST LAKE* | *1* |
| *HINKLER PARK* | *WINDSOR* | *1* |
| *HIVES PARK* | *SHERWOOD* | *1* |
| *HOCK DAVIS PARK* | *INALA* | *1* |
| *HOLDEN PARK* | *SUNNYBANK HILLS* | *1* |
| *HOLLYMAN PARK* | *RUNCORN* | *1* |
| *HOMESTEAD PARK* | *FOREST LAKE* | *1* |
| *HONEYWOOD STREET PARK* | *SUNNYBANK HILLS* | *1* |
| *HORIZON DRIVE PARK* | *MIDDLE PARK* | *1* |
| *HOYLAND STREET PARK (NO.10)* | *BALD HILLS* | *1* |
| *HUTCHISON PARK* | *SHORNCLIFFE* | *1* |
| *HUXTABLE PARK* | *CHERMSIDE WEST* | *3* |
| *ILLAWONG RESERVE* | *KARANA DOWNS* | *1* |
| *ILLOURA PARK* | *MANSFIELD* | *1* |
| *INVERNESS STREET PARK* | *UPPER KEDRON* | *1* |
| *IONA CLOSE PARK* | *BELMONT* | *1* |
| *IRIS PLACE PARK* | *FITZGIBBON* | *1* |
| *ISAAC BEST PARK* | *BRACKEN RIDGE* | *1* |
| *JACARANDA PLACE PARK* | *EIGHT MILE PLAINS* | *1* |
| *JACK COOK MEMORIAL PARK* | *TARINGA* | *1* |
| *JACK PYLE PARK* | *SUNNYBANK HILLS* | *1* |
| *JAGERA PARK* | *RUNCORN* | *1* |
| *JALOON STREET PARK* | *ASHGROVE* | *1* |
| *JAMBOREE LIONS COMMUNITY PARK* | *MIDDLE PARK* | *1* |
| *JAMES FRENEY PARK* | *ACACIA RIDGE* | *1* |
| *JEREMIAH O’TOOLE PARK* | *MORNINGSIDE* | *1* |
| *JILL STREET PARK* | *BRIGHTON* | *1* |
| *JOACHIM STREET PARK* | *HOLLAND PARK WEST* | *1* |
| *JOCK HING PARK* | *SUNNYBANK* | *1* |
| *JOE BRADFIELD CENTRE PARK* | *CARINA* | *2* |
| *JOHN FRENCH MEMORIAL PARK* | *GAYTHORNE* | *1* |
| *JOHN HENLEY PARK* | *ROBERTSON* | *1* |
| *JOHN TUCKER PARK* | *EVERTON PARK* | *1* |
| *JOHNSTON PARK* | *BULIMBA* | *1* |
| *JOY TAYLOR PARK* | *COOPERS PLAINS* | *1* |
| *JOYCE WHITE PARK* | *MORNINGSIDE* | *1* |
| *JUBILEE AVENUE PARK* | *FOREST LAKE* | *1* |
| *JUBILEE PARK* | *BARDON* | *1* |
| *KALINGA PARK* | *CLAYFIELD* | *2* |
| *KANUMBRA STREET PARK (ROAD RESERVE)* | *COORPAROO* | *1* |
| *KARAWATHA FOREST PARK* | *KARAWATHA* | *1* |
| *KARAWATHA FOREST SOUTH* | *DREWVALE* | *1* |
| *KATH BALLARD PARK* | *GEEBUNG* | *1* |
| *KEN VANSTONE PARK* | *ROCHEDALE* | *1* |
| *KENSINGTON AVENUE PARK* | *FOREST LAKE* | *1* |
| *KENTISH STREET PARK* | *MOUNT GRAVATT EAST* | *1* |
| *KEONG PARK* | *STAFFORD* | *1* |
| *KEPPEL STREET PARK* | *BOONDALL* | *1* |
| *KERRY ROAD PARK* | *ARCHERFIELD* | *1* |
| *KEV HOOPER MEMORIAL PARK* | *INALA* | *1* |
