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## PRESENT:

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

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

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

## OPENING OF MEETING:

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

Chair: Please be seated.

Are there any apologies?

## APOLOGY:

**139/2021-22**

An apology was submitted on behalf of Councillors Lisa ATWOOD, Fiona CUNNINGHAM, Fiona HAMMOND and Angela OWEN, and they were granted a leave of absence from the meeting on the motion of Councillor Sandy LANDERS, seconded by Councillor WINES.

Councillor CASSIDY: I have an apology, Chair.

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY.

**140/2021-22**

An apology was submitted on behalf of Councillor Kara Cook, and she was granted a leave of absence from the meeting on the motion of Councillor CASSIDY, seconded by Councillor STRUNK.

Chair: Confirmation of Minutes, please.

## MINUTES:

**141/2021-22**

The Minutes of the 4659 meeting of Council held on 31 August 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 WINES.

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

Chair: Councillors, we have two public participants today. I’d like first to call on Mrs Jacque Lachmund who will address the Chamber on Challenge DV supporting Council’s Domestic and Family Violence strategy.

Thank you. Jacque, you have five minutes. The time starts when you start speaking.

**Mrs Jacque Lachmund – Challenge DV supporting Council’s Domestic and Family Violence Strategy**

Mrs Jacque Lachmund: Thank you. Mr Chair, LORD MAYOR, and Councillors, my name is Jacque Lachmund. I am the CEO (Chief Executive Officer) of Challenge DV, formerly known as Australia’s CEO Challenge. We are a not-for-profit organisation that was established here in Brisbane over 20 years ago, as part of the Safe Cities Initiative, led by the then Lord Mayor, Jim Soorley. The Lord Mayor came to the view that women cannot be safe in our city if they are not safe in their own homes. He collaborated with the Office for Women on ways to address our silent epidemic, domestic and family violence. From this initiative came our organisation.

Since then, we have partnered with businesses, government agencies, and the frontline service sector to educate and raise awareness of domestic and family violence. Fast forward to 2015, where the Queensland Government appointed Quentin Bryce to head a Domestic and Family Violence Taskforce, which came back with our landmark Not Now, Not Ever report, 140 recommendations. Recommendation 48 named our organisation as a workplace that could support workplaces to support their people.

Challenge DV applauds the Brisbane City Council’s ongoing commitment to support the right of all people to live free from violence, abuse, or intimidation, as articulated in your Domestic and Family Violence strategy. As you know from your strategy, one in four women and one in 13 men over the age of 15 are affected by domestic and family violence. We understand, from your most recent Annual Report from Council, that you employ approximately 8,000 staff. This means that it is likely that many hundreds of Council’s own employees are affected each day by domestic and family violence.

We know that violence and abuse at home impacts your people at work, that the injuries, continuous electronic surveillance, and constant interruptions impact on the workplace. They also reduce productivity, absenteeism, presenteeism, which may be costing ratepayers more and decreasing the quality of services, but work can also be a safe place, a place for those living with violence. We know that a supportive workplace can make a real difference and have a huge impact. We want to help.

Challenge DV would like to work with the Brisbane City Council. We offer formal training to leaders, managers, and supervisors, to recognise the signs of domestic and family violence, to be able to respond appropriately and link that person into support services. We also provide training which can be made available to all employees, so they can better understand the issue, to understand the impacts on people living with domestic and family violence.

For over 20 years, we have been facilitating workplace training programs. These programs have stood the test of time, have been continuously improved on best practice, on evidence, and they work. The Queensland Government has made our online Recognise, Respond and Refer training available to every employee across the State, as well as implementing the Not Now, Not Ever recommendations. We have been supporting their leaders and staff for the past three years, and the Government has just signed a new contract with us to continue that important work to support their people.

We believe that we can make a real difference in the lives of Council’s employees who are impacted by violence and abuse in their lives. We want to help you keep them safe. I am a survivor of domestic and family violence, and my workplace helped me get out. I’m from New Zealand, don’t hold it against me. I came to this beautiful State on a plane that was paid for by my workplace. I now live free from violence and I want to help you help your people. I’d like to thank you for your time and I am happy to answer any questions.

Chair: Thank you, Mrs Lachmund.

The LORD MAYOR or Councillor HUANG, would you like to respond, please?

**Response by Councillor Steven HUANG, A/Civic Cabinet Chair of the Finance and City Governance Committee**

Councillor HUANG: Thank you, Mr Chair. Good afternoon. I am Councillor Steven HUANG. I am the Acting Chair for Finance and City Governance. I would like to—on behalf of the LORD MAYOR and Brisbane City Council, I would like to thank you for coming to the Council Chamber today to address the Councillors. In Brisbane, as a Council, we support the rights of all people to live in a family or domestic relationship free from violence, abuse, or intimidation.

Domestic and family violence occurs behind closed doors, but we know the impacts are felt beyond home, in our community and in the workplace. As an employer of thousands of people, we are all too aware that this is an issue for Council employees. In May last year, we adopted our Domestic and Family Violence strategy. While the State Government is the lead agency for domestic and family violence responses and prevention, as a Council, there are things we can do to educate and support the community, just like you do, on top of our important responsibilities to our staff.

Council provides up-to-date information and resources on our intranet to support employees affected by domestic and family violence. We also offer paid domestic and family violence leave, and have a 24/7 confidential support service. I am pleased to advise that the Schrinner Council is finalising work on new support services and resources for staff, which will be available soon, and we have partnered with experts in the field to deliver these, and of course, we’ll be thinking of you. We are looking to not only support employees affected by domestic and family violence, but also to educate and train colleagues who may be bystanders to domestic and family violence impacts and manage with team members who are impacted.

Our strategy also identifies ways that Council can continue to raise awareness and partner with big organisations such as yours to support and educate the community. In this year’s budget, the Schrinner Council committed $100,000 a year over the next three years for the Women’s Legal Service to support a hotline service, offering free information and referrals to women reaching out for help. I want to acknowledge your great work. It will bring much-needed awareness to the role that employers can and must play in supporting victims and educating staff.

Councillor Fiona CUNNINGHAM is the Civic Cabinet Chair for Finance and City Governance, and she has a strong interest in domestic and family violence prevention, being a Director of the Small Steps 4 Hannah Foundation. Councillor CUNNINGHAM has asked me to extend an invitation for you to meet with her in the near future, when she returns from her maternity leave, to discuss this matter further. So, thank you once again for your time today and your presentation. We all appreciate it. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor HUANG.

Thank you, Mrs Lachmund. Thank you very much for coming in.

Councillors, we have a second speaker standing outside who’ll be with us shortly, Mr Dan Crawford, who will address the Chamber on off-road cycling in Brisbane.

Thank you, Mr Crawford. You have five minutes to speak. The time starts when you start speaking. Thank you very much.

**Mr Dan Crawford – Brisbane Off-Road Riders Alliance and off-road cycling in Brisbane**

Mr Dan Crawford: Thank you. Mr Chair, LORD MAYOR, and Councillors. Thank you for the opportunity to highlight the community support for off-road cycling. I’m the President of the Brisbane Off-Road Riders Alliance (BORRA), and for me, going off-road is about riding on a skinny dirt trail in the bush. I ride a mountain bike, but however you do it, riding a bike in the bush is a connection to nature and it’s fitness by stealth. Just as much as I like the riding, I love the banter and I love a chat over coffee or a beer after the ride. It’s not about sport for me, it’s about recreation and it’s good for my mental health, but that’s just my story.

The Brisbane Off-Road Riders Alliance is a volunteer group dedicated to advocacy. We’re just two years old and formed to give enthusiasts a voice. Based on a study by cycling’s peak body in Australia last year, we estimate that there are more than 40,000 mountain bikers in the Brisbane local area. Mountain biking has seen steady growth for many years, and even with the current boom, participation rates are still relatively low by global standards, sitting at just over one per cent versus four per cent globally. So, given our perfect weather that we have here in Brisbane, we would expect to see growth for decades to come.

We know we’ve got a good handle on what mountain bikers want, based on an extensive survey that we did last year. We know that you’re on the right track with off-road cycling. Developing a strategy to meet the needs of this growing community is the best way to protect Brisbane’s natural environment. We know that most riders are looking for better access to natural areas to ride in. We strongly support better access to the areas highlighted in the Council’s draft strategy to afford residents access on a scale similar to that provided by hundreds of sporting ovals, parks, and kickabout areas all over Brisbane.

Currently, mountain bikers must pack up their bikes into their car and drive to a single location that has been the only official home for mountain biking in Brisbane since 2003, Mt Coot-tha. Our kids don’t have that option. We want more trails close to home so that we can drive less, and our kids need those options so they can help understand and respect the values provided by their local environment. We acknowledge that there are people within some community groups that believe that outdoor recreation is at odds with conservation. It isn’t. There is a global recognition that riding on well-designed single track can have the same impact as a walking trail.

There are people in these groups that misrepresent the issue and want mountain bikers locked out. This approach hasn’t worked for the last 20 years and has led to some residents, often kids on school holidays, building informal trails, forcing Council to use its precious resources to close down those unauthorised trails. Whilst this small group of people have taken a strong and emotional anti‑mountain biker stance, this has not been healthy for building good community relations, nor responding to the demands for recreational opportunities.

I want you to know that the public support for mountain biking in natural areas is bigger than that. The community wants to be active and healthy in this clean and green city. We want a sustainable, connected network of trails in natural areas. We know this because when the draft strategy was opened for feedback, you got 2,000 positive responses in that feedback. We know this because in 2019, over 6,500 people signed a petition to save informal trails, and those are still open, and thank you, because that is keeping kids and families off dangerous fire roads.

We know this because we ran our own petition supporting the draft strategy. After your official feedback line had closed, we picked up 1,700 people from all over Brisbane supporting your strategy. We know that support for mountain biking in the greater community is huge, and it’s widespread, and it continues to grow. Like most other sports, mountain biking is not a single discipline. Cross-country mountain biking has been an Olympic sport since Atlanta in 1996, but we also have the UCI (Union Cycliste Internationale) World Cup Downhill, the Enduro World Series, and Global Marathon class events, just to name a few. Our kids see Aussie riders like Tracey Hannah and Jack Moir on the global stage, and that inspires them to get outside and give it a go.

Chair: Mr Crawford, I’m sorry, your time has expired. Thank you very much for addressing Council.

Response—Councillor DAVIS, would you like to respond to Mr Crawford?

Mr Dan Crawford: Thank you.

Chair: Thank you.

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

Councillor DAVIS: Oh well, thank you very much, Mr Chair, and thank you very much, Mr Crawford, for coming in and speaking to Council, and I want to thank you for sharing your time with me recently and two other members of BORRA to talk about your membership and your vision for finding a balance between conservation and recreation in terms of moving forward with off-road cycling opportunities for enthusiasts like yourself. It gave me the opportunity to learn more about your sport, and it’s not just about your particular discipline.

As you said, there are off-road cycling opportunities that not necessarily go through our bushland areas, but simply provide—whether it’s a pump track or other such opportunities for people to get out and about and enjoy our great outdoor Brisbane lifestyle. As you are aware—and I thank you very much for your support of this Council moving forward with an off-road cycling draft strategy, and, as discussed the other day we’re still looking at the feedback because we did get a lot of feedback about the strategy. Our aim is to really provide those low‑impact opportunities that provide riders like yourself and those members of BORRA to be able to get out and enjoy our bushland without impacting negatively on the environment.

Now, we have over 2,100 parks in Brisbane and 130 in that estate are bushland reserves. As you mentioned, Mt Coot-tha is the place that we have focused on to provide opportunities for off-road cycling. As I mentioned to you the other day, as part of the $500,000 investment that was announced during the budget, we’re looking at Mt Coot-tha particularly for opportunities for riders and members of BORRA to be able to participate. We really need to map that out to be able to look and identify possible opportunities in the future, but it is all about finding a balance between our natural areas and those that wish to participate in off-road cycling activities.

We’re working very hard to try and get that balance, and I look forward to working with you in the future and BORRA, and hearing more about what you have planned. It was exciting to learn about your plans for the D’Aguilar Ranges and creating more tourist-based off-road cycling opportunities, and whilst I understand that that’s outside of the Brisbane City Council area, I know that you see that there are some synergies between what we can do localised here in Brisbane and what happens, you know, outside in other areas of Queensland. So, thank you very much for your time. We are working very hard and we should have something to provide in the not-so-distant future. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor DAVIS.

Thank you, Mr Crawford. Thanks for coming in.

## QUESTION TIME:

Chair: Councillors, we move on to Question Time.

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

Councillor LANDERS.

**Question 1**

Councillor LANDERS: Thank you, Chair. My question is to the LORD MAYOR. LORD MAYOR, this morning you unveiled a new small business roundtable, aimed at delivering opportunities to our local businesses and also assisting the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games. Can you outline for the Chamber what it means for the businesses of Brisbane?

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair, and through you to Councillor LANDERS for the question. When I became LORD MAYOR, I made my vision and priorities for Brisbane very clear. Firstly, record investment in our parks and greenspace network, not only big projects like Victoria Park, but record investment out in the suburbs, on suburban park upgrades, on securing greenspace, creating new greenspace, and making improvements to our park and recreational sports network.

Secondly, delivering city-changing infrastructure for our city, projects not only like the Brisbane Metro or the green bridges, but investment right across the suburbs of Brisbane in suburban road upgrades, in new bike paths, and a whole range of infrastructure opportunities. This year, we’re delivering on that with a record investment in infrastructure, over $1 billion allocated towards building infrastructure this year alone, but also in making sure that Brisbane was Australia’s most small business friendly Council, small business friendly city, because small business is the backbone of our economy.

It’s where the jobs growth is and it’s certainly a great driver of the future of our city and the creation of jobs for Brisbane residents. Coming from a small business background myself with my family’s small business, I know that small business is an entity that relies very little on the Government for what it does, but the Government can get in its way. So we need to make sure that we’re getting out of the way wherever possible, so that these jobs can be created, so that small business can be successful, and hopefully, that small business turns into medium-size business or even big business.

We’ve seen some wonderful examples of that here in our city. Just the other day, I had the opportunity to catch up with Don, the founder of Domino’s, and Domino’s is probably the biggest Brisbane-based business at this point in time. Domino’s controls not only the Domino’s franchise in Brisbane and Australia, but also in other parts of the world, as well, based right here in Brisbane. Obviously, we have companies like Flight Centre doing it tough at the moment, but also a Brisbane-based business.

We like to see those success stories. We like to see those businesses coming here or starting here and then thriving. So, when we faced the challenges of the pandemic in recent times, established with the support of my team and Councillor Adam ALLAN, the Economic Recovery Taskforce, and that taskforce resulted in a whole range of initiatives and recommendations which were rolled out, many—in fact, over 40 of them have been implemented and some great outcomes. The support for our business and our local business has been incredible, and also the initiatives like our local procurement policy, which sees almost $1 billion in one year invested through local business.

What we want to do now is take that Economic Recovery Taskforce and replace it with a permanent roundtable, a small business roundtable that will continue on permanently to make sure that we are cementing our position as Australia’s most small business friendly Council. This is important for our city. It’s important for anyone that wants a job in our city in the future, and so I’m pleased to announce that today, we have created this new small business roundtable.

The roundtable will be chaired by the DEPUTY MAYOR in her new portfolio, but will include representatives from Retail First—one of the large shopping centre owners in our city—the Restaurant and Catering Association, the National Retail Association, Family Business Australia, the Chamber of Commerce and Industry Queensland, the Triffid and Fortitude Music Hall owner and investor John Collins, Business South Bank. Also, we’ll have our brand-new CEO of Brisbane Economic Development Agency, Anthony Ryan, which was also announced today, as well. Anthony, who is currently the CEO of Youngcare, will come across and work with us in the Brisbane Economic Development Agency.

We’ll also have Nimrod Klayman, who is the Head of Ventures from the University of Queensland (UQ). We’ll have the Women’s Network of Australia represented. We’ll have Glen Richards, who is well-known as a local entrepreneur and Shark Tank participant. We’ll have the Queensland Hotels Association represented, and of course, we’ll have internal representation from our Business Hub, from our Economic Development Manager, and from John Cowie, as well.

Now, I hear some interjections from the Leader of the Opposition, whose association with small business—

Chair: LORD MAYOR—

LORD MAYOR: —involves imposing small business through the union movement.

Chair: LORD MAYOR, your time has expired.

Further questions?

Councillor CUMMING.

**Question 2**

Councillor CUMMING: Sorry, my apologies, Chair. My question is to the Chair of the Community, Arts and Nighttime Economy Committee, Councillor Vicki HOWARD. Councillor HOWARD, it’s been revealed that multiple allegations made by your LNP Administration against the Coorparoo Cricket Club were actually false. Despite this, the Cricket Club is still without a home after Easts Rugby Union evicted them. Instead of mediating the situation, you sided with the head lessee, Easts Rugby.

Now, it’s been proven by the CEO that Coorparoo Cricket Club and Labor Councillors were telling the truth and LNP Councillors were telling mistruths. Will you publicly and unreservedly apologise to the Coorparoo Cricket Club and all of its members for getting it so wrong?

Chair: Councillor HOWARD.

Councillor HOWARD: Well, thank you, Mr Chair, and through you, thank Councillor CUMMING for the question so that I can correct perhaps some of the rhetoric that he has just expressed. Mr Chair, through you, across the city, Brisbane City Council works with and empowers hundreds of sports clubs and community groups that call our public spaces home. Sporting clubs are vital to our community and we are committed to ensuring that they have places to call home.

In this regard, Easts Rugby Union Club currently operates as the head tenant at C.P. Bottomley Park and has been actively involved in this site for more than 50 years. As head lessee, Easts has had an informal agreement with Coorparoo Cricket Club, which has ceased to be in place. The conclusion of an informal arrangement between Coorparoo Cricket Club and Easts Rugby Club is a matter for those parties.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Please, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor HOWARD: I am trying to answer the question, Mr Chair. Through an internal investigation conducted by Council and highlighted within correspondence sent to the Coorparoo Cricket Club, some information passed on to me via a briefing note dated 19 June 2020 was not accurate.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor HOWARD: Within the same correspondence, Brisbane City Council CEO, Colin Jensen, has passed on his apologies on behalf of Council, to which I have since added my apologies, formally on ABC Radio, yesterday afternoon. That being said, this investigation had highlighted that certain actions taken by the Coorparoo Cricket Club were undertaken inappropriately. While I accept that errors and assumptions were made by Council, it does not materially change Council’s justification to allow Easts Rugby Union to exercise their right not to extend Coorparoo Cricket Club’s use of the ground.

Coorparoo Cricket Club declined our offer of a seasonal licence at nearby Balmoral Sports Park, but they should stay in touch with Council for opportunity to apply for future sites that might become available. Thank you, Mr Chair.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor HOWARD.

Further questions?

Councillor MACKAY.

**Question 3**

Councillor MACKAY: Thanks, Chair. My question is to the Chair for City Standards, Councillor MARX. Councillor MARX, we heard last week of the State Government enforcing a ban on single-use plastics from September. Can you update the Chamber on the background of this policy, including the Schrinner Council’s position?

Chair: Councillor MARX.

Councillor MARX: Yes, thank you, Chair, and thank you for the question, Councillor MACKAY. It’s great to see the State Government joining the fight against single-use plastics and following in the footsteps of the Schrinner Council who brought to this Chamber a ban on the single-use plastics wrap during election times. Single-use plastics present great risks to our waterways, wildlife and natural environment.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor MARX: Looking after Brisbane’s environment—

Chair: Councillor STRUNK.

Councillor MARX: —is up to all of us and it is a responsibility that those of us in this Chamber share with the residents of Brisbane. Mr Chair, this Administration leads by example, so in 2018, we moved to protect the health of our waterways and reduce our use of single-use plastics. We banned the use of single-use plastic drinking straws and phased out helium balloons and single-use plastic bottles in all Council operations. This mandate became Council’s single-use plastic reduction project.

We also started by banning single-use plastic items at the source. Single-use plastic straws and bottles were removed from Council stores, vending machines in the Council buildings, bus depots and other Council sites. Instead, we now offer sustainable alternatives such as water refill stations and reusable bottles, helping to reduce our community’s reliance on single-use plastics. We also banned straws and bottles, as well as helium balloons, at Council-run events such as LORD MAYOR’s civic events and the Green Heart Fair. What is clear is that a multi‑pronged approach is necessary to create a clean and green city, and this Council is tackling waste with a range of initiatives, ranging from education programs to community composting hubs.

Council’s 104 or more litter initiative also aims to keep litter and plastic waste out of our streets, bushlands and waterways. This initiative encourages everyone to make a small contribution by picking up two pieces of litter per week every week of the year to make a big difference in keeping Brisbane clean and our city litter free. We’ve also made it easier to recycle and reduce the waste sent to landfill. Food waste is the largest volume of avoidable material that goes into Brisbane landfill every year, representing about one quarter of the average rubbish bin’s contents from Brisbane homes.

Brisbane City Council’s Love Food Hate Waste program also aims to reduce the volume of food waste going into Brisbane’s landfill each year. This movement encourages people to change household recycling habits for the better by educating residents of the sustainability benefits and how they can save money at the same time. Everybody here should know in this Chamber that we do now provide Council residents with the capacity to recycle additional material by waiving the $30 fee for residents, ordering the larger, yellow recycling bins, as well as the green waste recycling bins.

Finally, as a carbon-neutral Council, we are also helping Brisbane residents reduce their household carbon emissions from home energy use, transport, and waste. By 2031, we are aiming to reduce household carbon emissions in Brisbane by 50%, and residents can use the Brisbane Carbon Challenge calculator to estimate their household’s carbon footprint and receive tips on how to reduce it and save money at the same time. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor MARX.

Further questions?

Councillor JOHNSTON.

**Question 4**

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, thank you, Mr Chairman. My question is to the LORD MAYOR. LORD MAYOR, in the 2020-21 budget, $124,000 was allocated for a refuge on Honour Avenue at Chelmer outside Chelmer rail station, which was rolled over into the 2021-22 budget, based on advice I was provided by Council’s traffic engineering team. There was inadequate funding in last year’s budget to undertake the construction works due to some complexities. Have you now fully funded this project, this important refuge outside Chelmer rail station, in this year’s budget?

Chair: Thank you, Councillor.

LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you for the question, Mr Chair. Through you to Councillor JOHNSTON, as I was pointing out before, we’ve funded over $1 billion of infrastructure works and capital works this year, so there’s a lot of things that are being done. I will investigate this particular project for you and provide you notice, either through the Chair or in writing.

Chair: Thank you, LORD MAYOR.

Further questions?

Councillor TOOMEY.

**Question 5**

Councillor TOOMEY: Thank you, Chair. My question is to the Chair of City Planning and Suburban Renewal, Councillor ALLAN. Councillor ALLAN, earlier this year, Council proposed an update of the Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP) for Brisbane, which recently completed community consultation. Can you update the Chamber on the feedback received in relation to this plan and highlight some of the projects that the Schrinner Council have included to ensure we continue to deliver better suburbs?

Chair: Thank you.

Councillor ALLAN.

Councillor ALLAN: Thank you, Mr Chair, and thank you to Councillor TOOMEY for the question. As the Councillor for The Gap, you have witnessed, obviously, significant change and growth in your area over the years, and obviously, the city as a whole is growing and we need to respond to that growth with investment in infrastructure. I’m conscious, in the context of The Gabba Ward—sorry, The Gap Ward, you’ve had a bridge replacement at Gresham Street in recent times.

So, Mr Chair, while it’s one thing to plan for infrastructure, it’s another thing to prioritise the investment to where it is most needed, and then to get on and deliver it. Only the Schrinner Council has a demonstrated track record of vision, forward planning, and delivery of infrastructure, which will be even more relevant in light of the opportunity presented by the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games.

Mr Chair, on 25 May 2021, the interim amendment to the *Brisbane City Plan 2014*, Local Government Infrastructure Plan (Interim LTIP amendment 1a),and the tailored amendment to *Brisbane City Plan 2014*, the long-term infrastructure plan, which is the LTIP amendment, were presented to Council. It’s no secret that Brisbane is a growing city. The State’s mandate to accommodate 386,000 additional residents by 2041 and an equivalent 188,000 new dwellings certainly puts into perspective the challenge we face, and ensures that we have to have good planning and infrastructure delivery. The amendments across both of these packages were open to the community for consultation from 31 May to 27 June 2021.

Mr Chair, we took this consultation very, very seriously and continued to accept submissions for a week after the consultation closed. A total of 429 submissions were received across both the LGIP and LTIP items. The fact that the majority of submissions were in support of the amendments indicates broad community support and that our plans are responding to the needs and priorities across the city. As many Councillors would be aware, the LGIP is a delivery focused blueprint which helps guide the growth of the city. It’s a 10-year plan with a delivery timeframe from 2016 to 2026. The total commitment is $2.1 billion.

The proposed interim LGIP amendment was undertaken to ensure that the plans are kept current, and relevant, and are sequenced appropriately to respond to the actual growth of our city. To this point, I’d like to acknowledge the 219 submissions that were received in support of the inclusion of roads, pathways, parks and stormwater infrastructure in Pallara. This rapidly growing area, in Councillor OWEN’s ward, is recognised by Council as needing support with the required infrastructure a priority.

To meet this priority, we are revising the LGIP budget with an increase of nearly $28 million. The LGIP total plan expenditure will increase, or is increasing, by $146.7 million over the 10-year period, and this is partially due to the inclusion of a small number of high value projects, including the Victoria Park upgrade, the Howard Smith Wharves ferry terminal, and obviously, the two green bridges.

By undertaking these amendments, Council is ensuring its delivery program is clear and transparent for the community, and that Council’s investment is prioritised on the importance of delivering trunk infrastructure that supports the existing and future residents of the city. The LGIP will support our plans to invest in essential city infrastructure, continue to create exciting leisure and lifestyle opportunities, and continue to create a city that is enviable and has a fantastic, multimodal transport system. We will ensure funding capacity to deliver the infrastructure that makes Brisbane a liveable, vibrant, accessible, and sustainable city.

Chair, this Schrinner Council is more than just words. We are all about planning, delivering, and ensuring that we generate outcomes for our residents. This cannot be evidenced better than with our commitment to transformative city-shaping infrastructure to service a growing city, and obviously, I’ve mentioned projects such as the green bridges and Victoria Park. By ensuring an up to date, fit‑for‑purpose LGIP, you can be assured that the Brisbane of tomorrow will be even better than the Brisbane of today. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor ALLAN.

Further questions?

Councillor GRIFFITHS.

**Question 6**

Councillor GRIFFITHS: Yes, thank you, Mr Chair. I direct my question to the Chair of the Olympic and Paralympic Games Committee, Councillor Krista ADAMS. Councillor ADAMS, in the lead-up to the Olympics, this Council needs to be pouring money and support into our community, supporting clubs to grow the athletes of tomorrow, but when it came to a dispute between two sporting clubs sharing a Council‑owned facility, Easts Rugby Union and Coorparoo Cricket Club, you sided with the rugby club and the cricket club was evicted. You are a club patron of Easts Rugby. You also made false remarks about the Coorparoo Cricket Club publicly in this Chamber.

When debating a petition, you stated, and I quote, you know why they don’t want to sublease, because they’ll have to contribute to the water and maintenance and works on the fields, which they have not done for years. That was disproven by a report recently conducted by the CEO, who confirmed that payments for water usage, equipment and ground maintenance was made by Coorparoo Cricket Club over the previous four financial years. Councillor ADAMS, will you publicly and unreservedly apologise to Coorparoo Cricket Club and its members?

Chair: Councillor ADAMS.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair, and under the Meetings Local Law, this is not within my portfolio.

Chair: Thank you.

Further questions?

Councillor HUTTON.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor HUTTON: Thank you, Chair.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order, Mr Chairman.

Chair: I’ve already taken your question.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, Mr Chairman. Councillor ADAMS is the Councillor responsible for the Olympics. Rugby is an Olympic sport. Our sporting facilities are part of and have been referred to on numerous occasions by all Chairs—the reason we’re involved in the Olympics is to upgrade sporting facilities. So could you—

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, I’ve heard your point of order.

Councillor JOHNSTON: I know that Councillor ADAMS has said that she doesn’t believe it’s in her portfolio. I believe that it is and I’m asking you as the Chair to make a ruling.

Chair: My ruling is that there was a very not sustained link between the question and Councillor ADAMS’ portfolio.

Further questions?

Councillor HUTTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order, Mr Chairman.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Just to be clear, then, will you rule out in future as a matter of consistency any references to community sporting as part of the Olympics portfolio?

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, questions about community sporting should be directed to the relevant Chair.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Righto.

Chair: Thank you.

Councillor HUTTON.

**Question 7**

Councillor HUTTON: Thank you, Chair. My question is to the Chair of Economic Development and the Brisbane 2032 Olympics and Paralympic Games, Councillor ADAMS. DEPUTY MAYOR, tomorrow a special edition of the Asia Pacific Cities Summit (APCS) and Mayor’s Forum will kick off in Brisbane. Could you please update the Chamber on what’s in store for the summit this year, including what it means for Brisbane?

Chair: Councillor ADAMS.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair, and I thank Councillor HUTTON for the question that is very clearly within my portfolio, which is the Asia Pacific Cities Summit for economic development and also, in Council, supporting the LORD MAYOR with international relations and multicultural affairs. For over two decades now, the Asia Pacific Cities Summit has provided countless opportunities for connection for learning and relationships, building those between both civic and business leaders. Given the strict international border restrictions, this year’s special edition will see the summit delivered in both a physical and virtual setting.

Feedback from the team is that there were dozens of cities who wanted to come to Brisbane in person, but obviously, those restrictions and, of course, mandatory quarantine made it just not a feasible option at this time. In total, there are over 72 cities participating this year, with a clear majority being international cities, a key indicator that APCS is a truly global event. Included in these 72 cities, there are close to 600 delegates who have indicated and registered for the summit, 400 of those being physical and the rest being virtual.

I am looking forward to—hoping that we get the numbers of those that are saying they are going to come in person turning up over the next few days as we continue to see low numbers of community transmission in Queensland. Virtual attendance is not as good as being in person, obviously, but it is a testament to the value of APCS that people are committed to that virtual participation, as well. It will run over three days at the Exhibition Centre and City Hall and delegates will be hearing from a range of speakers and panellists, bringing their own insight and experience to either growing their business or running their city.

For major public transport projects, cutting edge technology in the space of electric cars, and other major city-shaping projects in the Asia Pacific, delegates are sure to meet the business opportunities they need for years ahead. While there will be hundreds of people to meet, ideas to share, and businesses to partner with, the theme of this year’s summit is redefining cities through opportunities and challenges. Throughout the three days, panels will focus on four key things, being healthy cities, vibrant cities, connected cities, and intelligent cities.

I’ll be pleased to join the LORD MAYOR, Councillor MURPHY, and Councillor ALLAN in speaking on a variety of these topics in the Big Picture sessions, but more importantly, our keynote speakers will be very, very interesting. Martin O’Malley, the 61st Governor of Maryland, former Mayor of Baltimore, and a former Presidential candidate, will be speaking on Thursday morning, and three‑time Paralympic gold medallist Kurt Fearnley, AO (Order of Australia), who’s presenting on Friday. Delegates will hear from Mayors of South East Queensland as they share their insights to the foundational role they played in securing the 2032 Games.

The formalities will begin tomorrow with the Mayor’s Forum at City Hall and will depart to the rooftop of the Flight Centre building in South Bank, where all of the physical delegates will attend and meet each other to kick off the rest of the week’s activities. Hosting the APCS is an important role for Brisbane, as it helps further advance our city’s business interests in the Asia Pacific. It’s an integral part of Council’s economic development agenda, and from past summits, we know that it is working.

The business opportunities that can be harnessed for medium-sized businesses wishing to break the overseas market is incredibly strong, and the success stories to come out of APCS grow every year. I’d like to thank the entire team within International Relations department upstairs in City Hall who have worked incredibly hard to pull this together, and of course, Ashley, as well, the convenor of the convention, who have done—at Carillon Conventions, who have done a fantastic job, as well. It’s about the networking opportunities that can only be done in person that we’re looking forward to over the next few days.

We had the presentation today at the Business Hub during Committee, and we’ve seen there what networking can do for businesses, just to talk, to share, to share experiences of the last 18 months, and to take opportunities that we can see for the next—not 18 months, but 18 years as we go on this green and gold pathway in Brisbane. As we know, the insights into how many people looked up where Brisbane was after we were announced as an Olympic City was enormous, and we’ve gone above and beyond this time to ensure that anybody who is joining us virtually or physically will be able to take opportunities of that, as well.

I’m looking forward to spending the next three days with all of the delegates, virtual or physical, who will have their focus on Brisbane as we work to grow their business and build our city and expand everybody’s networks. Thank you, Mr Chair.

Chair: Thank you, DEPUTY MAYOR.

Further questions?

Councillor CASSIDY.

**Question 8**

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks, Chair. My question is to the LORD MAYOR. LORD MAYOR, in the previous two questions, Labor Councillors have outlined the wrongdoings of your LNP Administration when it comes to the dispute between Easts Rugby Union and Coorparoo Cricket Club. A number of your LNP Councillors made false remarks about the Cricket Club, and now they are without a home. LORD MAYOR, on behalf of your LNP Administration, will you unreservedly and publicly apologise to the Coorparoo Cricket Club and its members?

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair, and through you to Councillor CASSIDY for the question. Look, there’s been a lot said about the dispute between these two sporting groups in this place, and I do actually remember very clearly—because I was actually thinking at the time, am I really hearing him say this—Councillor Peter CUMMING getting up here and saying, look, we know that the Coorparoo Cricket Club has probably done the wrong thing here—

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —and so this is his statement in this place on the *Hansard*. Now look, I haven’t contributed to this commentary. I don’t remember talking too much about this matter myself, but what I can say is this, in relation to your question, and I now table this letter. I have written to the President of the club today to add my apology to the CEO’s apology, also to Councillor HOWARD’s apology, and I am apologising on behalf of everyone in this organisation. So, I’ll table this document now. I have apologised unreservedly, and I am sorry that inaccurate information was used and provided to us, and that that was repeated. There is no excuse for that, and I apologise unreservedly.

Chair: Thank you, LORD MAYOR.

Further questions?

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor ADERMANN—

Councillor CASSIDY: Point of order.

Chair: Councillor ADERMANN.

Councillor CASSIDY: Point of order, Chair.

Councillor ADERMANN: Thank you. Thank you, Chair—

Councillor CASSIDY: Chair, point of order.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor CASSIDY.

**142/2021-22**

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

*That Brisbane City Council commits to returning the Coorparoo Cricket Club to their home of 25 years at C.P. Bottomley Park or finding them a new facility with a turf wicket in the Coorparoo area.*

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

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair. The Coorparoo Cricket Club, as we know, were kicked out of their home in a bitter dispute with the head lessee, Easts Rugby Union. Now, this LNP Council should have mediated that dispute, but instead actively sided with Easts Rugby Union Club and supported that eviction. The Coorparoo Cricket Club has been in existence for 50 years and has called C.P. Bottomley Park home for the last 25 years.

Now, this is urgent today, Chair, because the Coorparoo Cricket Club is without a home and without support from this incompetent and biased LNP Council. It is urgent because we now know the truth, Chair. We now know that the LNP Councillors in here were not being truthful when they sided with that lessee. It is urgent, Chair, because LNP Councillors were found to have made false remarks publicly in this Chamber. Now, we should be supporting community clubs, Chair, not turning them against each other and making false allegations about them in a public setting.

LNP Councillors have brought this whole Council into disrepute when it comes to sporting clubs in our community. Now, the LNP Administration here, Chair, should have been bending over backwards doing everything it could to help the Coorparoo Cricket Club, and they should be begging for forgiveness for the way in which they have treated this volunteer-run community club. It is no way to treat a community club. Labor Councillors will not stand for it, and this Council must today commit to finding the Coorparoo Cricket Club a new, suitable home with a turf wicket or return them to C.P. Bottomley Park.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor CASSIDY.

I’ll now put the 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 Peter CUMMING, Steve GRIFFITHS, Charles STRUNK, Jonathan SRI and Nicole JOHNSTON.

NOES: 16 - The Right Honourable, the LORD MAYOR, Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER, 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, Ryan MURPHY, Steven TOOMEY and Andrew WINES.

Chair: We now move on with the remainder of the agenda, which is Question Time.

Councillor ADERMANN.

**Question 9**

Councillor ADERMANN: Thank you, Chair. My question is to the Acting Chair for Finance and City Governance, Councillor HUANG. Severe weather is a natural part of living in Brisbane’s subtropical climate. How is the Schrinner Council preparing for storm season and how can residents prepare their families and properties?

Chair: Thank you.

Councillor HUANG, who needs to get to the microphone.

Councillor HUANG: Thank you, Mr Chair, and I thank Councillor ADERMANN for your question. Well, this is the first Council meeting of spring, so with the winter behind us, we already need to turn our focus to severe weather season. Severe weather is a natural part of Brisbane’s life. Brisbane’s storm season traditionally runs from September to March, but severe weather can strike at any time, so it is important for the residents to make sure they are well prepared for all hazards. Our message to residents is that being prepared today can save you tomorrow.

The Bureau of Meteorology is forecasting a wetter than average spring across much of the country, with a 75% chance of above medium rainfall for Brisbane. This could lead to more thunderstorms, flash flooding, and localised flooding. The Schrinner Council takes its responsibilities seriously when it comes to protecting our citizens. I recently had the privilege of attending a disaster management exercise at the Hibiscus Sports Complex in my ward, which had a presentation this morning, and I’ll do a report at next week’s Council meeting.

A mock evacuation centre was set up as part of the exercise led by City Resilience. Council worked alongside multiple agencies, including the Red Cross, police, the SES (State Emergency Service), Salvation Army, St John’s Ambulance, Save the Children, and the Tzu Chi Foundation. The exercise was based on a scenario in which a severe weather event resulted in residents being displaced from their homes. The evacuation centre exercise also factored in COVIDSafe practices, something which realistically will be a big factor in our emergency response for some time.

Running exercises like this is an important part of making sure we can respond in times of crisis as effectively, safely and efficiently as possible. The setup of the evacuation hall was carefully planned and executed, and I congratulate the officers and volunteers involved. Hopefully, we don’t have to use the evacuation centre at Hibiscus any time soon, but residents can be assured that the Schrinner Council is doing everything we can to be prepared in protecting you.

Ahead of this year’s severe weather season, we are asking residents to take simple steps to prepare, things like signing up to Council’s free early warning alert service, cleaning leaf litter from their roof, gutter, and downpipes, and packing away loose items around the house, knowing the flood and bushfire risk and having an evacuation plan and emergency kit that includes items such as first aid supplies, non-perishable food and water, a torch, candles, portable radio, and car charger for your mobile phone.