| *KEVIN WHITMEE PARK* | *TINGALPA* | *1* |
| *KIANAWAH ROAD PARK (NO.330)* | *WYNNUM WEST* | *1* |
| *KILLARNEY STREET PARK* | *FOREST LAKE* | *1* |
| *KING STREET PARK* | *KURABY* | *1* |
| *KINGFISHER DRIVE PARK* | *UPPER KEDRON* | *1* |
| *KINGFISHER PARK (EAST BRISBANE)* | *EAST BRISBANE* | *1* |
| *KINNEN STREET PARK* | *ENOGGERA* | *1* |
| *KITCHENER PARK* | *WYNNUM* | *1* |
| *KITTO COURT PARK* | *EVERTON PARK* | *1* |
| *KLUVER STREET LIONS PARK* | *BALD HILLS* | *1* |
| *KOOKABURRA CIRCUIT PARK* | *ROCHEDALE* | *1* |
| *KOORINGAL STREET PARK* | *TINGALPA* | *1* |
| *KURANDA STREET PARK* | *BALMORAL* | *1* |
| *LACEY ROAD PARK* | *CARSELDINE* | *1* |
| *LAGONDA STREET PARK* | *ANNERLEY* | *1* |
| *LAKEWOOD AVENUE PARK* | *PARKINSON* | *2* |
| *LANG STREET PARK* | *SUNNYBANK HILLS* | *1* |
| *LANGLEY AVENUE PARK* | *WILSTON* | *1* |
| *LANHAM CRESCENT PARK* | *NEWMARKET* | *1* |
| *LAUREL OAK PARK* | *ALGESTER* | *1* |
| *LAURINA CRESCENT* | *MCDOWALL* | *1* |
| *LEWIS PLACE PARK* | *MANLY WEST* | *1* |
| *LEX ORD PARK* | *ST LUCIA* | *1* |
| *LEXUS STREET PARK* | *RUNCORN* | *1* |
| *LILLIAN AVENUE PARK* | *SALISBURY* | *1* |
| *LINACRE STREET PARK* | *DURACK* | *1* |
| *LINDSAY EVANS MEMORIAL PARK* | *RUNCORN* | *1* |
| *LIQUIDAMBAR PLACE PARK* | *STRETTON* | *1* |
| *LIVESAY ROAD PARK* | *MOGGILL* | *1* |
| *LORIKEET PARK (ALGESTER)* | *ALGESTER* | *1* |
| *LUCOCK PLACE PARK* | *OXLEY* | *1* |
| *LYNELLE STREET PARK (LOT 300)* | *SUNNYBANK HILLS* | *1* |
| *LYTTON ROAD PARK* | *MORNINGSIDE* | *1* |
| *MACARANGA CRESCENT PARK* | *CARSELDINE* | *1* |
| *MACKENZIE PLACE PARK (ROAD RESERVE)* | *ANNERLEY* | *1* |
| *MACQUARIE WAY PARK (NO.123)* | *DREWVALE* | *1* |
| *MAIN AVENUE PARK* | *WAVELL HEIGHTS* | *1* |
| *MAJESTIC PARK* | *COORPAROO* | *2* |
| *MANN PARK* | *WINDSOR* | *1* |
| *MANSFIELD PARK (ROAD RESERVE)* | *INDOOROOPILLY* | *1* |
| *MARKHAM STREET PARK* | *DARRA* | *1* |
| *MARSHALL PARK* | *KELVIN GROVE* | *1* |
| *MARTINDALE STREET PARK* | *CHERMSIDE WEST* | *1* |
| *MARTY STREET PARK* | *WYNNUM WEST* | *1* |
| *MARY CHAYTER PARK* | *TARRAGINDI* | *1* |
| *MCEWAN PARK* | *INALA* | *1* |
| *MCGINN ROAD PARK (NO.130)* | *FERNY GROVE* | *1* |
| *MCKINLAY-DAVEY PARK* | *EIGHT MILE PLAINS* | *1* |