This financial year, the Schrinner Council is investing over $5 million in the Brisbane City SES Unit, including $1.8 million in SES accommodation upgrades and maintenance. We had 14 SES groups training out of eight SES depots, located across the city, and one depot on Moreton Island. The Schrinner Council provides the Brisbane SES with 42 dedicated vehicles, which are deployed across nine SES depots, as well as a fleet of 11 flood boats and trailers. We encourage all residents to join us in getting ready for severe weather by preparing their homes and businesses, and ensuring they have an emergency plan in place. Together, we can weather the storm. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor HUANG.

Further questions?

Councillor CASSIDY.

**Question 10**

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair. My question is to Councillor HUANG, the Acting Chair of the Finance Committee. In the E&C (Establishment and Coordination Committee) report tabled today, in the Annual Report, it outlines Councillors’ remuneration, and there it shows that the LORD MAYOR continues to receive his $100,000 allowance. Councillor HUANG, in the spirit of transparency, do you have any idea what the LORD MAYOR spends his $100,000 allowance on?

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor HUANG: I’d like to thank Councillor CASSIDY for your question, and I can assure you that the Schrinner Council is the most transparent Council in Australia.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor HUANG: Yes, if you look at the Annual Report today, you’ll see it is that thick, and—

Chair: Please allow the answer to be heard in silence.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor HUANG: Can you imagine this happening in the Soorley years?

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor HUANG: Or Tim Quinn years? There wasn’t even Hansard back in those times. Yes, so the successive Lord Mayors Newman, Quirk, and Schrinner, has made this Council more and more transparent—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor HUANG: —to make sure that the residents of Brisbane see how Brisbane City Council is working for them and there’s nothing to hide. So, you’ve—we campaigned on this issue and the people of Brisbane have made a decision to re-elect the Schrinner Council. We’ve—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor HUANG: So, look, I understand it’s a political question, and I honestly think that if there is nothing better for the Labor to ask, the people of Brisbane will be very disappointed, and I’m sure that come—in 2024, people will choose to re-elect Schrinner Council again, and I’m sure you’ll be asking the same question in 2024, anyway.

Councillor GRIFFITHS: Point of order, Mr Chair.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor HUANG: Yes, if you’re still around—

Councillor GRIFFITHS: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order to Councillor GRIFFITHS.

Councillor HUANG: Look—

Chair: Point of order.

Councillor GRIFFITHS: I would ask you to bring the Chairperson back. That’s not answering the question. The question is very clear. How is that money spent?

Chair: I think the Chair has just about completed his response.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Thank you.

Councillor HUANG: Look, the report’s been audited by QAO (Queensland Audit Office) and, I mean, you know, if QAO approves how the money is spent, thus that’s how the money is spent. So look, it has nothing to hide. It is apparent. Like, are you going to tell us how you spend your Opposition Leader’s allowances?

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor HUANG: Yes. Like, yes, I remember you were saying you were going to donate it. Have you done that?

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor STRUNK: Point of order, Mr Chair.

Councillor HUANG: So, look—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor STRUNK: Point of order.

Councillor HUANG: So it’s been—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor STRUNK: Point of order, Mr Chair.

Councillor HUANG: —audited by QAO.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor STRUNK: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor STRUNK.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor STRUNK: Yes, Chair. I believe it’s not really properly—it’s not proper that the Chair ask the Leader of the Opposition a question. He’s supposed to be answering—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor STRUNK: He’s supposed to be answering our question.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor STRUNK: He’s not supposed to be posing a question.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor STRUNK. I believe the Chair is responding to the question asked.

Councillor HUANG: That’s right, yes. I think I said, I remember you were saying. I didn’t ask you, have you done that?

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor HUANG: So yes, by the way, so look, I mean, there are so much items contained in this great report, and if that’s the only thing you can come up with, I think that’s pretty pathetic, yes. So—but look, it’s been audited by Queensland Auditors Office, and there’s nothing to hide. This is the most transparent Council in Australia, and yes, if you have—honestly, I look forward to you asking something more substantial than just how the LORD MAYOR is spending the money where it’s legally provided and audited by Queensland Auditors Office.

Chair: Thank you.

Further questions?

Councillor MATIC.

**Question 11**

Councillor MATIC: Thanks, Mr Chair. I prefer listening to Councillor HUANG. That was an excellent speech. Well done. Mr Chairman, my question is to the Chair of Transport, Councillor MURPHY. Councillor MURPHY, the Schrinner Council’s new green bridges will make it even easier to get around our city on foot, by bike or scooter, or by connecting with public transport. Can you please give an update on the progress of our first two bridges?

Councillor MURPHY: Thanks very much—

Chair: Councillor MURPHY. Sorry, away you go.

Councillor MURPHY: Thank you very much, Chair, and thank you to Councillor MATIC for the question. It’d be hard to top that response from Councillor HUANG, though, but it’s very exciting for me to talk about the Green Bridges Program. It always is, Chair. Many Councillors will have seen the announcement from the LORD MAYOR last week where we showed exactly how the Kangaroo Point Green Bridge will be built. It’s a fantastic animation, and it goes to the heart of the matter, that this project will not just be an iconic landmark for our city. It won’t just be a convenient active transport link to the eastern suburbs, but it will also be a technical marvel in its construction.

Construction for the project starts this year with site preparation onshore in the CBD and at Kangaroo Point, next year bringing major construction to life with the activity on the river to construct a bridge deck, viewing areas, mast, pylons, and install the cable stays. By late 2022, the permanent marine piling will be completed to support the bridge piers, and a 72-metre-high tower crane will be installed on a platform in the river to bring in the main pylons.

The installation of the tower crane will be done from the water and the main components of the crane will be transported via barge along the Brisbane River to minimise impacts to traffic. We’ll have masts 95 metres above the Brisbane River. This will be the tallest bridge in the city, some 20 metres taller than the Story Bridge. Finally, 2023 will see the final fit-out of the bridge and landing points, with expected completion late that year. In the first half of 2023, works will commence to install the main span.

This will be fabricated offsite in three 60-metre modules and transported to the site via barge along the river. This innovative technique, Chair, is a first for Brisbane, involving three major deck lifts to install the 182-metre bridge span, which is the longest main span for an active transport bridge in the country.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor MURPHY: This technique minimises the impacts to the main navigational river chain—

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor MURPHY: —and it allows safe access to be maintained throughout construction by reducing the amount of temporary works in the Brisbane River. With all this construction comes some obstacles in making sure our river remains safe and accessible, but there will be minimal impacts on local residents during construction. This complex and innovative construction design is a testament to the experience of Connect Brisbane, led by BESIX Watpac, and headquartered here in Brisbane.

Connect Brisbane and its partners have been involved in a diverse range of local and national projects, Chair, including the Matagarup Bridge, the Neville Bonner Bridge, the Toowoomba Second Range Crossing, the Townsville Stadium, South Road Urban Superway, and then a bit further afield, Chair, the Dubai Water Canal Bridges and the Sheikh Zayed Bridge. The Kangaroo Point Green Bridge will be a worthy addition to that list of amazing projects. We’re not just building a bridge here, Chair, though, we’re building a destination.

This bridge will incorporate a commercial activation, an iconic over-water restaurant café and bar, truly an Olympic standard piece of infrastructure. Of course, Mr Chair, the icing on the top anytime I talk about the Kangaroo Point Green Bridge is that Connect Brisbane will source more than 90% of construction supplies and material from local suppliers here in South East Queensland with more than 40% of those suppliers being sourced directly from within the Brisbane city limits, truly an outstanding legacy of this project. It will create more than 300 local jobs, and as I have mentioned here previously, 50 apprentices will get their start working in industry, working on this iconic Kangaroo Point Green Bridge.

Now, the DA (development approval) is also underway for the Breakfast Creek Green Bridge, Chair. I know you wouldn’t want me to leave that one out. This is a very important link to extend the Lores Bonney Riverwalk and the Kingsford Smith Drive upgrade, but it will be of course an active transport gateway to the Olympic Athletes’ Village. In showcasing our city’s natural beauty to the world, the design will take inspiration from Newstead’s Moreton Bay figs. We know that 2,300 trips are taken on the Lores Bonney Riverwalk every day, and by making this much‑needed connection, it will no doubt become even more popular.

These are projects that only a visionary Schrinner Council can deliver, Chair, connecting growing suburbs and precincts to each other and to the CBD, encouraging people to swap their car for active transport by walking, riding, or scooting. We have the potential to take 80,000 cars off our streets each and every year with the Kangaroo Point Green Bridge. Our city needs outcomes like this to relieve congestion and to be cleaner and greener, which is at the forefront of all of our major infrastructure planning. I’m incredibly excited by this project, Chair, and every time I talk to local residents, they say exactly the same thing.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor MURPHY.

Councillors, that ends Question Time.

We’ll now move on to the remainder of the Agenda.

LORD MAYOR, the Establishment and Coordination Committee report, 30 August 2021.

## 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 30 August 2021, be adopted.

Chair: Is there any debate?

LORD MAYOR: Yes, there is definitely debate, Mr Chair, but before I move on to the items in front of us, I just want to congratulate Councillor HUANG for that excellent response.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: You are one of Council’s best-kept secrets, Councillor HUANG. You could just imagine the Labor strategy brains trust going, what are we going to do today? You know, they’re having their usual strategy meeting. What about a press conference with a union official? Tick, yes, we’ve done that. Let’s create a meme or two. Tick, we’ve done that. Let’s look after our mates in the Coorparoo Cricket Club. Tick, we’ve done that, yes. Then, if we run out of things to do, let’s raise the failed 2021 election theme—

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —where they tipped $2.1 million into this same issue, and they still believe that only if one more person had have heard about this issue, they maybe might have won the election.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: What is the definition of insanity?

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Doing the same thing over and over again and expecting a different outcome, but that is exactly the Opposition that we have here. If it’s not about their union mates or their mates elsewhere, then they’re not interested. It’s a shame. It’s a real shame, but that’s all right. The good news is, we’ll keep getting on with running this city and building a better Brisbane. We’ll keep getting on with the agenda, which is outlined very clearly in this Annual Report. Feel the weight of it.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Feel the weight of that delivery, all of the achievements that has been delivered in the last 12 months alone, the investment that has been made, the progress towards building a better Brisbane that has been made. Fantastic, and I look forward to talking about that further shortly. I did want to table two documents today, as we’ve been doing recently and I mentioned before, when we receive particular financial reports or documents, we table them at the next available meeting of Council, and so I have a couple of items for tabling here.

First of all, is the Final Management Report for the Brisbane City Council. Now, Councillor HUANG mentioned this before, and as we always do, we get the Auditor-General to audit our financial statements and also our organisation, not just the statements, but our organisation. This is an independent audit by a State Government entity that has no association with us at all. Once again, as we always get, we have got an unmodified audit opinion on our financial statements and a good tick of approval for our organisation.

Now, an unmodified opinion is a very good thing, just in case you’re not aware of, you know, what that means. That is exactly what you want. If you get a modified opinion, then obviously, there’s issues that need to be addressed, but unmodified opinion is what we’re after and it’s what has been once again delivered, so I’ll table that. We also have the Annual Report and Financial Statements of the City Parklands Pty Ltd, which is the entity that we have established to deliver services and run the maintenance of South Bank Parklands, Roma Street Parklands and, going forward, Victoria Park, as well. So, I have those for tabling.

Now, before I move onto the items in the agenda, I wanted to, as I always do, let people know about some of the community events and important milestone dates that are coming up. Tonight, Brisbane City Hall will be lit purple and orange to support Women’s Health Week and the Jean Hailes Foundation is a not-for-profit women’s health organisation dedicated to improving women’s health across Australia through every stage of life. Women’s Health Week puts a focus on good health and wellbeing for women and girls, so we’re supporting that in City Hall tonight.

On Wednesday and Thursday, Brisbane City Hall and the Story Bridge will be lit blue to celebrate the 2021 Asia Pacific Cities Summit special—and Mayor’s Forum special edition that was mentioned by the DEPUTY MAYOR just before. So, because of the global pandemic and the fact that the previous host city could not go ahead, we have taken this opportunity on to keep the Asia Pacific Cities Summit and Mayor’s Forum going. There’s going to be some great discussion over the coming days with city leaders from right across the region and across the globe, so I’m very excited about that.

Friday is White Balloon Day, which is in support of Bravehearts. Everyone knows about Bravehearts. It’s Australia’s leading child protection organisation, working holistically to prevent child sexual exploitation and exploitation generally. White Balloon Day is their dedicated day to unite communities and make a commitment to protecting our kids. Story Bridge will be lit purple and white on Friday evening to show our support for this important day.

Item A in front of us is the Audited Consolidated Financial Statements, and this submission presents the final, signed 2021 Audited Consolidated Financial Statements which have been audited by the Auditor-General. This is obviously something we do every year, and once again, we’re demonstrating our strong commitment to responsible management of the city’s finances. I want to thank all of the officers in that Finance team that help us deliver these great results.

It is always a team effort and they do an exceptional job on our behalf in making sure all of the I’s are dotted and the T’s are crossed, and that we continue to be an entity, an organisation which is the envy of so many others around not only the State, but so many others around Australia. In fact, we’ve heard recently it’s the envy of the State Government, as well. They are envious of our balance sheet and our finances. So, we continue to strive for that excellence in financial management.

Item B is the SCP (Significant Contracting Plan) for the Construction of the Dockside and Mowbray Park ferry terminals. Now, we are dedicated and committed to investing more than ever before into our public transport network, and you see the record. Year after year, we invest more into public transport, not only on services, but also on infrastructure, as well, and upgrading and replacing our ferry terminals is an ongoing program and one that we are very firmly committed to.

So, in June, we announced a $53 million program over the next three years to upgrade terminals at South Bank, Mowbray Park, and Dockside, as well as continuing the construction of the new Howard Smith Wharves terminal. So, these upgrades are all about making our terminals more accessible, more convenient to access, but also, more resilient to the impacts of climate change, and more resilient to the impacts of natural disasters such as floods and storms.

The Brisbane River can be an angry river at times, and as we saw in the 2011 flood, many of our terminals were severely damaged or washed away. We saw Labor’s floating Riverwalk washed away down the river, and we’ve since been making sure that our infrastructure in the river is far more resilient to natural disasters and flooding events, but also more accessible for people. Whether they have a disability or whether it’s just parents with prams or other mobility devices, we are making sure that our public transport is accessible to all.

The Dockside ferry terminal upgrade is part of this works, Dockside-Kangaroo Point, and we’re constructing a new, fixed walkway and flood resilient articulated gangway and pontoon. The Mowbray Park ferry terminal will also be upgraded, once again, with an additional fixed walkway and new flood resilient gangway and dual-berth pontoon. There’s also some landside works that are required at Mowbray Park. Dockside ferry terminal will be upgraded first, and the good news is, we’ll ensure that Mowbray Park terminal stays open while Dockside is under construction, so that they’re not both closed at the same time.

Okay, item C is the Stores Board Submission on the—for the Lease and Operation of the Minnippi Park—the Minnippi Golf Course, apologies. This is obviously something that’s a very exciting new creation in the eastern suburbs. A creation that helps facilitate Council having two public golf courses available, and obviously, this goes hand-in-hand with our vision for Victoria Park, where we’re converting Victoria Park into a publicly accessible greenspace and parkland wonderland for the people of Brisbane to enjoy, but by the same token, delivering a new 18-hole golf course which is publicly available and affordable.

Once complete, the Minnippi Park Golf Course will be Brisbane’s first new public golf course in more than 70 years, and Brisbane’s only public golf course south of the Brisbane River. Obviously, when it comes to operating these facilities, there’s a lot of expertise out there in the market, and we have some great operators around the city, both in the public golf course, places like St Lucia, but also in the other golf courses in our city that do a fantastic job.

Chair: LORD MAYOR, your time has expired.

**143/2021-22**

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

Chair: LORD MAYOR, you have 10 minutes.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you. So, there’s a lot of expertise out there that we’re looking to tap into, so we’re looking for opportunities to partner with an operator for this course, to use their expertise to make sure it is well run and it is affordable for the people of Brisbane, but also there’s an opportunity for people that do want to invest in some of the facilities there, as well. We saw that in examples both like St Lucia and also Victoria Park, where the operator for those golf courses has also delivered other offerings to the people, as well, that use that site. We’ve seen some great facilities delivered through this kind of partnership and we’re looking forward to working with potential operators to see new opportunities created with the Minnippi Golf Course.

Item D is the consent to enter into a Right of Entry Deed and register a mortgage over the lease to Sunnybank Rugby Union Club (SRUC). This is—so, Council is the registered proprietor of land described as 470 McCullough Street, MacGregor, or the Sunnybank Rugby Union Club. The current registered lease is expiring on 31 July 2046, so obviously a long-term lease, and once again an example of where a club is invested in facilities, hence they get a long lease.

The club is in the process of refinancing its commercial finance arrangements from the ANZ (Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited) Bank to the Commonwealth Bank, and they’re seeking our consent to make this change. The club is not borrowing any more money. They’re simply just refinancing their existing commitments and, obviously, we’re asking Councillors to support this request from the club.

Item E is the Annual Report which I referred to before, and we’ve seen another successful year under what are, challenging circumstances. You know, we have continued to be going through a global pandemic. There have been significant pressures placed on Council as an organisation, placed on our staff, and placed on our finances, as well, with revenues declining and with a lot of new expectations arising from the community, expectations of support for local businesses, support for community clubs and sporting facilities, and we have delivered that support and we have risen to the occasion, but we’ve continued to do that while getting on with the job of running Australia’s largest Council.

There’s some interesting figures in here, if you look at the report. There’s obviously a lot of detail in here, but the community represented by Brisbane City Council is now 1.27 million people, and that is very significant by any measure. So the next largest council is half our size. The next largest council in Australia is half our size. We see Brisbane City Council representing more people than all of the other capital cities combined, and then double that number. So if you get all of the other capital cities’ councils combined and you double it, that’s what we’re representing.

You also see that we’re representing approximately the same number of people as the State of Tasmania, the Australian Capital Territory or the ACT, Canberra, and the Northern Territory combined. So, this is a significant organisation that provides incredible service to those 1.27 million people, but there’s great figures about the diversity of our residents, as well, including 28% of people speaking a language other than English at home. My daughter, Petra, is yet to master the English language, so I don’t know if she fits into that. We say that she speaks Petch, which—but certainly, it’s a very diverse community, which is great, which makes us better, which makes us richer and more vibrant.

Thirty-six per cent of residents born outside Australia. We even have some in this Chamber, and that’s a good thing, as well, once again. It is a very young city, with a median age of only 35, and that is something that is a big strength to our city, as well, but it’s a city that also has a very strong environment, a healthy environment and one that we’re determined to protect. A city that has more than 1,300 square kilometres of landmass. We have 114 kilometres of the river, the Brisbane River, in our city, and we have over 800 species of wildlife and more than 2,500 species of native plants.

We are the most biodiverse capital city in Australia. Someone was reminding me of this the other day, because not many of us get the opportunity to travel at the moment, but when you do travel and you fly into Brisbane Airport, the thing that always strikes you, you’re looking at the city as you fly over it, is how green it is, how much greenery there is right across the city. That is not the case when you fly into a lot of other cities. You see concrete and glass as far as the eye can see, whereas Brisbane is a very green city and we want to improve on that and even increase the biodiversity of our city, and certainly protect what we have.

We also have a very strong economy, as well. There are 134,889 businesses registered, of which 97.2% are small businesses. This is something—those businesses together employ over 915,000 people. Obviously, that includes people coming from outside the City of Brisbane to work each day, but around 68% of people employed in Brisbane also live in Brisbane, but on the other side of the coin, that means that, you know, we have a lot of people commuting in, as well, each day, which is why we’re investing in infrastructure like Brisbane Metro, new green bridges, suburban road and safety upgrades, new bikeways, active travel links and other connections.

It’s why we’re investing record amounts in footpaths, as well. The simple fact of walking around our green city, and for every tree that you see planted on a street, that tree probably means a cracked footpath, but in the end, we invest the money to make sure that those footpaths are fixed because we love our trees, and we also love our footpaths. So that’s an ongoing process of work and we’re investing more than ever before into that.

I do want to draw Councillors’ attention to page 35 and 36, which is something that makes me very proud and every Council employee should also be very proud, which is the list of over 30 different awards that have been won by Brisbane City Council and its employees and its departments and as an organisation over the past 12 months, more than 30 different awards. If you look at the breadth and depth of those awards, just some fantastic outcomes there. It shows the dedication with which this entire organisation and its employees approach their job, and we should all be proud of those awards.

Interestingly, though, last year’s Brisbane City Council Annual Report actually won a gold award in the Australasian Reporting Awards, so we don’t—we’re not just reporting on the awards, our report wins awards, as well. So, that is a good thing, and congratulations to the team that put this document together.

When it comes to our assets, as a community, the assets under the control of Brisbane City Council grow each year and they are significant. We call that community equity because they are community assets and they are to benefit the community, but that includes 2,180 parks, it includes 6,217 bus stops, 29 community halls, 4,935 kilometres of pathways and walkways, 91 wharves and jetties, pontoons and boat ramps, 158 dog off-leash areas in parks, which are well received by the community, more than 9,940 hectares of natural areas and conservation reserves, 12 cemeteries and crematoria, also an important thing—asset for the city.

We have 6,754 hectares of urban parks maintained by Council, which include sports parks. We have 33 libraries plus the mobile library, making 34 libraries. We control and manage eight cross-river bridges, about to be a few more, which we’re excited about. Twenty-two swimming pools, 5,781 kilometres of road, five KittyCats and 22 CityCats, 1,267 buses, and 595 picnic grounds. So, the scale is just massive, but I know that the community appreciates the ongoing investment in all of those assets and our efforts to grow those assets. So, there’s been incredible results this year, another positive year, and each—and this document, all 246 pages of it, goes through in detail all of the achievements.

Chair: LORD MAYOR, your time has expired.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Move for an extension.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you.

Councillor LANDERS: Seconded.

LORD MAYOR: Oh no, I’m done, I’m done.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Finished, LORD MAYOR?

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Further debate?

Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair.

**Seriatim *en bloc* - Clauses A and E**

|  |
| --- |
| Councillor Jared CASSIDY requested that Clause A, PRESENTATION AND TABLING OF THE AUDITED CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AND THE AUDITOR-GENERAL’S AUDIT REPORTS FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30 JUNE 2021; and Clause E, BRISBANE CITY COUNCIL ANNUAL REPORT 2020-21, be taken seriatim *en bloc* for voting purposes. |

Councillor CASSIDY: Yes, yes. Thanks very much, Chair. So, I’ll speak on these items before us today. Starting with A, the Tabling and Presentation of the Audited and Consolidated Financial Statements for the year ended 30 June 2021, and this document reveals the truth about this LNP Administration’s financial position.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: Now, it’s not as dire as the LNP MAYOR has led or misled Brisbane residents to believe. Repeatedly, last year, LORD MAYOR Schrinner crowed about COVID‑19 costing Council big time. He said at the time, that revenue would be hit by $142 million. He said there would be a $142 million loss in revenue, and he said that forced his hand to cut basic services, cut services like kerbside collection, for instance. Well, here in this document today, the actual consolidated financial impact of COVID-19 on Brisbane City Council over the last year has been—drumroll, please—$4.3 million, out of a $3.6 billion budget. $4.3 million, not $142 million as this LORD MAYOR claimed, but $4.3 million.

Now, the State and State Governments all around Australia and the Federal Government are in debt to the tune of billions and up to $1 trillion, I think, now are projected at the Federal Government level, because unlike this LNP Administration, they have put their hands in their pockets to help the community when they need it. Now, this LORD MAYOR has been less than truthful to the people of Brisbane on this. There was clearly no need to cut kerbside collection when he did all along. It was a political decision, not a financial decision, and a bad one, at that.

It’s clear that the LORD MAYOR cares about himself and his Administration, but not so much the suburbs of Brisbane. In the middle of a crisis last year, we see revealed here, he cut kerbside collection, cut public transport, cut grants to community clubs, froze the wages of hardworking Council employees for two years, and at the same time, he increased his advertising spend, the number of those self-promotional newsletters, and refused to give up that $100,000 cash bonus we heard about earlier. This, Brisbane, is where your rates are actually being spent.

COVID-19, as we know here today, hardly had any impact on Council’s budget at all. Again, a $4.3 million hit to revenue, not a $142 million hit like this LORD MAYOR was running around and saying. So, while this LORD MAYOR sits in his ivory tower here in City Hall, making residents and workers of this city think otherwise so he can spend their hard-earned rates on advertising himself, instead of on basic community services.

On Clause B, Chair, which is the submission for a significant contracting plan for the construction of the Dockside and Mowbray Park ferry terminals. We’ll be supporting this item, but we certainly hope that these terminals won’t be shipped in from overseas like the New Farm ferry terminal was. We know at the time, those local jobs had gone wanting, and they were just down the road in Murarrie for that project. We know that Council had to send employees over to China, which is where it was being constructed at the time, because we didn’t have local oversight on that project.

We know that the LORD MAYOR talks about buying local when it’s convenient for him or when he can put that on a glossy brochure to talk about it, but we do know the reality is there is so much of this major infrastructure that is not being built locally. We know those electric buses running around the City Loop have been bought from overseas. All 60 buses for the Metro are being bought from Europe, playground equipment from Europe, ferry terminals previously from China. The list goes on and on. So, we’ll be supporting the significant contracting plan, but put on record that we expect to see local jobs supported throughout this construction.

On item E, the Annual Report, Chair, this report is all spin and doesn’t tell the people of Brisbane what’s really going on in City Hall here under the LNP, like the double rates hike in one calendar year and what are residents getting in return? Well, the reality is less and less and less. This report illustrates the LNP Administration’s complete neglect for our suburbs. We know that 40% of Brisbane streets don’t have a footpath at all. There are over 1,100 footpaths that are broken and dangerous, and this LNP Council is taking over a year to fix them, which is unacceptable.

More bus and ferry reviews are on the way, and we know what that means, cuts to services. Sixty-seven per cent of ferries have been cut. Ferries were left to rot under this LNP Administration. We see less ferry terminals and less bus stops in this Annual Report. Community grants were cut by $3 million last financial year. The COVID‑19 Assistance Grants were all show and no substance. Clubs, as we know, all around the city are struggling to pay water bills, to keep their lights on, to be supported in any way. They’re facing eviction left, right and centre, and they are being treated with contempt and disrespect from this LNP Administration. Again, in this report, we saw the cutting of kerbside collection, which was clearly a political decision and not a financial decision.

This report also highlights the LNP’s rorts and complete misuse of ratepayers’ money, Chair. The Living in Brisbane brochure gets more funding than ever before. The number of editions has increased, and now it is costing residents $6 million.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: Councillor SCHRINNER’s priority is self-promotion, not the people of Brisbane, Chair. He has refused to give back that $100,000 allowance or have it tracked and audited and, LORD MAYOR—I thought he might have had an interjection then, he did earlier—I absolutely support a system where those allowances are tracked and audited and they are published in the Annual Report. I would sign up to that today and I certainly hope you would too, LORD MAYOR. We have eight executors being paid between $3.6 million and $4.4 million a year. The CEO’s wage is now over $700,000, and Councillor Schrinner spends $3 million on billboards, and that spending continues, Chair.

$1.6 million marketing the Brisbane Metro before one single shovel has hit the ground, and $0.5 million splurged on social media advertising. This LORD MAYOR, Chair, is addicted to advertising, and residents are being forced to fund this habit. We also have a company owned by a key management personnel (KMP) of Council, so that’s either a Councillor in this room or a senior executive member of this organisation that has been awarded contracts for design, data processing, print and mail services to Brisbane Green Heart CitySmart, but we have no idea who those contracts were awarded to.

It could have been a Councillor in this room. It could be the LORD MAYOR. It could be a relative of a Councillor in here, but that’s being kept secret again this year. Where is the transparency around the use of ratepayers’ money? If the LNP are awarding contracts to Councillors or their relatives behind closed doors, I think the public deserve to know who they are, and it should be—

DEPUTY MAYOR: Point of order, Mr Chair.

Chair: Point of order, DEPUTY MAYOR.

DEPUTY MAYOR: I believe Councillor CASSIDY is imputing motive.

Chair: Yes, Councillor CASSIDY, I’m not sure how you’re able to establish your assertions here. Please get back to the report, please.

Councillor CASSIDY: Oh yes, this is on page 216 and 217 in the Annual Financial Statement.

Chair: Yes, but you’re making statements that aren’t contained there.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: Sorry, I don’t understand, Chair.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: You’re imputing motive, Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: I think I said if this—if the LNP is awarding contracts to Councillors and their relatives, which is clearly the case, there are hundreds of thousands of dollars being awarded to key management personnel in terms of contracts.

Chair: What are you claiming is clearly the case?

Councillor CASSIDY: It is the case.

Councillor SRI: Point of order, Chair.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: You’re debating the letting of contracts and your implication is that they’re being let to either Councillors or to relatives of Councillors.

Councillor SRI: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor SRI.

Councillor SRI: I guess I’m concerned that it feels like you’re entering into a debate about the substance of what Councillor CASSIDY is speaking to, and I think in a healthy democracy, it’s important that he is allowed to speak his mind on the matter before him. It’s not really your place to debate whether he is correct or not.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor SRI.

Without imputing motive, please continue, Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair. So, the reality is this Annual Report talks about key management personnel or the key management personnel’s relatives being awarded Council contracts. It’s in the Annual Report. Now, key management personnel of Council, Chair, is either a Councillor or the LORD MAYOR or a Senior Executive within Council. The Annual Report details hundreds of thousands of dollars being awarded to those KMPs or their family members for contracts.

It also talks about, as I said there—that’s one example I’ve given which is contained in the Annual Report before us today. What I am saying is there needs to be more transparency around that. If ratepayers want to find out which Councillor in this Chamber or their family member or senior executive within Council or their family member—

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY, your time has expired.

**144/2021-22**

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

Councillor CASSIDY: Thank you, Chair. So, if a ratepayer wants to know which key management personnel, which Councillor or senior executive or their family members are getting Council contracts, where do they go? How are they to find out? It’s not contained within the Annual Report. It’s kept behind closed doors. That’s the point I’m making. We have raised this point in the past and we are consistent on that. The use of ratepayers’ money should be fully transparent. Chair, this report is also riddled with mentions of this LNP Administration’s pet projects which have been mismanaged from the start, resulting in enormous cost blowouts being paid for by the ratepayers of Brisbane.

We have seen a $300 million on the Metro project before that’s even started, a $60 million blowout on the Indooroopilly roundabout, which hasn’t even begun yet, green bridges which are underfunded and under-costed, and we know that because there are enormous contingencies built into those projects, all of those projects, and we know how those contingencies work. They get spent because those projects are so poorly managed. Now, contained in the Annual Report is also about Council’s workforce.

Now, every week, we see more ongoing work being contracted out by this LNP Administration. In fact, contractor and consultancy services have gone up by just under $10 million since last year. That’s an increase of more than 20%, so more than 20% increases in temporary and unsecure work over the last year by this LNP Administration, which is a shameful figure. For this LNP Administration, the more disposable a worker is, the better they are. Under the LNP, workers are more at risk of being exploited and underpaid. Council’s in-house capabilities are more hollow than ever, and again, we see the results of that. We see the results of that because there are poorly planned projects. There are projects that require redesign and redesign because Council doesn’t have that capability any more to mitigate those risks. Every basic piece of ongoing Council work now has to go through lengthy, costly procurement processes, things like mowing, landscaping, bus stop works, footpath, road repairs, all being done by labour hire workers now. Contracting this basic work out creates unstable employment. It does not support our economy. It doesn’t support our communities and it doesn’t support workers’ rights.

This report also features key projects where this LNP Administration has snubbed local jobs and local manufacturers, Chair, like the electric buses this LNP Administration ordered from a Chinese company when South East Queensland bus builders can build them right here and they have been doing for some time. They’re doing it today. Those 60 bendy-buses for the Metro are being purchased from Switzerland. It’s quite clear on these major projects and major procurement, Chair, that this LORD MAYOR cares more about jobs overseas than he does here in Brisbane.

Now talking about diverting waste from landfill under Program 3 which is detailed in this report before us today, Council should and could be doing so much more, Chair. This Administration should be taking up Labor’s idea of FOGO (Food Organics, Garden Organics). FOGO creates three times as many jobs as traditional landfill and creates a revenue stream through the sale of valuable compost. We know that FOGO is the single best thing a Council can do to reduce its carbon footprint. It is the recycling of the 21st century, Chair. It would remove 80,000 tonnes of organic waste from landfill. You can’t have an economy in the 21st century without investment in climate action initiatives.

Now this LNP Administration thinks building walking bridges and buying overseas carbon credits is good enough to address climate change here in Brisbane. Well Labor would be generating carbon credits with FOGO instead of buying them from overseas. Chair, this report—the Annual Report—is a smokescreen for what’s really going on in Brisbane under the LNP, a tale of suburban neglect, of misuse, mismanagement and contracting out basic work. There is no support for job creating projects like Labor’s FOGO plan, emission reducing, waste-cutting and money saving initiatives.

But that’s not entirely surprising from this Administration. This LORD MAYOR and the LNP put themselves first and Brisbane residents and suburbs last every single time. That’s evidenced here today.

Chair: Thank you Councillor CASSIDY.

Further debate?

Councillor HUANG.

Councillor HUANG: Thank you, Mr Chair. I rise to speak on item A and E of the E&C report. On item A, the Audited Consolidated Financial Statements. This submission presents the final, signed 2020-21 Auditors Consolidated Financial Statements which have been audited by the Auditor-General. This year we have once again demonstrated our strong and responsible management of Council’s finances. As in prior year, financial statements impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on Council’s operating capacity—capability—and Council’s response to the pandemic have been disclosed.

In fact, the $4 million figure quoted by Councillor CASSIDY is actually revenue and expense impact. It does not take into account revenue foregone, such as reduced fees and charges which were part of the Schrinner Council’s COVID-19 economic recovery package. In fact, the report reminded us of the net reduction in rates and utility charges last year due to the Schrinner Council’s $15.9 million special COVID-19 rebate, the $15.1 million Kingsford Smith Drive rebate and first homeowner rebates to the tune of $2.4 million which shows the Schrinner Council’s commitment to support the residents of Brisbane in a very challenging time.

I found it interesting that it seems that sound financial management has been attacked by Councillor CASSIDY. He probably can’t understand the difference between the anticipated impact and the real impact. Because of the sound financial management of the Schrinner Council we were able to bring the actual impact to a lower figure. That should be something to be applauded, not be attacked.

Also, I would like to speak on item E, the award-winning Annual Report. The Council Annual Report for the 2020-21—we are only in early September and already we have the Annual Report for the financial year, which has just finished.

I would now like to take this opportunity to congratulate and thank to all in Council who have contributed to this report. Well done. Council’s Annual Report has retained gold standard since 2016-17. We received confirmation in August that this has been retained again for 2019-20 report and we are confident the report for the 2020-21 will continue to meet best practice in annual reporting, ensuring our achievements and outcomes for the community. The Annual Report provides an insight into the achievements of this Council last year and also shows how we are adapting to meet the challenges of the ever-changing world around us.

It also provides a snapshot of Council as an organisation. This was the first year Council employees have spanned five generations from the lucky generation right now to night staff who are part of the iGen. Also of note is that over the past year Council has retained or increased representation of women in our workforce and in executive roles. In fact, I think there are more Fiona’s in Team Schrinner than women in the Labor team.

In terms of the City Governance program area, it was another successful year. In terms of progress against the five-year plan, Council remains financially sustainable with a strong credit rating and a neutral outlook. We have the lowest minimum rates in South East Queensland. We have invested $34.4 million of our procurement budget directly with social enterprises. This Annual Report marks the second year of climate disclosures. As we continue to make mature our approach to assessing and responding to climate related risks and opportunities.

There are a number of notable developments in this year, including the ability to monitor residential carbon emissions and initiatives such as the Brisbane Carbon Challenge which encourages and supports the community to reduce carbon emissions and save on related bills. This year we have also taken up the additional reporting requirements of the City of Brisbane Act and Regulation. This is a lengthy document, but it is truly informative and serves to highlight all the great work being done by the Schrinner Council each and every day to make our city and suburbs an even better place to live.

This is an accountable Council and a Council with a plan for the future. I would like to again say thank you to the dedicated team who assisted in drafting the Annual Report. I commend the report to the Chamber.

Chair: Thank you Councillor HUANG.

Further speakers?

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, thank you. I rise to speak on items A, C and E.

**Seriatim - Clause C**

|  |
| --- |
| Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON requested that Clause C, STORES BOARD SUBMISSION – SIGNIFICANT CONTRACTING PLAN FOR THE LEASE AND OPERATION OF THE MINNIPPI GOLF COURSE, be taken seriatim for voting purposes. |

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes please. I do not support Council constructing a golf course at the Minnippi Parklands. As over many years in this place I’ve tried to have that money allocated towards stormwater drainage and backflow valves with the LNP voting against it. I do not under any circumstances believe Council should be investing some $50 million over the next 20 years in building a golf course. We have golf clubs all over Brisbane that are struggling. Brisbane City Council could have achieved this result in a different way. Instead it is investing money to compete against not‑for-profit sporting clubs unnecessarily. So, I absolutely do support item C. In my view, this is an inappropriate use of money when so many golf clubs in this city are struggling.

With respect to item A, the Audited Financial Statements and Auditor-General’s report for the year—I actually had reason to write to the Auditor-General during the week. I was reading Council’s tabling the CBIC (City of Brisbane Investment Corporation) report. I am concerned about the dividends that are being allocated back to Council. The financial report of the CBIC says that $20 million in dividends has been paid to Brisbane City Council and the director’s report says it’s $15 million that has been provided in a dividend back to Brisbane City Council. I have written to the CEO and to the Auditor-General to clarify how much money in fact the CBIC has given.

Now in the Annual Report and the financial reports before us today, that’s lumped into a bigger sum called other revenue, but $5 million is a significant sum of money and either the director’s report is wrong or the Audited Financial Statement that the Auditor-General did is wrong. I would like to know which one is correct. It’s not reflected in the notes here and it really should be. With respect to the financial report of this Council let’s look at the long-term financial sustainability statement. Brisbane City Council sets a range of benchmarks that it puts in place to assess its financial performance over the long term. Good idea. Great to track how we’re going.