| *MCKINNON COURT PARK* | *UPPER KEDRON* | *1* |
| *MCPHERSON PARK* | *BRACKEN RIDGE* | *1* |
| *MEADOWLANDS PICNIC GROUND PARK* | *TINGALPA* | *1* |
| *MELROSE CLOSE PARK* | *CARINDALE* | *1* |
| *MELROSE PLACE PARK (NO.14)* | *RUNCORN* | *1* |
| *MERCER PARK* | *KEDRON* | *1* |
| *MERLINA STREET PARK* | *MANLY WEST* | *1* |
| *MERRI MERRI PARK* | *CHAPEL HILL* | *1* |
| *MIKADO STREET PARK* | *ASCOT* | *1* |
| *MILTON PARK* | *MILTON* | *1* |
| *MILTON URBAN COMMON* | *MILTON* | *1* |
| *MINDONA ROTARY PARK* | *WISHART* | *1* |
| *MINGOOLA PARK* | *MURARRIE* | *1* |
| *MIRRABOOKA ROAD PARK* | *ASHGROVE* | *1* |
| *MONASH ROAD PARK (ROAD RESERVE)* | *TARRAGINDI* | *1* |
| *MONOCEROS STREET PARK* | *INALA* | *1* |
| *MOONIE AVENUE PARK* | *MURARRIE* | *1* |
| *MOORA PARK* | *SHORNCLIFFE* | *1* |
| *MOORBELL STREET PARK* | *TARRAGINDI* | *1* |
| *MOORDALE STREET PARK* | *CHAPEL HILL* | *1* |
| *MOORE PARK* | *INDOOROOPILLY* | *1* |
| *MOORLANDS PARK* | *AUCHENFLOWER* | *1* |
| *MOOROOKA PLAYGROUND PARK* | *MOOROOKA* | *1* |
| *MOSES ADSETT PARK* | *THE GAP* | *1* |
| *MOSSVALE DRIVE PARK* | *WAKERLEY* | *1* |
| *MOVILLA STREET PARK* | *FERNY GROVE* | *1* |
| *MT COOT-THA RESERVE* | *MOUNT COOT-THA* | *2* |
| *MT CROSBY SPORTSGROUND* | *CHUWAR* | *1* |
| *MT GRAVATT OUTLOOK RESERVE* | *MOUNT GRAVATT* | *1* |
| *MT GRAVATT PARK* | *UPPER MOUNT GRAVATT* | *1* |
| *MULBEAM PARK* | *BOONDALL* | *1* |
| *MULGRAVE CRESCENT PARK* | *FOREST LAKE* | *1* |
| *MULLEY PARK* | *ELLEN GROVE* | *1* |
| *MUNGARIE STREET PARK (NO.46)* | *KEPERRA* | *1* |
| *MUNGO SCOTT PARK* | *ZILLMERE* | *1* |
| *MUR STREET PARK* | *FERNY GROVE* | *1* |
| *MURARRIE RECREATION GROUND* | *MURARRIE* | *1* |
| *NANKOOR STREET PARK (NO.9)* | *CHAPEL HILL* | *1* |
| *NARRUNG STREET PARK* | *MIDDLE PARK* | *1* |
| *NELL JONES OAM PARK* | *SANDGATE* | *1* |
| *NELSON PLACE PARK* | *NEWMARKET* | *1* |
| *NEW FARM PARK* | *NEW FARM* | *1* |
| *NEWSTEAD PARK* | *NEWSTEAD* | *1* |
| *NEWTON PLACE PARK* | *WACOL* | *1* |
| *NICHOLSON PLACE PARK* | *NORTHGATE* | *1* |
| *NILKERIE STREET PARK* | *CARSELDINE* | *1* |
| *NIXON PARK* | *OXLEY* | *1* |
| *NORM ROSE PARK* | *FAIRFIELD* | *1* |
| *NORMA CROKER PARK* | *ACACIA RIDGE* | *1* |
| *NORTH STREET PARK* | *KEDRON* | *1* |