So operating surplus ratio—Brisbane City Council sets a target of it being between zero and 10%. We are at one per cent. So we’re just scraping over the line. When the LORD MAYOR stands up and claims he’s got this great surplus, he pretty much balances the budget which he is required to do. The asset sustainability ratio—it is supposed to be greater than 90%. It’s actually 47%. So that’s an epic fail on that financial measure of sustainability, but it’s the net financial liabilities ratio where Council fails and has failed, I think, every single year pretty much other than maybe the first two when the money from the sale of the water assets and the establishment of QU occurred and Council was debt free.

The financial liabilities ratio says it should be no greater than 60%. Brisbane City Council 202%. Now the 60% is something that even their own side thinks is a good idea. It was always Peter Costello’s benchmark for how the Federal books run. So this Administration just fails on every significant financial marker that you can find. It gets better though when you get to the Annual Report. It is fascinating to me that the Finance Chairperson of this city—or the Acting Finance Chairperson of this city—thinks that some $280,000 of public funds doesn’t need to be accounted for.

That’s how much we are—$100,000 the LORD MAYOR receives in his allowance and then another $180,000 amongst all the—actually it might even be $200,000 because I didn’t count Councillor CASSIDY. So, it’s essentially $300,000. So who is it that thinks that we should be publicly accountable for ratepayers’ funds? Certainly not the Finance Chairperson. Councillor HUANG said it’s pathetic—that somebody should account for the expenditure of public funds. Now let’s be clear, he was then applauded by the LORD MAYOR, the major beneficiary of the unaccountable funds and told what a great job he’s doing, not disclosing how this money was spent.

Now I moved a motion in this place a few years ago calling for a system just like we have to do as Councillors to account for our expenditure to be put in place for the expenditure of the allowances. Guess who voted it down? The LNP. Those measures are the opposite of being accountable and transparent. The fact that the Acting Finance Chair thinks that it is pathetic that some $300,000 in ratepayers’ funds—public funds—does not need to be accounted for publicly is okay, says that there is something very wrong with this Administration.

Now, let’s look at the Annual Report itself. The Annual Report outlines a number of medium-term objectives that Council reports against. There are 137 objectives that Council outlines across all of the portfolios. They are measured against a range of benchmarks—ongoing, delivered; there is one that says monitor closely; and action required. Now of the 137 objectives that Council sets for itself—these are not externally we’re going to benchmark you—this is what Council says they’re going to do. So it’s not decided outside of Council. They’re not independent or objective benchmarks.

Of the 137 objectives—does anyone want to guess how many Council actually has marked as delivered? Anybody want to have a guess? One. One. There is one. There are six that are in the category saying monitor closely. All the rest of them are listed as ongoing. So, let’s be clear, some of these things to be fair are ongoing. Some of them not so much, but what I can say is of the 137 objectives that this Council sets for itself in this Annual Report document before us today, just one has been delivered. That’s their own reporting against their own benchmarks.

It’s not like someone independently has come in and said, yeah no you’ve only done one of the 137 things that you were going to do. That’s what they set for themselves and then they met just the one. Now there are a number of issues in the Annual Report. You would think listening to the LORD MAYOR it was all just beer and giggles, but that’s absolutely not the case. The failure of this Administration to deliver on what it says, is just shocking. So let’s be clear, reduce congestion by standardising and streamlining traffic movements around school.

Council says that’s an ongoing—I’m sorry the ongoing means it’s on track to be delivered. There’s not a single Councillor in this room that thinks that managing traffic around schools has got better in this city. Not one. I’m certainly not one of them. So that one is not being met. That’s definitely a not being delivered. Council goes on to talk about making sure that degraded natural environments are being restored. Now Oxley Creek Transformation Project hasn’t done anything at this stage to deliver on improving the health of Brisbane’s single largest creek, Oxley Creek. So that one is not really on track to be delivered. It’s failing.

Here’s another one. Oh, ensure that communities are involved in planning for the future. Now the most interesting thing I heard today was from Councillor ALLAN who stood up and told us that there were 429, I think it was, submissions on the LGIP and the LTIP, of which 219 came from Pallara. That means that citywide there were just 210 submissions on infrastructure planning for the future of Brisbane. Do I think that means that this Council has engaged in a meaningful way with the 1.27 million residents of Brisbane? No. That’s an epic fail. When I have a look at all of those, I suspect a good chunk of that 219 will actually be from Tennyson Ward.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON your time has expired.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Oh I have so much more to do.

Chair: Further speakers?

Councillor HOWARD.

Councillor HOWARD: Well thank you, Mr Chair. I rise—

*Councillor interjection*

Councillor HOWARD: —to enter the debate on items C and D. Oh my mic is not on. There we go. It says—oh there we go. Thank you. Thanks, Mr Chair. I rise to enter the debate on items C and D. Item C is the Minnippi Golf Course and I would like the opportunity to speak to this item and to discuss the ambitious plans that the Schrinner Council has for the Minnippi golf course. I would like to explain some of the background as to the history of the site and the strides that this Schrinner Council has taken to activate this very appealing site.

As the LORD MAYOR mentioned, Minnippi Golf Course will be Brisbane’s first new golf course in more than 70 years and the first ever public course on the city’s southside. As one of the fast-growing participation sports in Brisbane, it is important that the Schrinner Council work proactively to meet the demand for access to quality, accessible golf courses for the residents of Brisbane. Although, the announcement of the Minnippi Golf Course and the residential estate were first announced in 2014, the early discussions regarding the development commenced in 1994—

Chair: Councillors, if you’re speaking to each other please can you take the discussion outside.

Councillor HOWARD: It is quite distracting. Thank you. Developmental delays imposed by the State Government for a significant period contributed to the delay of actions needed to activate this then under-utilised site. In 2014, progress in regard to the development was made and an agreement between Council and Urbex being reached for the development of the residential estate and golf course. At the lower end of the proposed golf course and adjoining the Bulimba Creek was once a redundant landfill site. In 2015 and 2016, Council undertook remediation works to ensure that this area does not pose a safety or environment risk to the community or to golfers.

The remediation works were funded by Council at an estimated cost of $1 million to ensure that this land was properly and appropriately remediated. The development of the residential estate is to be completed in five different stages and the first four areas were completed between 2016 and 2020, with Council retaining a trust account to cover the cost of the golf course development. The subdivision and civil works for the final residential stage is currently underway and it is hoped that it will be completed to coincide with the completion of the golf course and supporting facilities.

The construction of the golf course commenced in early October 2020 with works well underway. McMahons Construction have been appointed by Urbex to complete the construction works on the golf course at this time. McMahons Construction are specialist golf course construction contractors. Works on the golf course are well progressed and include the construction of the water storage dams, bridges over waterways, an emergency access pathway, tree removal, fairways and perimeter fencing. It is anticipated that the golf course construction will be completed and the golf course operational in mid-to-late 2022.

Moving to item D, the Sunnybank Rugby Union Club holds the current lease with Council until 31 July 2046 and as the LORD MAYOR said is in the process of refinancing their commercial finance arrangements from Australia and New Zealand Banking Group to the Commonwealth Bank of Australia (CBA) and the opportunity to refinance the existing loan facilities to enable further improvement works to be completed at the leased premises located at D.M. Henderson Park at MacGregor. As part of the refinance process, the rugby union club are seeking consent to allow CBA to register a mortgage over the current lease to replace the existing ANZ mortgage.

The rugby club is also seeking a consent from Brisbane City Council to accept the CBA Right of Entry Deed. The Sunnybank Rugby Union Club is compliant with the terms and conditions of their current lease in meeting the annual community contributions. We have done substantial reviewing of their financial performance and we actually know that they have the ability to suitably meet the repayment amounts and the terms of the proposed new loan facility with CBA. So Lifestyle and Community Services supports the application for consent to mortgage for SRUC and continue to make improvements to their lease premises and support the Sunnybank community. I recommend it to the Chamber.

Chair: Thank you Councillor HOWARD.

Councillor LANDERS: Point of order, Chair.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

|  |
| --- |
| **145/2021-22**  At that time, 3.02pm, it was resolved on the motion of Councillor Sandy LANDERS, seconded by Councillor Andrew WINES, 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 3.03pm. |

**UPON RESUMPTION:**

Chair: Thank you, we are now resuming.

Further speakers?

Councillor CUMMING.

Councillor CUMMING: Yes, thank you. Thank you, Mr Chair. Mr Chair, I’d like to refer to item 3, the item about the Minnippi Golf Course.

Chair: Item C.

Councillor CUMMING: This matter—this idea for a golf course goes back a long, long way. I can recall the Soorley Administration were very interested in the matter. At that stage, golf was going strongly, booming. Brisbane had much—many fewer public courses than some of the capitals in the State. It was considered that it would be a good idea to have a course at Minnippi.

Now times have changed since then. Such that, up until recently, golf player numbers has been dropping away, unfortunately. That has meant that in various parts of Australia golf courses have closed. I know it’s not only an Australian phenomenon, the United States, the home of golf, there was at one stage—I read an article that the courses were closing at the rate of one a week in the States. Now the States is a big market, but still that was what was happening.

So my obvious concern—and I hate to be parochial, you know that is that this course will have a considerable effect on the Wynnum Golf Course. Wynnum Golf Course is an interesting combination. The clubhouse is on private land owned by the golf course and has been owned by them for decades. I think the club’s going for its—about 75th or 80th anniversary soon, but the course itself is leased from the Brisbane City Council and the club is struggling in recent years.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Point of order, Mr Chair.

Chair: Point of order, DEPUTY MAYOR.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Will Councillor CUMMING take a question?

Chair: Councillor CUMMING will you take a question from the DEPUTY MAYOR?

Councillor CUMMING: Oh—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor CUMMING: Yes, righty-oh, righty-oh.

DEPUTY MAYOR: I’m asking very straightforwardly, Councillor CUMMING. Do you remember when you were here in 1996 and Jim Soorley signed off the starting of this golf course, if you supported or not in the vote.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor CUMMING: That’s what I said earlier, that’s what I said earlier, yes. At the time, it seemed a good idea, that’s what I said. That’s what I’ve said in the last—and I’ve got to say the—anyhow, I continue. So the Wynnum Golf Course, the problem is with golf courses is they take a lot of money to maintain. They’re reliant on substantial numbers of people taking out their full golf club membership and getting enough revenue in to be able to pay for all the expense of running the course. That’s been a problem in recent years.

Wynnum Golf Course used to have a waiting list to become a member of the club. Actually you had to apply to be a member of the club and then there was fee payable for the application, something like $500 it was. Then once you got accepted then you had to pay your full membership fee on top of that. Well they’ve had to scrap the application fee, that’s not—the market can’t deal with that anymore. So that’s their problem. The number of actual members of the course—of the club—have been falling away as well.

But anyhow look, my—look I wish the Minnippi Golf Course well. However, I just hope that it doesn’t—it’s not something that is—I notice there’s—the running of it. There’s reference in the material here that Council will be paying for the maintenance of the course. Which that means there’s been a fairly substantial ratepayer subsidy of the course. Which of course Wynnum Golf Course doesn’t have.

My concern is that if that undermines the viability of the Wynnum Course that it could be—face more problems as time goes on. So that’s—I just want to put that on the record. That’s my concerns and—but I wish the BMD (BMD Properties Pty Ltd) and the Council do get a good operator and the Minnippi Golf Course is a success as well, but hopefully that it won’t put other courses out of operation, thank you.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Thank you Councillor CUMMING.

Further debate on the E&C report? No further speakers?

Oh Councillor—sorry, Councillor SRI.

Councillor SRI: You’re all right. Yes, thanks, Chair, I rise to speak on items B and C. Just regarding B, the contracting for the ferry terminals. I was obviously quite pleased to see the Administration confirm that the Dockside ferry terminal will be delivered before the Mowbray Park terminal. I thank the Administration, particularly Councillor MURPHY, for listening to the community’s concerns on that front. I realise that the timing of projects like this is often quite difficult.

But given that that Dockside terminal had been shut down for quite some time now and that that part of the Kangaroo Point Peninsula doesn’t have a lot of public transport alternatives to ferries and CityCats. I think it is quite important that that terminal is reinstated and improved as soon as possible. I do want again put on the record the concerns from local Kangaroo Point residents about how abruptly that terminal and that ferry service was shut down.

I won’t go into that again at length, but residents still remain dubious that it wasn’t possible to make minor or temporary alterations to the terminal to facilitate ferries stopping there in the short term. Yes, I’m not going to unpack that again at length, but I think residents have made their voices very clear on that. That if ferries have been able to stop there of many years, why suddenly was it not possible for them to stop there anymore?

The other piece of the puzzle I wanted to highlight—sorry Councillor ADAMS. I—sorry, I missed the interjection. The other piece of the puzzle I wanted to highlight was that the Thornton Street ferry terminal closure has also had a negative impact on public transport on the Peninsula. What happens with Dockside and Mowbray can’t be considered separately from Thornton Street.

The Administration has said that—very clearly—that the Thornton terminal won’t be reopened, but that does reduce public transport connectivity for the western side of the Kangaroo Point Peninsula. If the Administration is dead set on not reopening that terminal, residents of that side of Kangaroo Point will need better bus services or another public transport option to move around. Rather than everyone simply having to walk all the way up to Holman Street. Or to cross the Story Bridge and—to cross under the Story Bridge and get to the Dockside terminal when it reopens.

But yes, we are very pleased to see that the terminal works are progressing. A lot of money, I do wonder a little bit whether it would have been cheaper to do some of this work in house. The fact that Council no longer has the capacity to do projects like this in house is perhaps a little bit concerning. I’m always concerned about the ongoing privatisation of the delivery of essential public infrastructure. This is perhaps just another step down that road where Council is simply relegating itself to the role of contract manager. Rather than doing any of the work itself.

Turning—I would just add finally that the—with both of these ferry terminal redevelopments, I still don’t think the local residents are fully aware of what’s proposed. Or understand that the Mowbray Park terminal will be shutting down for refurbishment works. The terminal itself is now outside my electorate, but I’m still closely connected to a lot of residents in that area. It’s still not widely known that that terminal is going to be closed down and rebuilt.

So perhaps that’s a flag. That the Administration does need to do a little bit more clear communication about that means in terms of the network and where people will be able to access alternative services *et cetera*. So I just wanted to place that on Councillor MURPHY’s radar and make sure it’s not forgotten. I know the Mowbray terminal redevelopment’s still a little while away. I wouldn’t be surprised if by the time we get up to it, Council is trying to drop a restaurant on top of the ferry terminal as well. I shouldn’t give you ideas.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor SRI: Yes, yes, but what I—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor SRI: —what I will say, what I will say is that I think—oh no, he’s making a note of it. What I will say—

Chair: Don’t be distracted Councillor SRI.

Councillor SRI: What I will say is that ferry terminals can, if well designed, serve a useful purpose as community gathering spaces and community facilities. This is something that Council hasn’t really explored in the past, but I would encourage the Administration to at least look into this in a little bit of detail.

If we’re spending a lot of money creating a roofed facility that’s wheelchair accessible and is serving as terminal, there’s an opportunity there for that to double as a form of public meeting space or gathering space. Particularly at times when the ferries aren’t operating at high capacity or high frequency. So, for example, a covered space can be—can have a dual purpose as an outdoor live music venue. Or simply as a space where local residents can meet and gather.

That particular part of Kangaroo Point and East Brisbane is really poorly served in terms of community facilities and Council has found this itself. That if it’s trying to have a meeting with local residents and get people together for any kind of public consultation, really your only option is the pub. I’m sure some of us like going to the pub, but it’s not an accessible venue for everyone.

To say to people hey, if you want to talk to Council you have to come to this pub or this hotel is not a particularly inclusive approach, but the reason Council does that is because we don’t have alternative venues available. So, I would be supportive of design approaches with Dockside and Mowbray Park ferry terminals that create usable public space as part of the terminal infrastructure. Subject of course to careful consultation with residents. I think that’s something we should look at a little more in the future.

Turning to item C, this is a good idea of Jonathan SRI’s that the Council Administration has taken up. I’m talking of course about the closure of the Victoria Park Golf Course and its conversion into public parkland. I think that was a great step forward for the city. Obviously, I think the opening of the Minnippi Park Golf Course is probably not as high priority and may be a step in the wrong direction.

But I look forward to—one day to St Lucia Golf Course and the Minnippi Park Golf Course also being shut down and replaced with genuine public parkland, community facilities and maybe a couple of small eco villages. These are really large areas of Council-owned land and it doesn’t make sense for so much publicly owned land within the city footprint to be set aside for golf. It’s simply a very space intensive sport.

When you compare, for example, the amount of people who benefit from and get to use a cricket field or a soccer field or any number of other sporting facilities. In terms of the space taken up by golf, there’s a real mismatch in terms of use value. Council is constantly looking for ways to optimise how it uses its land. It’s shutting down bowls clubs, it’s kicking out cricket clubs, *et cetera*, *et cetera*. You actually have a lot of space on these golf course sites.

I’m not saying the entire thing needs to be flattened and levelled and turned into soccer fields, but I am saying that this land is not being put to its best possible use. I would argue that golf courses in places like Minnippi and also St Lucia should ultimately be converted into other forms of public greenspace, public parkland and community facilities.

Minnippi does have a bit of natural bushland and parkland around it, but the golf course itself is not a good use of space. It would be much better to see more of that restored as natural bushland and native habitat and indeed other public greenspace uses. It was really sad to see how many trees were cut down as part of this Minnippi Golf Course development. Even still it seems, as Council is connecting up some of the pathways leading to this new golf course, more trees are being removed.

I do think it makes a bit of a mockery of this establishment, this Administration’s claim that it’s really supportive of planting more trees and increasing canopy cover. Because I look at projects like the Minnippi Golf Course and all I see is trees getting cut down and more and more canopy cover being lost. So we’re planting a few small saplings here and there, but are we actually accounting for how many existing trees on Council land are being removed? It seems like perhaps we aren’t.

This project is, I guess, on the wrong side of that equation. Where I’m sure we’re planting new trees as well and, in a few years, they’ll grow a little bit, assuming they don’t die in the next drought. But we’ve lost a lot of trees as a result of the Minnippi Park Golf Course development. A big chunk of bushland. Some of it was remnant regrowth and I’m aware of the history of the site. But the fact remains that we were cutting down trees to make space of golf. That just doesn’t seem like a very sustainable way forward.

So hopefully this is the last golf course that Brisbane City Council will ever establish in our city. Hopefully a few years from now we’ll be shutting those down and converting them to other uses. Because the Victoria Park Golf Course is a—that conversion into parkland is a really great project. It’s something that other cities around Australia are looking to as a positive example to follow.

I’m certainly really proud and I think all of us as Councillors should be really proud that we’ve made that tough decision to shut down that golf course and turn it into something better. Hopefully down the track we’ll be able to do that with the other Council owned golf courses in the city as well. Thanks.

Chair: Thank you Councillor SRI.

Further debate on E&C? No further debate?

Councillors we’re voting seriatim on these items.

I shall move items A and E together, items A and E.

**Clauses A and E put**

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

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

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 14 - The DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Krista ADAMS, and Councillors Greg ADERMANN, Adam ALLAN, Tracy DAVIS, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Sarah HUTTON, James MACKAY, Kim MARX, Peter MATIC, David McLACHLAN, Ryan MURPHY, Steven TOOMEY and Andrew WINES.

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

ABSTENTION: 1 - Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON.

Chair: Thank you.

The other items in seriatim were items B—sorry item C, we’ll move to item C which was called for seriatim.