| *NORTHEY STREET PARK* | *WINDSOR* | *1* |
| *NORTHSHORE RIVERSIDE PARK* | *HAMILTON* | *1* |
| *NORUP PARK* | *EIGHT MILE PLAINS* | *1* |
| *NUDGEE BEACH RESERVE* | *NUDGEE BEACH* | *1* |
| *NUDGEE WATERHOLE RESERVE* | *NUDGEE* | *2* |
| *OAKLEIGH PARK* | *ASHGROVE* | *1* |
| *O’CALLAGHAN PARK* | *ZILLMERE* | *2* |
| *OLEANDER CRESCENT PARK* | *DURACK* | *1* |
| *OLIVIA DRIVE PARK* | *CARINA HEIGHTS* | *1* |
| *O’REILLY STREET PARK* | *WAKERLEY* | *1* |
| *ORIEL PARK* | *ASCOT* | *1* |
| *ORLEIGH PARK* | *WEST END* | *2* |
| *OSPYA PARK* | *ELLEN GROVE* | *1* |
| *OXENHAM PARK* | *NUNDAH* | *1* |
| *OXFORD GROVE PARK* | *KEPERRA* | *1* |
| *OXLEY PLACE PARK* | *OXLEY* | *1* |
| *PACIFIC PARADE PARK* | *FOREST LAKE* | *1* |
| *PALLARA PARK* | *WILLAWONG* | *2* |
| *PARDALOTE PARK* | *ALGESTER* | *1* |
| *PATEN PARK* | *THE GAP* | *1* |
| *PATONGA STREET PARK* | *BANYO* | *1* |
| *PATTISON PARK* | *NORMAN PARK* | *1* |
| *PEDEN COURT PARK* | *CALAMVALE* | *1* |
| *PENHALIGON PARK* | *CHAPEL HILL* | *1* |
| *PENSON STREET PARK* | *STRETTON* | *1* |
| *PERKINS STREET PARK (LOT 403)* | *CALAMVALE* | *1* |
| *PETER GASKELL PARK* | *BRACKEN RIDGE* | *1* |
| *PHIL DENMAN PARK* | *JAMBOREE HEIGHTS* | *1* |
| *PHILIP VAUGHAN PARK* | *CARSELDINE* | *1* |
| *PHILLIPS PLACE PARK (WAKERLEY)* | *WAKERLEY* | *1* |
| *PICOT STREET PARK* | *KELVIN GROVE* | *1* |
| *PINDARI CRESCENT PARK* | *WISHART* | *1* |
| *PIONEER CRESCENT PARK* | *BELLBOWRIE* | *1* |
| *PIONEER DRIVE PARK* | *KURABY* | *1* |
| *PLATYPUS PARK* | *MOUNT CROSBY* | *1* |
| *POINCIANA PARK* | *MOOROOKA* | *1* |
| *POMONA STREET PARK* | *BRIGHTON* | *1* |
| *PORTADOWN PARK* | *SINNAMON PARK* | *1* |
| *PORTER’S PADDOCK PARK* | *TINGALPA* | *1* |
| *PRESIDENTIAL PARK* | *STRETTON* | *1* |
| *PRINCESS STREET PARK (NOS.5-21)* | *FAIRFIELD* | *1* |
| *PRINCESS STREET PARK (NOS.8-18)* | *BRIGHTON* | *1* |
| *PRINCETON PLACE PARK* | *FOREST LAKE* | *1* |
| *QUANDONG PARK* | *ASHGROVE* | *1* |
| *QUEEN BESS STREET PARK* | *WOOLLOONGABBA* | *1* |
| *RASEY PARK* | *HERSTON* | *1* |
| *RAVEN STREET RESERVE* | *CHERMSIDE WEST* | *1* |
| *REMBRANDT STREET PARK* | *CARINA* | *1* |
| *RIKKI BAILEY PARK* | *OXLEY* | *1* |
| *RILATT PARK* | *WAVELL HEIGHTS* | *1* |
| *RIVERVIEW FARM PARK* | *WESTLAKE* | *1* |