**Clause C put**

Upon being submitted to the Chamber, the motion for the adoption of Clause C 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: 18 - The DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Krista ADAMS, and Councillors Greg ADERMANN, Adam ALLAN, Tracy DAVIS, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Sarah HUTTON, James MACKAY, Kim MARX, Peter MATIC, David McLACHLAN, Ryan MURPHY, Steven TOOMEY, Andrew WINES and the Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Jared CASSIDY, and Councillors Peter CUMMING, Steve GRIFFITHS and Charles STRUNK.

NOES: 2 - Councillors Jonathan SRI and Nicole JOHNSTON.

Chair: I declare that carried.

The final two items, B—

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order, Mr Chair.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, just—abstentions?

Chair: Were there any—oh my apologies.

Were there any abstentions on item C?

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: No? We—I think we recorded everybody who voted thank you.

Items B and D in the E&C report.

**Clauses B and D put**

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

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, Tracy Davis, Vicki Howard, Steven Huang, Kim Marx, Ryan Murphy and Andrew Wines.

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE:**

Councillor Fiona Cunningham.

#### A PRESENTATION AND TABLING OF THE AUDITED CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AND THE AUDITOR-GENERAL’S AUDIT REPORTS FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30 JUNE 2021

**134/695/317/1207**

**146/2021-22**

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

2. The Consolidated Financial Statements are prepared by Council based on the requirements of the *City of Brisbane Regulation 2012*. The Consolidated Financial Statements comprise:

(a) the general purpose financial statements for the financial year, audited by the Auditor‑General

(b) the current year financial sustainability statement for the financial year, audited by the Auditor‑General

(c) the Auditor-General’s audit reports on the general purpose financial statements and the current year financial sustainability statement

(d) the long-term financial sustainability statement for the financial year.

3. The Consolidated Financial Statements have been reviewed and endorsed by the Audit Committee.

4. The Auditor-General has a statutory obligation to audit Council’s financial statements, as required by the *Auditor-General Act 2009*. The Auditor-General has completed the audit of the general purpose financial statements and the current year financial sustainability statement for 2020-21, and has provided Auditor‑General audit reports.

5. Section 40(4)(c)(ii) of the *Auditor-General Act 2009* requires that the statements be provided to the Lord Mayor as soon as practicable following certification.

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

7. **RECOMMENDATION:**

**THAT THE CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AND AUDITOR‑GENERAL’S AUDIT REPORTS FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30 JUNE 2021, AS SET OUT IN ATTACHMENTS A, B AND C** (submitted on file)**, BE TABLED AT COUNCIL.**

**ADOPTED**

#### B STORES BOARD SUBMISSION – SIGNIFICANT CONTRACTING PLAN FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF DOCKSIDE AND MOWBRAY PARK FERRY TERMINALS

**165/210/179/3976**

**147/2021-22**

8. The Chief Executive Officer provided the information below.

9. The Chief Executive Officer and the Stores Board considered the submission, as set out in Attachment A (submitted on file), on 11 August 2021.

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

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

Purpose

12. The Stores Board recommends approval of the Significant Contracting Plan (SCP) for the Construction of Dockside and Mowbray Park Ferry Terminals.

Background/business case

13. The budget (New and Upgraded Ferry Terminals) provides that:

*This service continues to upgrade the ferry terminal infrastructure as an essential part of the city’s public transport network. Council has committed to upgrading the city’s ferry network to provide improved access for everyone. All future upgrades and ferry network assets will be designed and built to be compliant with the Disability Standards for Accessible Public Transport 2002 and the Disability Discrimination Act 1992 (DDA).*

14. This SCP seeks approval to procure the construction of Dockside and Mowbray Park Ferry Terminals in line with this commitment.

15. The Dockside Ferry Terminal (Dockside) upgrade will include removing the existing pontoon, gangway and associated piles, demolition of a section of the adjacent boardwalk and sub‑structure, reconstruction of the demolished section of boardwalk and the installation of a new fixed walkway, and flood resilient articulated gangway and pontoon. The pontoon will be a bespoke design, dual freeboard to allow flexibility in use by vessels, however, due to the footprint and site constraints, it will not be dual berthing for CityCats.

16. The Mowbray Park Ferry Terminal (Mowbray Park) upgrade will include removing the existing pontoon, gangway and associated piles, repurposing and refurbishing the existing waiting area to provide a more open and transparent space, and the installation of a new fixed walkway and flood resilient articulated gangway and a dual berth, dual freeboard pontoon suitable for all fleet vessels. There are also landside (and associated landscape) improvement works to provide DDA compliant set down, parking spaces and access paths from the existing car park within Mowbray Park, and improvements to the adjacent cul‑de‑sac set down.

17. For Dockside, the wet lease resumption process is underway and owner’s consent is being sought to allow lodgement of the Development Application (DA). Mowbray Park has DA approval.

Policy and other considerations

18. Is there an existing Corporate Procurement Arrangement (CPA)/contract for these goods/services/works?

Yes. CPA 531599 – Ferry Terminal and Maritime Infrastructure Construction and Upgrades. CPA 531599 has two suppliers considered capable of completing the work.

19. Could Council businesses provide the services/works?

No, Council does not have the capacity or equipment to deliver the works.

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

No

21. 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?

Environmental sustainability is considered in the design process. Access and equity have been considered in the design to meet DDA requirements. QA will be considered as part of the evaluation process. Local benefit has been included in the non-price weighted evaluation criteria.

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

Yes

23. Does this proposed contract involve leasing?

No

Market analysis

24. There is a relatively small marine industry in Brisbane/South East Queensland influenced by current and planned projects both locally and interstate and availability of sub-contractors with specialist marine equipment. A market scan has identified at least one further supplier (in addition to the two suppliers on Council’s current CPA (531599) is capable of undertaking the work and interested in tendering. The market scan indicated a strong preference to tender the two terminals together to leverage efficiencies and provide greater incentive to bid. The market for steel (and to a lesser extent aluminium) has been disrupted by the COVID-19 pandemic and is likely to continue to experience price volatility.

Procurement strategy and activity plan

25.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Procurement objective: | To procure the Construction of Dockside and Mowbray Park Ferry Terminals 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: | Construction of Dockside Ferry Terminal (separable portion 1).  Construction of Mowbray Ferry Terminal (separable portion 2). |
| Type of procurement: | Establishing a once-off contract(s) for construction of Dockside Ferry Terminal and construction of Mowbray Park Ferry Terminal. |
| Process to be used: | Request for Proposal (RFP) with negotiations. |
| RFP standard to be used: | The RFP standard will be Council’s corporate standard. |
| Market engagement: | The RFP will be publicly released. Panel and other known suppliers will be advised of the release of the RFP. |
| How RFP is to be distributed and submitted: | Via Council’s supplier portal |
| How proposals are to be lodged: | Via Council’s supplier portal |
| Part offers: | An offer for one ferry terminal only may be accepted. An offer for part only of either ferry terminal will not be considered. |
| Joint offers: | Joint offers may not be considered. |
| Contract standard to be used (and any amends): | AS 4000 (with Council’s standard amendments) |
| Term of contract: | 16 months |
| Insurance requirements: | Council’s Principal Arranged Construction Insurance will apply. Additionally, motor vehicle insurance of $20 million will be required. |
| Price basis: | Lump sum |
| Price adjustment: | Fixed lump sum pricing will be requested. However, price adjustment (such as for fluctuations in steel pricing and/or timing of works) may be negotiated during the tender process. |
| Liquidated damages: | $5,000 per day |
| Security for the contract: | Security in the form of two unconditional bank guarantees each to the value of 2.5% of the estimated contract sum. |
| Defects liability period/warranty period: | 12 months from practical completion |
| Other strategy elements: | Tenderers will be required to:  - program the work so that the new Dockside Ferry Terminal is open prior to the closure of the Mowbray Park Ferry Terminal for replacement  - price local (as opposed to international) fabrication of pontoon and gangway elements. The local benefit element of the evaluation will consider a preference for Brisbane, South East Queensland, Queensland, then interstate.  The above additional strategy elements may be subject to negotiation during the RFP process. |
| Alternative strategies considered: | Tendering to suppliers on CPA 531599 was considered. However, a public tender may result in greater competition and stronger value for money (VFM) outcomes to Council.  A two-stage process (an Expression of Interest (EOI) followed by an RFP) was considered. However, an EOI shortlist is likely to contain the same tenderers as an RFP, offering little additional benefit for suppliers or Council.    Procuring the two projects separately was considered. This was not recommended as grouping of the two terminals in one tender is expected to result in savings related to fabrication. In addition, grouping may also attract additional suppliers to bid for this work. |

Anticipated schedule

26. Pre-market approval: 7 September 2021

Date of release of RFP to market: 10 September 2021

RFP closing date: 3 December 2021

Evaluation completion: Mid/late January 2022

Contract prepared: Late January 2022

Post-market approval: Late February 2022

Contract expenditure and budget availability

27. Estimated total expenditure under this contract (including any optional additional periods):

Estimated total expenditure for the Construction of Dockside and Mowbray Park Ferry Terminals is [Commercial-in-Confidence].

Contingency requested: [Commercial-in-Confidence] ([Commercial-in-Confidence] of the estimated contract sum).

28. Sufficient approved budget to meet the total spend under this contract?

Yes

29. Anticipated procurement savings (if any):

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

30. Program budget line item:

Program: Program 1 – Transport for Brisbane

Outcome: 1.2 – Public Transport

Strategy: 1.2.1 – Providing High Quality Ferry Services

Service: 1.2.1.1 – Enhance the Ferry Infrastructure Network

Operating/projects: New and Upgraded Ferry Terminals

Procurement risk

31. Summary of key risks associated with this procurement:

| **Procurement risk** | **Risk rating** | **Risk mitigation strategy** | **Risk allocation** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Delay in receiving approvals (e.g. wet lease for Dockside, finalisation of DAs) | Medium | Resumption (Dockside) underway. Revised programs can be negotiated, however, these may impact potential savings/incur additional cost. | Council |
| Low number of bids leads to poor VFM outcomes | Low | Open market RFP process to maximise competition. A sufficient number of suppliers have indicated interest in tendering. | Council |
| Fluctuation in prices of steel and aluminium | Low | Local supply is anticipated. Rise and fall provisions may be negotiated if required, with hedging considered. | Council and contractor |

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

No

Tender evaluation

33. Evaluation criteria:

(a) Mandatory/essential criteria:

- Satisfactory financial capacity and viability.

- Ability to complete the project in line with program expectations.

- Agreement to Council’s terms and conditions of contract.

(b) Non-price weighted evaluation criteria:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Weighted evaluation criteria** | **Weighting**  **(%)** |
| Local benefit | 30 |
| Company capacity and experience constructing similar facilities in a marine based environment | [Commercial-in-Confidence] |
| Proposed team, personnel and capacity | [Commercial-in-Confidence] |
| Methodology and program | [Commercial-in-Confidence] |
| Plant and equipment | [Commercial-in-Confidence] |
| **Total:** | **100** |

(c) Price model:

Normalised tendered price

34. Evaluation methodology:

(a) Shortlisting process:

Proposals will be initially shortlisted, if required, using the total score against the non‑price weighted criteria. Further shortlists, if required, will be based on VFM score. At any time during the evaluation, proposals 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 proposal contains non-compliances with the specifications or draft contract that the Evaluation Team consider to be unacceptable/not advantageous for Council

- the proposal/tenderer is 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.

(b) VFM method:

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

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

36. **RECOMMENDATION:**

**THAT THE STORES BOARD RECOMMENDS APPROVAL OF THE SIGNIFICANT CONTRACTING PLAN FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF DOCKSIDE AND MOWBRAY PARK FERRY TERMINALS.**

**ADOPTED**

#### C STORES BOARD SUBMISSION – SIGNIFICANT CONTRACTING PLAN FOR THE LEASE AND OPERATION OF THE MINNIPPI GOLF COURSE

**165/830/179/852**

**148/2021-22**

37. The Chief Executive Officer provided the information below.

38. The Chief Executive Officer and the Stores Board considered the submission, as set out in Attachment A (submitted on file), on 16 August 2021.

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

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

Purpose

41. The Stores Board recommends approval of the Significant Contracting Plan for the Lease and Operation of the Minnippi Golf Course and associated services, located at 1825 Creek Road, Cannon Hill, for a term of up to 25 years. Expenditure is based on estimated annual operating costs up to $50 million over the potential 25-year term and subject to any revenue offset.

Background/business case

42. Council is working with BMD Properties Pty Ltd (BMD) to deliver the Minnippi Golf Course and residential precinct in Cannon Hill. BMD is delivering, at no cost to Council, an 18-hole golf course, including a golf pro shop, café and maintenance facilities. Final construction is due for completion in mid‑2022, for a 1 September 2022 opening date.

43. Once complete, the Minnippi Golf Course will be Brisbane’s first public golf course in 70 years and Brisbane’s only public golf course south of the Brisbane River.

44. Revenue streams for golf courses are generated through green fees and complementary offerings including food and beverage, equipment hire/sales, function rooms/catering and putt putt. At St Lucia Golf Course, Council spends approximately $1.8 million per year in operational expenditure to maintain the course. Using the St Lucia Golf Course’s operational expenditure as a guide, the operating costs at Minnippi are estimated up to $50 million over the potential 25-year period. It does not include costs to operate the golf pro shop or café. Green fees revenue only partially offsets this operational expenditure.

45. While COVID-19 has driven an increase in golf player numbers, it has adversely affected the more profitable hospitality revenue streams. An immediate to short term capital investment for such offerings is unlikely.

46. This Request for Proposals (RFP) seeks an offer, that over time:

- contributes capital expenditure to upgrade existing infrastructure

- provides additional ancillary services or facilities to the venue

- minimises Council’s operational expenditure for maintenance.

47. The RFP will cater for commercial models proposed by tenderers to be negotiated and refined for the most advantageous outcome, including:

- lease and operate the golf course and café facilities

- lease and operate the golf course and café facilities and maintain the golf course

- lease and operate the golf course and café facilities and invest in additional facilities that complement the golf course

- lease and operate the golf course and café facilities, maintain the golf course, and invest in additional facilities that complement the golf course.

48. This flexible approach to commercial models will be assessed based on shorter term operating models being normalised, with an assumption that responsibility transitions to Council at the end of the contract.

Policy and other considerations

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

No

50. Could Council businesses provide the services/works?

There is a small contingent of experienced Council staff and machinery in use at Victoria Park that could be transferred to provide maintenance, however, there is no capacity for the broader operational requirements.

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

There are large portions of marine and environmental protected areas on and bordering the Minnippi Golf Course. These are addressed in the construction requirements and ongoing requirements will be addressed in the lease agreement.

52. 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. All items above are included in the evaluation criteria for assessment. Tenderers will be asked to explain what local benefits will be delivered as a result of winning this contract.

Examples of these include:

- the percentage of total expenditure/profit that remains in the local economy

- local employment strategies reflecting diversity and inclusion

- attracting business/patrons from outside South East Queensland

- alignment to Council’s *Brisbane Vision 2031* themes.

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

No

54. Does this proposed contract involve leasing?

Yes. Corporate Finance, Organisational Services (OS), and City Legal, City Administration and Governance (CAG) have been consulted.

Market analysis

55. Council has received interest from a number of private operators and golf professionals. A desktop scan has identified additional potential tenderers, with capability and capacity to operate the facility. Additional potential tenderers include:

- Atlas Golf Services Pty Ltd

- Avid Sports Management Pty Ltd (Golf Central – Brisbane Airport)

- Belgravia Health and Leisure Group Pty Ltd

- CBD Golf Pty Ltd

- Golf Service Management Pty Ltd

- Golf World Pty Ltd.

Procurement strategy and activity plan

56.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Procurement objective: | To procure a suitable and experienced lessee to operate the Minnippi Golf Course, for a term of up to 25 years.  The achievement of the above procurement objective will be measured in the post-market submission. |
| Title of contract: | Lease and Operation of Minnippi Golf Course |
| Type of procurement: | Establishing a once-off contract (lease) |
| Process to be used: | RFP |
| 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: | Offers are to be sought publicly via Council’s supplier portal and advertised in *The Courier-Mail*, various Golf Industry forums, and Sports and Leisure Industry forums who work with most golf industry operators and golf professionals in Australia. |
| How RFT/P/Q or EOI 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 not be considered. |
| Joint offers: | Joint offers may be considered. |
| Contract standard to be used (and any amends): | Lease drafted by City Legal, CAG, with any amendments to be confirmed once proposals have been submitted and offers negotiated. |
| Period/term of contract: | Up to 25 years |
| Insurance requirements: | Public liability of $20 million, property and building insurance to the value of any proposed capital improvements, and workers’ compensation insurance to an amount as required by legislative requirements in Queensland. |
| Price basis: | To be nominated by tenderers and negotiated. |
| Price adjustment: | To be nominated by tenderers and negotiated. |
| Liquidated damages: | Not applicable |
| Security for the contract: | Not applicable |
| Defects liability period/warranty period: | Not applicable |
| Other strategy elements: | Nil |
| Alternative strategies considered: | Nil |

Anticipated schedule

57. Council approval: 7 September 2021

Date of release to market: 17 September 2021

Tender closing: 8 December 2021

Evaluation completion: 28 January 2022

Lease prepared: 28 February 2022

Post-market approval: 1 March 2022

Contract commencement: 1 May 2022

Golf course opens to public: 1 September 2022

Contract expenditure and budget availability

58. Estimated total expenditure under this contract (including any optional additional periods):

The estimated expenditure over the potential 25-year term is up to $50 million. This is based on Council undertaking maintenance responsibilities for the course and subject to the final operating model negotiated.

The estimated revenue will be determined through the RFP process and subsequent negotiations. The primary objective being a revenue target that is close to or exceeds projected Council expenditure.

59. Sufficient approved budget to meet the total spend under this contract?

Operating budget exists in current and forward year’s budgets. If additional funding is required following negotiations, this will be sought through Council’s budget review process.

60. Program budget line item:

Program: Program 5 – Lifestyle and Community Services

Outcome: 5.6 City Icons and Venues

Strategy: 5.6.2 City Venues Management

Service: 5.6.2.3 Golf Courses

Operating: Operating

61. Anticipated procurement savings (if any):

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

Procurement risk

62. Summary of key risks associated with this procurement:

| **Procurement risk** | **Risk rating** | **Risk mitigation strategy** | **Risk allocation** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Financial risks** | | | |
| Expenditure revenue ratio is unfavourable to Council | Low | Tender evaluation process. The tenderer provides a fixed price submission for any rental payable to, or subsidy payable by Council. Council approval is required for the granting of a lease. | Council/ lessee |
| **Operational risks** | | | |
| Poor quality of service | Low | Tender evaluation process and lease clauses that define Council requirements such as entry fees, public access, etc.  Council may maintain the golf course. | Council/ lessee |
| Construction of additional improvements not to standard (if applicable) | Low | All approvals are the responsibility of the lessee (incorporated in the lease).  Construction is the responsibility of the lessee (Council approves designs and final approval on finished product). | Lessee |
| **Procurement risks** | | | |
| The offers received do not meet Council’s expectations | Medium | The RFP process will include a number of tender briefings for Council to explain the desired outcome in more detail and to encourage tenderers to seek clarification. | Council |

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

No

Tender evaluation

64. Evaluation criteria:

(a) Mandatory/essential criteria:

Nil

(b) Non-price weighted evaluation criteria:

| **Weighted evaluation criteria** | **Weighting**  **(%)** |
| --- | --- |
| Capability | [Commercial-in-Confidence] |
| Local benefit | 30 |
| Track record and experience | [Commercial-in-Confidence] |
| Capacity | [Commercial-in-Confidence] |
| **Total:** | **100** |

(c) Price model:

A comparative price will be derived by calculating the Net Present Value (the total cost/revenue to Council over the proposed term of the lease).