| *ROBERT MITCHELL PARK* | *SUNNYBANK HILLS* | *1* |
| *ROBINSON PARK (FAIRFIELD)* | *FAIRFIELD* | *1* |
| *ROBTRISH STREET PARK* | *MANLY WEST* | *1* |
| *RON WARD PARK* | *THE GAP* | *1* |
| *ROSEMOUNT PARK* | *SINNAMON PARK* | *1* |
| *ROSS PARK* | *NUNDAH* | *1* |
| *ROTARY INTERNATIONAL PRESIDENTS PARK* | *ST LUCIA* | *1* |
| *ROTARY PARK* | *HEATHWOOD* | *1* |
| *ROY HARVEY PARK* | *STAFFORD* | *1* |
| *SABOT COURT PARK* | *MANLY WEST* | *1* |
| *SALISBURY RECREATION RESERVE* | *SALISBURY* | *1* |
| *SANANANDA STREET PARK* | *DARRA* | *1* |
| *SANCTUARY DRIVE PARK* | *FOREST LAKE* | *1* |
| *SANDGATE FORESHORES PARK* | *SANDGATE* | *1* |
| *SAPSFORD STREET PARK* | *NORTHGATE* | *1* |
| *SCEPTRE ROW PARK* | *BARDON* | *1* |
| *SCHOONER CIRCUIT PARK* | *MANLY WEST* | *1* |
| *SEAFERN STREET PARK* | *SUNNYBANK HILLS* | *1* |
| *SEDGEMOOR STREET PARK* | *STAFFORD HEIGHTS* | *1* |
| *SEILS PARK* | *ASHGROVE* | *1* |
| *SELKIRK CRESCENT PARK* | *UPPER KEDRON* | *1* |
| *SENDEN CRESCENT PARK* | *MANLY WEST* | *1* |
| *SETTLERS VILLAGE PARK* | *FOREST LAKE* | *2* |
| *SEVEN HILLS BUSHLAND RESERVE* | *CARINA* | *1* |
| *SHAW ESTATE PARK* | *WAVELL HEIGHTS* | *2* |
| *SHEEHY STREET PARK* | *STAFFORD* | *1* |
| *SHEFFIELD PLACE PARK* | *KURABY* | *1* |
| *SHEOAK STREET PARK* | *MIDDLE PARK* | *1* |
| *SHERWOOD ARBORETUM* | *SHERWOOD* | *1* |
| *SHILLINGTON PLACE PARK* | *WISHART* | *1* |
| *SID LODER PARK* | *MITCHELTON* | *1* |
| *SKYLINE DRIVE PARK* | *KHOLO* | *1* |
| *SOAMES STREET PARK* | *EVERTON PARK* | *1* |
| *SOLAR PARK* | *BRIDGEMAN DOWNS* | *1* |
| *SPENCER PARK* | *NEWMARKET* | *1* |
| *SPRINGFIELD CRESCENT PARK* | *PARKINSON* | *1* |
| *SPRINGWATER PLACE PARK (NO.27)* | *ALGESTER* | *1* |
| *ST HELENS ROAD PARK (NOS.16-70)* | *MITCHELTON* | *1* |
| *ST JAMES STREET PARK* | *FOREST LAKE* | *1* |
| *STANLEY DAY PARK* | *BALD HILLS* | *1* |
| *STANNARD ROAD PARK* | *MANLY WEST* | *1* |
| *STRAWBERRY FIELDS PLACE* | *ROCHEDALE* | *1* |
| *STRETTON COMMUNITY PARK* | *STRETTON* | *2* |
| *STRETTON WETLAND RESERVE* | *STRETTON* | *1* |
| *STUBBS STREET PARK* | *BRIGHTON* | *1* |
| *STUMERS ROAD RESERVE* | *MOUNT CROSBY* | *1* |
| *SUMMERGLEN PARK* | *EIGHT MILE PLAINS* | *1* |
| *SUMMIT STREET PARK* | *BELMONT* | *1* |