65. Evaluation methodology:

(a) Shortlisting process:

Responses will initially undergo a preliminary compliance/conformance screen. If a response does not comply, and clarification cannot be provided, it may be excluded.

Compliant responses will be assessed against the weighted evaluation criteria and may be excluded from further evaluation or 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 proposal contains non-compliances with the specifications or draft contract that the Evaluation Team consider to be unacceptable/not advantageous for Council

- the proposal/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 commercial reasons for further consideration of the proposal.

(b) Value for money (VFM) method:

Council’s standard VFM methodology.

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

67. **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Stores Board recommends approval of the Significant Contracting Plan for the Lease and Operation of the Minnippi Golf Course and associated services, located at 1825 Creek Road, Cannon Hill, for a term of up to 25 years. Estimated expenditure is based on estimated annual operating costs up to $50 million over the potential 25-year term and subject to any revenue offset.

**ADOPTED**

#### D CONSENT TO ENTER INTO A RIGHT OF ENTRY DEED AND REGISTER A MORTGAGE OVER THE LEASE TO SUNNYBANK RUGBY UNION CLUB LTD ACN 167 172 947

**112/445/444/1327**

**149/2021-22**

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

69. Council is the registered proprietor of the land described as Lot 1 on RP171887 and Lot 1 on CP SL1395, 470 McCullough Street, MacGregor. Sunnybank Rugby Union Club Ltd ACN 167 172 947 (SRUC) has a current registered lease under dealing 717640124, expiring on 31 July 2046 (refer Attachment B, submitted on file).

70. SRUC is in the process of refinancing its commercial finance arrangements from Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited (ANZ) to Commonwealth Bank of Australia (CBA).

71. SRUC has requested consent to register a mortgage on the current registered lease to replace the existing ANZ mortgage facility. SRUC has also requested Council become a party to the CBA’s Right of Entry Deed in a form similar to the draft set out at Attachment C (submitted on file). The new mortgage will transfer all existing debt from the ANZ mortgage to CBA, with no further increase in debt. Based on recent financial performance by SRUC, they have demonstrated ability to meet all of the obligations as outlined in the mortgage documents (refer Attachment D, submitted on file).

72. SRUC is compliant and has met all the performance criteria as outlined in the registered lease, including provision of $13.5 million contribution related to the construction of Sunnybank Performing Arts and Cultural Centre, construction of an underground car park, various building extensions and installation of a synthetic field.

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

74. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A**

**Draft Response**

**DRAFT RESOLUTION TO CONSENT TO ENTER INTO A RIGHT OF ENTRY DEED AND REGISTER A MORTGAGE OVER THE CURRENT REGISTERED LEASE, DEALING NUMBER 717640124, BY COMMONWEALTH BANK OF AUSTRALIA ABN 48 123 123 124**

As:

(i) Council is the registered proprietor of the land described as Lot 1 on RP171887 and Lot 1 on CP SL1395, 470 McCullough Street, MacGregor (the site)

(ii) Sunnybank Rugby Union Club Ltd ACN 167 172 947 (SRUC) has a current registered lease over the site under dealing 717640124, expiring on 31 July 2046

(iii) SRUC has requested Council’s consent to enter into a Right of Entry Deed with Commonwealth Bank of Australia ABN 48 123 123 124 (CBA) and SRUC

(iv) SRUC has requested Council’s consent to register a mortgage on current registered lease 717640124,

then Council:

(i) agrees to enter into the Right of Entry Deed with CBA and SRUC on terms and conditions satisfactory to the Chief Legal Counsel, City Legal, City Administration and Governance

(ii) consents to SRUC registering a mortgage of lease with CBA.

**ADOPTED**

#### E BRISBANE CITY COUNCIL ANNUAL REPORT 2020-21

**134/695/586/298**

**150/2021-22**

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

76. Section 174(2) of the *City of Brisbane Regulation 2012* (the Regulation) requires that Council adopt its Annual Report for a financial year within one month of the day the Auditor-General gives the Auditor‑General’s report regarding Council’s financial statements, or by a later day as decided by the Minister for Local Government, Racing and Multicultural Affairs.

77. The financial statements, which form part of the Brisbane City Council Annual Report 2020‑21 (the Annual Report), are the subject of a separate submission to Council.

78. The Regulation provides that the Annual Report must include (among other things):

(a) the general purpose financial statement for 2020-21 and the current year financial sustainability statement, audited by the Auditor-General

(b) the long-term financial sustainability statement for 2020-21

(c) the Auditor-General’s audit reports about the general purpose statement, and the current year financial sustainability report

(d) the community financial report

(e) details of Council’s business activities

(f) particulars of Councillors’ remuneration, expenses, facilities, meeting attendance, and orders and recommendations made regarding Councillors

(g) particulars of administrative action complaints

(h) particulars of overseas travel by Councillors and employees

(i) information regarding Council’s annual performance and achievements against the Annual Operational Plan and Budget

(j) reporting by the Chief Executive Officer regarding Council’s progress in implementing Council’s *Corporate Plan 2016-17 to 2020-21 – 2017 Update* (the Corporate Plan) as required by section 157(3) of the Regulation.

79. In compliance with section 174(2) of the Regulation, the Annual Report has been prepared and is set out in Attachment B (submitted on file).

80. Council also meets the reporting requirements of *The* *Queensland Plan* (the Plan) by reporting on the achievements of Council’s program area and business units towards meeting Corporate Plan objectives, which are relevant to many of the goals outlined in the Plan*.*

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

82. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A**

**Draft Response**

**DRAFT RESOLUTION TO ADOPT THE BRISBANE CITY COUNCIL ANNUAL REPORT 2020‑21**

As:

(i) section 174(2) of the *City of Brisbane Regulation 2012* (the Regulation) requires that Council adopt its Annual Report within one month after the day the Auditor-General gives the Auditor-General’s audit report about Council’s financial statements for the financial year to Council

(ii) section 157(3) of the Regulation requires that the Chief Executive Officer must present a written assessment of Council’s progress towards implementing Council’s *Corporate Plan 2016-17 to 2020-21 – 2017 Update* (the Corporate Plan)

(iii) Council has prepared the Brisbane City Council Annual Report 2020-21 (the Report), as set out in Attachment B (submitted on file),

then Council:

(i) pursuant to section 174(2) of the Regulation, resolves to adopt the Report as set out in Attachment B (submitted on file)

(ii) notes the Chief Executive Officer’s written assessment of progress towards implementing Council’s Corporate Plan, as set out in the Report.

**ADOPTED**

Chair: Councillors we move on to the Economic Development and Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games Committee.

DEPUTY MAYOR.

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

The DEPUTY MAYOR (Councillor Krista ADAMS), Civic Cabinet Chair of the Economic Development and the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Sarah HUTTON that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 31 August 2021, be adopted.

Chair: Is there any debate?

DEPUTY MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair. Look, before I get into the Committee report, I’d just like to go through some of the Business Hub workshops and mentoring programs coming up in the next week. We were just there this morning and Miriam gave us a great rundown of how busy it is. There is quite a few next week. Please pass on to your businesses throughout your networks as a Councillor, to let them know that these are on, free of charge.

On Wednesday 8, tomorrow, from 9am until 11am, Business Matters: Inspiring you to be a better leader, get better results and make a bigger impact. That will be hosted by Free to Shine, one of the business experts. On Monday 13, from nine o’clock, Domestic and family violence: How it impacts the workplace and what you need. This masterclass is about understanding domestic and family violence and how to develop a business response to the issue. That’s being hosted by CCIQ (Chamber of Commerce and Industry Queensland) and WorkHaven.

On Tuesday 14 at 9am, Community Curious—Growing and Activating Online Communities. It’s about connecting people who are aspiring to become a community manager and help businesses to start a customer community. Being hosted by Social Mediology. Then next Tuesday at 3pm, How to Master Your ‘Why’ and Share it With Confidence. This is about making your business stand out and help you leave with confidence to share your business story. That is being hosted by one of our business partners, P4 Group.

So a bit of things for everybody. As well as—don’t forget the mentoring, if you have businesses or businesspeople that would like support in that space as well.

The Committee presentation last week was on the Brisbane Business Summit, it was the first time, the inaugural time we’ve held that, on 21 April this year. It was a pivot—dare I use the word—over the last 18 months. Where we’ve had a Brisbane Innovate Day over the last four or five years while I’ve been Economic Development Chair. Which was about bringing scaleups, ideas and using data to drive solutions in the community.

We saw a new need, obviously, coming out of the back of the last 12 months, to get businesses, local, interstate, together. To see what it was going to look like from beyond 2021. That was all about what the focus of the day was. The opportunities for businesses amid a changing economic environment.

So there was 860 registrations. On the day 285 in person, 271 who came along virtually and 114 unique views from that afterwards. Because we kept the things online for a little while as well. So we need to in these uncertain times, make sure we do virtual and in person, as we’ll see over the next three days.

But it was fantastic, we had great guest speakers. Mark McCrindle, a demographer and social researcher did a fantastic opening keynote speech. Then we had other directors from businesses like Matthew Tobin from UAP (Urban Art Projects) speaking on how his Brisbane-based business grew to where it is today and how art brings so much of a city to life. Andrea Culligan who’s a partner in Deloitte Australia talking around data and how it can be used to predict.

We had a panel that I joined myself with Li Cunxin from the Queensland Ballet, Dimity Dornan from—Director of Hear & Say, Llew Jury who’s a Director of Sprint Ventures and that was about our city, our strengths. Very interesting from the other panel members. Of course the closing keynote was Mark Bouris from Yellow Brick Road which you will know from *The Apprentice* I think—am I showing—yes, *The Apprentice,* showing my non-millennial trademark there. I don’t know if I’ve watched that one, How to Survive the New Normal in Business.

Well I can tell you what, everybody knew who Mark Bouris was, whether they watched his TV or not because we couldn’t get him off stage and nobody wanted to leave. He was extremely popular and he did very, very well. We got great positive feedback from the day. We are planning already for bigger and better next year and look forward to all Councillors sharing this with their communities and joining us on the day as well. Thank you, Mr Chair.

Chair: Thank you DEPUTY MAYOR.

Further debate? Any further debate? No?

We’ll now move the report which is the report of the Economic Development and Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games Committee meeting, dated Tuesday 31 August 2021. I love saying that Committee name.

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 – INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY PROTECTIONS

**151/2021-22**

1. The Manager Brisbane City Host Office and Chief Planner, City Planning and Economic Development, City Planning and Sustainability, attended the meeting to provide an update on Intellectual Property Protections. She provided the information below.

2. The Olympic brand is an attractive proposition for sponsors, and due to the global visibility and goodwill associated with the event, the International Olympic Committee’s (IOC) intellectual property is protected.

3. Legislation polices who can capitalise on the Olympic brand, including the *Olympic Insignia Protection Act 1987* (Cth) and *Major Sporting Event (Indicia and Images) Protection Act 2014* (Cth), together with rules set out under the IOC Charter. These laws go much further than conventional consumer protection or trademark laws.

4. For Council, all logos, emblems and designs including the transition logo and emblem already created, or yet to be created, for the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games (the Games), are protected.

5. For the IOC, the Olympic symbol (the five rings), the Paralympic symbol, emblems such as the flag and motto, mascots, pictograms, Games’ titles, images, sounds, terms (including the words ‘Olympic’ and ‘Paralympic’) and related hashtags, are the intellectual property of the Games.

6. Council is licenced by the Australian Olympic Committee (AOC) to use the transition logos, and may, with prior AOC approval, use the Olympic symbol and the word ‘Olympic’, to promote and communicate the awarding of the Olympic and Paralympic Games to Brisbane in 2032 until the Games emblems are approved.

7. Council is not licenced to:

- use any other Olympic property or IOC and AOC intellectual property

- authorise a third party to use or reproduce the transition logos, the Olympic symbol or any other Olympic property

- agree to any other third parties using or reproducing the transition logos, the Olympic symbol, or any other Olympic property for advertising, marketing or fundraising activities. This includes external parties working with, or engaged by, Council, even where the activities or events may be for Council or mutual benefit.

8.The transition logo is available for limited use on:

- Council’s website homepage and Olympic and Paralympic Games webpage

- Council’s Facebook profile page

- PowerPoint presentations for external and internal audiences meeting a required set of principles.

The transition logo is not available:

- for commercial purposes including fundraising

- to be separated out into individual elements such as the five rings and used.

9. All use of the AOC and IOC intellectual property (including references to the Olympic and Paralympic Games) and the transition logo by Council is subject to consideration and approval by City Communication, City Administration and Governance (CAG). Requests will be managed as follows:

- City Communication will refer the request to City Legal, CAG, for advice

- City Communication will request any necessary AOC approval

- no approval requests are to be made directly to the AOC or IOC through any other means.

10.Any unauthorised use by a business which attempts to make a link between themselves and the Games without being an official sponsor is considered ambush marketing. Council is obliged to dissuade businesses from ambush marketing to protect the interests of Council, the IOC, the AOC and legitimate sponsors, and to make businesses aware of the potential repercussions of such unauthorised use. In the Summer Olympics of 1996, an athlete was photographed in the Nike shoes he wore in the Games. Nike used this imagery in a campaign and people began to believe that Nike had sponsored the Games, rather than Reebok. The IOC required Nike to desist with the ambush marketing campaign.

11. In relation to social media, a member of the public posting in their personal capacity about the Games to their followers will generally not contravene the relevant laws. However, if a person’s social media identifies that person by reference to their business or employment, this may be considered self‑promotion leading to potential commercial, advertising or other benefit contrary to intellectual property rights. If in doubt, guidance should be sought by emailing City Communication, City Administration and Governance: communication@brisbane.qld.gov.au.

12. Following a number of questions from the Committee, the Civic Cabinet Chair thanked the Manager Brisbane City Host Office and Chief Planning Officer for her informative presentation.

13. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

Chair: Councillor MURPHY, a very short name—Transport Committee report.

### TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

Councillor Ryan MURPHY, Civic Cabinet Chair of the Transport Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Sarah HUTTON, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 31 August 2021, be adopted.

Chair: Is there any debate?

Councillor MURPHY: Thanks, Chair. Look earlier in Question Time I spoke extensively about our ambitious Green Bridges Program in response to a question from Councillor MATIC so I won’t belabour that point again. Last week the Transport Committee was given an update on that program as well. We also received a number of petitions. We considered four petitions, each urging Council not to proceed with any of the alignment options for the West End of St Lucia Green Bridge and one asking us not to proceed with the project overall.

Council has engaged extensively in consultation on this project, as we have with all of the green bridges in the Green Bridge Program. In addition to consultation that was undertaken directly by Councillors MACKAY and SRI. Over a period of four months from 23 November 2020 to 31 March 2021, Council invited the community to have their say on a shortlist of preferred alignments and landing locations for the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge.

The shortlisted options were informed by a range of technical investigations including traffic and transport modelling, environmental studies, site investigations and initial cost estimates. Key feedback from residents and stakeholders on the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge included general positive support for Option A, Chair. Which was the Guyatt Park to Orleigh Park option, with 64% of survey respondents completely or somewhat supportive of that alignment. Requests for impacts to greenspace at landing locations be minimised, with some residents objecting to any impact on Guyatt Park.

Limited support for Option B which was the Munro Street to Ryan Street align. Then there was some support for Option C which was Keith Street to Boundary Street, with concerns from some residents about the impact of these alignments on local communities, particularly in relation to some of the private property requirements and the resumptions that Council would need to undertake.

Following technical investigations and feasibility assessments and taking into account the outcomes of community consultation. Option A connecting Guyatt Park to Orleigh Park near Morry Street has been identified as the preferred alignment for the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge. We’re now developing a business case that will consider the feedback received by community, during the consultation period and subsequent to it, in the process.

I recently held a Teams meeting with representatives of St Lucia Community Association and the Friends of Guyatt Park groups to discuss these concerns further. We are both committed to engaging further on this issue, although we did not see eye to eye on a number of matters.

I, of course, will ensure that Council is committed to continual engagement with communities on both sides of the river. Anyone who is impacted by not only the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge, but also the Toowong to West End Green Bridge. We want to make sure that these bridges are absolutely supported by those communities for the benefits that they will bring. Not only to those who live adjacent to them, but to the wider City of Brisbane. I’ll leave further debate to the Chamber.

Chair: Than you Councillor MURPHY.

Further debate? Further speakers?

Councillor SRI.

Councillor SRI: Thanks, Chair. Just really briefly regarding the green bridge petitions. I always say really briefly that it’s not going to be brief.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor SRI: I’m concerned about the loss of public greenspace associated with some of these public infrastructure projects. I know that some in the Chamber are a little bit incredulous or sceptical when I say that people are concerned about losing the amount of land that we lose to these projects. Because in the context of a large area of public parkland, a couple of hundred square metres for a bridge landing doesn’t seem like much.

But it’s important to understand the context here, which is that these suburbs round the inner city—suburbs like Toowong, suburbs like West End—have seen dramatic increases in the local population. Thousands of additional residents moving into these areas in housing styles that don’t have private greenspace. There aren’t big backyards, there aren’t other spaces for kids to play, there aren’t spaces for recreation within the private properties. So people are increasingly reliant on public parkland.

So we’ve got more people moving into an area. We’ve got people shifting into styles of accommodation where they are more dependent on public greenspace. Then we have the cumulative impact of public projects which are reducing the supply and availability of public parkland. I’m not just talking about the bridges here. Obviously other projects like the Brisbane Metro, road and intersection widening projects, it all adds up.

While, for any one of these projects by themselves you might look at it in isolation and say oh, that bridge landing’s only taking up a few hundred square metres. When you add it all up, in the inner city we’re actually losing thousands of square metres of public land to public infrastructure projects. At least we’re retaining ownership of that land, but it’s no longer accessible and usable as public parkland.

I think this is something that maybe Administration Councillors who don’t live as close to the inner city or perhaps spend less time in public parks don’t quite appreciate. But perhaps the best example is to go and look at the southern approach to the Goodwill Bridge in South Bank, so that’s the footbridge that connects over to QUT (Queensland University of Technology) and the Botanic Gardens.

If you look at that southern approach—which is a bridge that just takes bikes and pedestrians. That whole area is concreted. It’s very busy as a through corridor for the high volumes of pedestrians and cyclists. It’s not a public park that you can hang out in. It’s not a usable public space for people to gather and wait or engage in recreation. It’s a through corridor for active transport.

That’s the reality of these bridge landings and I’m obviously quite supportive of the West End Toowong Bridge. I still want to see detailed business case for the St Lucia Bridge, but the point is that these bridge landings do take up space in public parks and then that space is no longer usable as public greenspace in the same way.

So I guess all I’m really asking is that this Administration at least acknowledges that that is a genuine and legitimate concern. If the response is well yes, it’s unfortunate, but we just don’t have the money for new parkland. Then say that, but don’t just stand up and pretend that this isn’t negatively impacting how these public spaces can be used.

The bridge landings take up space, it’s a matter of physics. They take up not just any park space, but they take up greenspace right near the river. Often in locations that people are really keen on having a picnic in or sitting down and watching the water. So I think what really should be happening is that the Council should be calculating how much public park and greenspace is being taken up by these sorts of projects, offsetting that by creating new public parkland in the nearby area.