| *SUNFLOWER CRESCENT PARK* | *CALAMVALE* | *1* |
| *SUNNY COURT PARK* | *SUNNYBANK HILLS* | *1* |
| *SUNSET PLACE PARK* | *MCDOWALL* | *1* |
| *SWEETAPPLE PLACE PARK* | *MANLY WEST* | *1* |
| *TAIGUM PLACE PARK* | *TAIGUM* | *1* |
| *TALLTREES STREET PARK* | *BRACKEN RIDGE* | *1* |
| *TARINGA PLAYGROUND PARK* | *TARINGA* | *1* |
| *TARRAGINDI RECREATION RESERVE* | *TARRAGINDI* | *1* |
| *TARRAGON PLACE PARK* | *FOREST LAKE* | *1* |
| *TAYLOR PLACE PARK* | *MACKENZIE* | *1* |
| *TENNESSEE AVENUE PARK* | *MOOROOKA* | *1* |
| *TENNIS AVENUE PARK* | *ASHGROVE* | *1* |
| *TERALBA PARK* | *EVERTON PARK* | *1* |
| *TERRACE STREET PARK* | *SPRING HILL* | *1* |
| *THE AVENUE PARK* | *SUNNYBANK HILLS* | *1* |
| *THE LAKE PARKLANDS* | *FOREST LAKE* | *2* |
| *THE WOODS MEMORIAL PLAYGROUND PARK* | *ASHGROVE* | *1* |
| *THOMPSON ESTATE RESERVE* | *GREENSLOPES* | *1* |
| *THORNYCROFT STREET PARK* | *TARRAGINDI* | *1* |
| *THRUSH STREET PARK* | *INALA* | *1* |
| *TILLACK PARK* | *MANSFIELD* | *1* |
| *TIMBERLAND PARK* | *ALGESTER* | *1* |
| *TOLLANA PLACE PARK* | *INALA* | *2* |
| *TOOHEY FOREST PARK* | *NATHAN* | *2* |
| *TORWOOD PARK* | *AUCHENFLOWER* | *1* |
| *TOULBY STREET PARK* | *MANLY WEST* | *1* |
| *TRANQUIL PARK* | *SUNNYBANK HILLS* | *1* |
| *TREVALLY CRESENT PARK* | *MANLY WEST* | *1* |
| *TREVALLYN PLACE PARK* | *UPPER KEDRON* | *1* |
| *TRISTANIA CLOSE PARK* | *CALAMVALE* | *1* |
| *TRUNDLE PARK* | *COORPAROO* | *1* |
| *TRYON STREET PARK* | *UPPER MOUNT GRAVATT* | *1* |
| *TUCKETT STREET PARK* | *KENMORE HILLS* | *1* |
| *TURQUOISE PLACE PARK* | *WAVELL HEIGHTS* | *1* |
| *TURRBAL PLACE PARK* | *ASPLEY* | *1* |
| *UPTON STREET PARK* | *NUNDAH* | *1* |
| *VALARIA AVENUE PARK* | *SEVEN HILLS* | *1* |
| *VECTIS STREET PARK* | *NORMAN PARK* | *1* |
| *VENETIA STREET PARK* | *STAFFORD HEIGHTS* | *1* |
| *VIC LUCAS PARK* | *BULIMBA* | *1* |
| *VICTOR GRENNING PARK* | *ZILLMERE* | *1* |
| *VICTORIA PARK* | *HERSTON* | *1* |
| *VOGLER PARK* | *SUNNYBANK HILLS* | *1* |
| *VOYAGER DRIVE PARK* | *KURABY* | *1* |
| *W. A. JOLLY PARK* | *LUTWYCHE* | *1* |
| *WAKERLEY PARK* | *WAKERLEY* | *1* |
| *WALLABY PARADE PARK* | *ROCHEDALE* | *1* |
| *WALLAROO WAY COMMUNITY PARK* | *DOOLANDELLA* | *1* |
| *WALLAROO WAY PARK* | *DOOLANDELLA* | *1* |
| *WALLY TATE PARK* | *KURABY* | *1* |
| *WALTON BRIDGE RESERVE* | *THE GAP* | *1* |
| *WAMINDA STREET PARK* | *MORNINGSIDE* | *1* |
| *WARBURTON PARK* | *VIRGINIA* | *1* |
| *WARREN RITCHIE MEMORIAL COMPLEX PARK* | *ELLEN GROVE* | *1* |
| *WATERLINE CRESCENT PARK* | *BULIMBA* | *1* |
| *WATHEROO PLACE PARK* | *PARKINSON* | *1* |
| *WELLS PLACE PARK* | *HEMMANT* | *1* |
| *WEMBLEY PARK* | *COORPAROO* | *2* |
| *WEST PLACE PARK* | *VIRGINIA* | *1* |
| *WESTERN OUTLOOK PARK* | *ROBERTSON* | *1* |
| *WHATMORE STREET PARK* | *CARINA HEIGHTS* | *1* |
| *WHIPBIRD PARK* | *MACGREGOR* | *1* |
| *WHISTLER PLACE PARK* | *PALLARA* | *1* |
| *WHITES ROAD PARK* | *CHERMSIDE WEST* | *1* |
| *WILLIAMINA PARK* | *EAST BRISBANE* | *1* |
| *WILLS STREET PARK* | *COORPAROO* | *1* |
| *WILSON PARK* | *NORMAN PARK* | *1* |
| *WILSTON PLACE PARK* | *WILSTON* | *1* |
| *WINDSOR PARK* | *WINDSOR* | *1* |
| *WISHART COMMUNITY PARK* | *WISHART* | *1* |
| *WOLLOMBI PARK* | *HOLLAND PARK* | *1* |
| *WOLSTON CREEK BUSHLAND RESERVE* | *RIVERHILLS* | *1* |
| *WOOD AVENUE PARK* | *CANNON HILL* | *1* |
| *WOODLAND AVENUE PARK* | *FOREST LAKE* | *1* |
| *WYANDRA CRESCENT PARK* | *MURARRIE* | *1* |
| *WYNNUM MEMORIAL PARK* | *WYNNUM* | *1* |
| *WYNNUM WADING POOL PARK* | *WYNNUM* | *2* |
| *WYNOLA PARK* | *COORPAROO* | *1* |
| *YERONGA MEMORIAL PARK* | *YERONGA* | *1* |
| *YEWLEAF PLACE PARK* | *CALAMVALE* | *1* |
| *YOWOGGERA PARK* | *ALBION* | *1* |
| *YUCCA COURT PARK* | *EIGHT MILE PLAINS* | *1* |
| *YUGARAPUL PARK* | *SUNNYBANK* | *2* |
| ***GRAND TOTAL*** |  | ***619*** |

**Q17.** Please provide the locations of any Council playgrounds with more than 10 new trees planted in the last financial year.

***A17.*** *Council officers advise we are unable to collate the list in a timeframe that accords with the Meetings Local Law 2001.*

**RISING OF COUNCIL: 8.44pm.**

**PRESENTED: and CONFIRMED**

**CHAIR**

**Council officers in attendance:**

Victor Tan (Council and Committee Coordinator)

Ashleigh O’Brien (Senior Council and Committee Officer)

Jeanette Clarkson (A/Council and Committee Officer)

Kristy Ramirez (A/Council and Committee Officer)

Billy Peers (Personal Support Officer to the Lord Mayor and Council Orderly)