That seems a simple enough proposition. We do the same thing with tree offsets. I’ve been quite critical of that because I don’t think the offsets are genuine or sufficient, but at least on that front the Council accepts the premise that if you chop down a tree, you should try and plant a new one somewhere else.

In this case though the Council is building infrastructure in public parks that undermines the usability of that space as public parkland, but it’s not creating new public parkland nearby. So if thousands of additional people are moving into an area and are saying they need more public parkland, the Council shouldn’t be reducing the overall supply of public parkland. At the bare minimum we should be maintaining the area available of public parkland, but we’re not even doing that.

We’ve actually seen in the inner southside and also the inner west in Councillor MACKAY’s ward and in Councillor MATIC’s ward, we’ve seen a net reduction in public parkland in recent years due to the cannibalisation of parkland for other projects. Like I mentioned, bridge landings, intersection widenings, road widenings and increasingly projects like the Metro as well.

I hope that the Administration will at least think ahead and plan a bit better in future. We don’t want the situation we’re seeing now, which is where positive public infrastructure projects like a footbridge are being resisted on the grounds that they’re negatively impacting greenspace. We want these projects to be celebrated by everyone. If there was a creation of new parkland nearby, I think the detractors would be a lot less vocal and we’d be able to get a lot more public support for these kinds of projects.

Public support is going to be important for these projects, because it seems like these bridges aren’t fully funded by Brisbane City Council. So that means this Council Administration is going to have to go to the State and Federal Governments to seek funding. Those residents who are concerned about negative impacts to the public parkland are also going to be going to those State and Federal MPs (Members of Parliament) and saying we don’t want you to fund this bridge, because it’s ruining our park.

We shouldn’t be playing those kinds of divisive games. We shouldn’t be turning residents against each other and we shouldn’t be turning residents against positive public projects. If we just put a little bit more money into creating new public parkland around these bridge landing areas, I think that would go a long way to easing those concerns. I’ve made those suggestions repeatedly regarding the West End Toowong Bridge.

We’ve identified parts of Orleigh Street and Hill End Drive—I believe it is, or Hill End Terrace, that can be converted into parkland. Where we can narrow the roadway significantly and create more greenspace. Without Council even having to buy new land. We simply need to convert a bit of bitumen into greenspace. It’s a relatively cheap way to offset the greenspace that’s being lost by the bridge landings.

Local residents are supportive of this idea. It doesn’t even necessarily result in a reduction in street parking. It’s simply narrowing the roadway a little bit. If we’re willing to narrow the roadway, we can create more public parkland and more room for trees. So that the bridge project doesn’t result in a net reduction of greenspace, but actually contributes to a net increase in public parkland and wouldn’t that be a great thing?

So I’ll continue to raise this issue at every opportunity I get, because I’m still concerned the Administration is downplaying and dismissing these concerns about greenspace. We want the bridges to happen, but we also want improvements to accessibility of public parkland. I’m sure Councillor MACKAY’s residents are letting him know about this as well. I think it would be a great thing if we could deliver some new public parkland as part of these projects. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor SRI.

Further discussion?

Councillor MACKAY.

Councillor MACKAY: Thanks, Chair. I rise to speak on the petitions regarding the St Lucia Green Bridge. On 19 March 2019, Adrian SCHRINNER was endorsed by his colleagues as LORD MAYOR of Brisbane. On that day he announced five new green bridges and said, the green bridges will be a major program aimed at tackling traffic congestion, improving public and active transport and creating a healthier, more active city.

Since that time two extensive consultation sessions have been conducted, with the most recent finishing in March this year. I’m referring specifically to the St Lucia Bridge. More than 4,000 people gave feedback about green bridges in St Lucia and Toowong in that community consultation. While my personal preference for the St Lucia Bridge was for a site other than Guyatt Park, the community has spoken and the message is clear.

The majority of respondents indicated support for a green bridge to land at Guyatt Park. We do know, however that the St Lucia Bridge will not proceed until the Toowong Bridge has been constructed. At the moment a preliminary design and business case is underway and we should see them by the end of the year.

The Toowong Bridge will be wonderful for the local communities on both sides of the river. The Green Bridge Program will be truly city changing. We also know that many people want any bridge at Guyatt Park to minimise the impact on greenspace. Council heard that message and has released an indicative map of Guyatt Park that has expanded the potential bridge landing option rather than the prescriptive site that was first presented. I’ve had confirmation from the LORD MAYOR that only concept designs released to date are indicative and not final.

This gives us the opportunity to fine tune the design and location of the bridge. It gives us the opportunity to provide the bridge that people want, while complementing the existing greenspace and facilities. It gives us the opportunity to manage feedback points. Such as the dissection of the park and loss of significant trees.

But one thing I do need to put on record about these petitions is the position of others in the Chamber. Where are the Greens on this? I’m not sure because I can’t get a clear message, but here are some clues directly related to the St Lucia Green Bridge. Chair, you know I’ve passed comment on this before, but for those watching at home, I’ll say it again. In the 2020 State election, one of the Greens plastered his—their—signs all over the western suburbs. It was writ large, delivering for the west side two new green bridges.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor MACKAY: On the other hand, the Greens Councillor can’t even bring himself to use the term green bridge. It hurts so much that he has to use the term, proposed new pedestrian and cycling bridges, on his Facebook posts. He’s also said in this place before that he hasn’t yet decided if he supports the St Lucia Green Bridge. You just heard before he supports the Toowong Bridge, but is still waiting for the business case for the St Lucia Bridge.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor MACKAY: Well I’ve got news, Chair. I have it here in writing that apparently the St Lucia Green Bridge is Greens political party policy. Of course—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor MACKAY: —this policy was announced after the LORD MAYOR announced the bridges.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor MACKAY: Classic Greens political party policy, just claim credit for stuff you didn’t actually do.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor MACKAY: Another policy that’s just come up is the one million social houses. Maybe it’s—Councillor SRI would like to see it on the St Lucia Golf Course because he wants eco villages, apparently. So how come these two representatives from the Greens political party aren’t on the same page? Maybe they don’t like each other. They certainly don’t appear in photos together.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor MACKAY: As a reminder, the Greens political party did not fund the bridges. In fact they didn’t even write a letter of support—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor MACKAY: —for the St Lucia Bridge. Now we’re not even clear if the Councillor supports it or not. Where are they? I’ve got a new slogan for the Greens Party, ‘Anyway the wind blows’.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor MACKAY: Meanwhile, the Schrinner Council is getting on with the job. We have conducted two stages of consultation and there’s more coming. Now we can continue the consultation, listen to the feedback and site the bridge in an optimal location to complement our wonderful greenspace. I look forward to the next stage of consultation.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Thank you Councillor MACKAY.

Further speakers?

Councillor MURPHY.

Councillor MURPHY: Well thank you, Chair. Can I thank Councillor SRI and Councillor MACKAY for their wonderful contributions on this exciting topic. You know, Chair, whether you call them green bridges, whether you call them footbridges. The most important thing is that you actually support the principle, the underlying principle that we’re trying to achieve here, which is getting people out of cars, out of fossil-fuelled locomotion and on to—into active ways of travelling.

Whether it’s by cycling, whether it’s by e-scooters, whether it’s by walking. Those are the principles which underpinned the entire program that the LORD MAYOR announced on the day that he was elevated to the role. I think it’s tremendous to see the program so well advanced now. You know starting construction on the Kangaroo Point Green Bridge, a DA in for the Breakfast Creek Green Bridge. These other two green bridges with community consultation wrapped up and done and proceeding to business cases at the end of this year.

We’ll be having discussions with our friends and colleagues in the Commonwealth Government, Infrastructure Australia. Of course I will be continuing to lobby the State Government about funding for these important bridges as we continue to go.

To Councillor MACKAY’s points, yes, imitation is the finest form of flattery so I’m not a—probably not as offended as you, Councillor MACKAY. You know if the Greens want to claim these bridges, I think people will see through that quite frankly. This is our program and they criticise us on the other side by saying well no one’s contributed to your program. Well there’s plenty of people trying to claim that it’s theirs—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor MURPHY: —it’s weird, isn’t it? It must be pretty popular out there.

I just want to make a number of points to some of the items that Councillor SRI raised though, Chair. Firstly greenspace in South Brisbane. We’ve heard this time and again, but I just have to ask a question here, Chair. If greenspace was your number one priority, if greenspace was your number one priority in choosing where to live, would you go and live in South Brisbane? No, you’d probably live out in Councillor—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor MURPHY: —yes, you’d probably live out in Pullenvale Ward, you’d probably live out in Chandler Ward or in one of the other wards that had plenty of greenspace per capita, but all of that being considered, they’re not stopping moving to South Brisbane. People, despite the fact that it has a lower proportion of greenspace than probably any other ward in the city, people are still flocking to live in South Brisbane.

So I just think it’s not stopping people moving there, Chair. Clearly people want to be close to things other than greenspace. They want to be close to the river, they want to be close to the wonderful schools. They want to be in the only ward represented by a Greens Councillor. I don’t know, Chair.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor MURPHY: But they keep moving into that area. Clearly, we as a Council are doing something right there. Clearly, you know Councillor SRI might even be getting something right, but I just want to say that the proof is in the pudding. People keep moving into that area and a perceived lack of parks or that the fact that this bridge might have a footing in Orleigh Park, it might take up some of the space there, is clearly not turning people off in any appreciable way from moving into the area.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor MURPHY: So I’d also just like to add that this Administration, this Council has never pretended that bridges don’t literally take up some of the greenspace in a park. That’s of course beyond question, as Councillor SRI said, it’s a matter of physics. They will take up a footing—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor MURPHY: —in the park, but our argument has always been the fact that bridge footing will be landing in the park on either side is not a good enough reason to oppose these projects. That the net benefit that these green bridges will bring the communities on both sides of the river is far greater than the net loss of that greenspace. Connecting people in West End—

Councillor SRI: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor SRI.

Councillor SRI: Will Councillor MURPHY take a quick question?

Chair: Councillor MURPHY will you take a question—

Councillor MURPHY: Of course.

Chair: —from Councillor SRI?

Councillor SRI: Thank, through you, Chair. I actually agree with you on that. I think the net benefit does justify the projects, but just to your previous point around lots of people are moving into West End. Do you accept the premise that if we don’t provide enough public greenspace locally, more of those residents are likely to drive further out to access public greenspace and thus impact the traffic congestion issues?

Councillor MURPHY: Well I take the point that people do, as the LORD MAYOR said in this Chamber last week, park tourism is a growing thing. People do travel to parks around the city. That’s because of this Administration’s record investment in parks infrastructure—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor MURPHY: —all around the city.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor MURPHY: That includes buying land that wasn’t parkland and converting it into parkland. Which we are doing in South Brisbane and we will continue to do going forward.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor MURPHY: So—oh well, Councillor SRI there’s plenty of sites that have been earmarked for new parkland in your ward as you well and truly know. So, Chair, look, thank you to both Councillor MACKAY and Councillor SRI for their—I would say overriding support for the program. Even though they may disagree on some of the smaller items.

Chair: Thank you Councillor MURPHY.

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 and Jonathan Sri.

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE:**

Councillor David McLachlan.

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – GREEN BRIDGES PROGRAM - KANGAROO POINT AND BREAKFAST CREEK GREEN BRIDGES UPDATE

**152/2021-22**

1. The Project Director Green Bridges, Civil Major Projects, Major Projects, City Projects Office, Brisbane Infrastructure, attended the meeting to provide an update on the Green Bridges Program and the Kangaroo Point and Breakfast Creek Green Bridges. He provided the information below.

2. The Kangaroo Point Green Bridge will be a new world-class landmark linking the CBD and Kangaroo Point. The bridge is anticipated to increase walking and cycling trips by more than 6,100 trips per day by 2036, and will provide a vital active travel connection between the CBD and the Brisbane 2032 Olympics and Paralympic Games (the Games) main stadium at The Gabba.

3. The final design for the Kangaroo Point Green Bridge incorporates the following:

- an elegant single-mast cable-stayed structure that is optimised to reduce visual impacts

- a length of approximately 460 metres, with dedicated cycle and pedestrian paths

- a navigable bridge height of 12.7 metres, which is the same height as Captain Cook Bridge

- viewing platforms and rest nodes that will provide panoramic views of our River City

- green design features including solar panels, cooling vegetation and shade cover along the length of the bridge.

4. The Kangaroo Point Green Bridge will present several new, unique dining options for new food and beverage outlets on the bridge and its city landing. This includes:

- a new over-water restaurant on the approach to the city landing

- a new café at the city landing plaza

- smaller food and beverage outlets at viewing platforms in the centre of the bridge and the approach to the Kangaroo Point landing.

5. The Kangaroo Point Green Bridge provides the following connections:

- Kangaroo Point landing:

- a lift and stair connection from the bridge to C.T. White Park and riverside pathways

- a raised priority crossing on Main Street, Kangaroo Point

- a new underpass beneath the Story Bridge

- an upgraded pedestrian path and a two-way, off-road cycle path provided by a realignment of Deakin Street, Kangaroo Point

- speed limit reductions on Main Street

- city landing:

- a connection for cyclists and e-mobility users to the CityLink cycleway

- a shared pedestrian and cyclist zone providing access to the City Botanic Gardens and riverwalk.

6. In June 2021, Council awarded the contract to design and construct the Kangaroo Point Green Bridge to Connect Brisbane, led by BESIX Watpac. In September 2021, Council will undertake community engagement to introduce Connect Brisbane’s successful design for the bridge and outline upcoming construction impacts. Construction is anticipated to commence in late 2021, with completion expected by late 2023, subject to approvals. The Main Street and Deakin Street connection is planned to be delivered separately from the main bridge works, with timing to be confirmed later in 2021.

7. The Breakfast Creek Green Bridge will deliver an enhanced active transport link from the inner city to the northern suburbs, providing an extension of the new Lores Bonney Riverwalk. The bridge will:

- provide a safer and more convenient connection to walk or ride

- enhance recreational experiences along the Brisbane River

- provide a critical connection to the Games Athletes’ Village at Northshore Hamilton.

8. The detailed design for the Breakfast Creek Green Bridge includes the following:

- an arch bridge span with a length of approximately 80 metres, maintaining the existing navigational channel

- dedicated pathways for pedestrians and cyclists

- distinctive colour and materials reflecting the leaves of the Moreton Bay fig tree

- pause points at the southern and northern bridge approaches

- a bridge landing that integrates with Newstead Park.

9. The Breakfast Creek Green Bridge provides the following connections:

- a new two-way, on-road cycle path from the bridge landing at Newstead Park

- the existing left southbound lane of Breakfast Creek Road will be converted into a two‑way cycle path, with Newstead Avenue being reconfigured to accommodate one‑way vehicle traffic.

10. In August and September 2020, Council undertook community consultation on the concept design of the Breakfast Creek Green Bridge to help inform the bridge design. In October 2021, Council will undertake community engagement on the final design, its ongoing connections and outline upcoming construction impacts. Procurement activities are well underway with three shortlisted tenderers to submit bids in late 2021. The contract to construct the bridge is expected to be awarded by the end of 2021, with construction commencing in early 2022 and completion expected by late 2023, subject to approvals.

11. The Committee was shown the following:

- a fly-through video and images of the Kangaroo Point Green Bridge

- images and an alignment map of the Breakfast Creek Green Bridge.

12. Following a number of questions from the Committee, the Civic Cabinet Chair thanked the Project Director Green Bridges for his informative presentation.

13. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

#### B PETITION – REQUESTING COUNCIL NOT PROCEED WITH OPTION C OF THE PROPOSED ST LUCIA TO WEST END GREEN BRIDGE, FROM KEITH STREET, ST LUCIA, TO BOUNDARY STREET, WEST END

**CA21/336223**

**153/2021-22**

14. A petition requesting Council not proceed with Option C of the proposed St Lucia to West End Green Bridge, from Keith Street, St Lucia, to Boundary Street, West End, was received during the Autumn Recess 2021.

15. The Manager Transport Planning and Operations, Brisbane Infrastructure, provided the following information.

16. The petition contains 583 signatures. Of the petitioners, 445 live in the City of Brisbane and 138 live outside of Brisbane.

The Green Bridges Program

17. Council is building new green bridges across Brisbane which will make it even easier to get around our city on foot, by bike or scooter, or by connecting with public transport.

18. The Green Bridges Program aims to develop a linked network of cross-river connections that will enable residents and visitors to replace car-based trips with public and active travel, and assist in making our city a cleaner, greener place to live.

19. The program currently comprises new green bridges linking Kangaroo Point to the Central Business District (CBD), Toowong to West End, St Lucia to West End, as well as a new crossing at Breakfast Creek, connecting Albion and Newstead.

St Lucia to West End Green Bridge

20. The St Lucia to West End Green Bridge will cater for pedestrians and cyclists and create a vital active travel network between the growing communities in West End and St Lucia as well as the University of Queensland. Together with the Toowong to West End Green Bridge, it will connect to the city’s existing active transport networks, enhancing the river loop cycling and walking experiences.

21. The new green bridge will:

- improve active transport connections to St Lucia and UQ, particularly from the inner south, inner west and CBD

- deliver greater accessibility to public transport for St Lucia residents, including high‑frequency bus services in West End travelling to the CBD and Fortitude Valley

- create a more direct route between the Bicentennial Bikeway and UQ.

22. From 23 November 2020 to 31 March 2021, Council invited the community to have their say on a shortlist of preferred alignments and landing locations for the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge. During this period, Council sought feedback on the following alignment options:

- Option A – Guyatt Park, St Lucia to Orleigh Park, West End

- Option B – Munro Street, St Lucia to Ryan Street, West End

- Option C – Keith Street, St Lucia to Boundary Street, West End.

23. The shortlisted options were informed by a range of technical investigations including traffic and transport modelling, environmental studies, site investigations and initial cost estimates.

24. Council has reviewed and analysed all feedback received on the alignment options and has prepared a consultation summary document. A detailed consultation report has also been prepared that outlines the consultation process, feedback received and Council’s response to key feedback themes. These documents can be accessed on Council’s website at www.brisbane.qld.gov.au by searching ‘green bridges’.

25. Key feedback from residents and stakeholders on the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge included:

- general positive support for Option A (Guyatt Park to Orleigh Park), with 64% of survey respondents completely or somewhat supportive of this alignment

- requests for impacts to greenspace at landing locations to be minimised, with some residents objecting to any impacts to Guyatt Park

- limited support for Option B (Munro Street to Ryan Street) and some support for Option C (Keith Street to Boundary Street), with concerns from some residents about the impacts of these alignments on local communities, particularly in relation to private property requirements

- some residents do not consider the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge as a priority, or made suggestions for other projects in the local area

- interest in more information being made available, including a business case, to outline the demand for the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge and the benefits it will deliver.

26. Following initial technical investigations and feasibility assessments, and the outcomes of community consultation, Option A connecting Guyatt Park to Orleigh Park (near Morry Street) has been identified as the preferred alignment for the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge.

27. This alignment has been selected because it:

- provides direct connectivity to high-frequency public transport, including CityGlider and CityCat services

- would attract substantially higher patronage compared to other options, based on initial transport modelling

- enhances access to greenspace on both sides of the river

- integrates with riverside recreation and active transport networks

- provides a comfortable bridge grade for all users

- does not require resumption of private homes or property

- enhances walking and cycling access to UQ from West End, via Macquarie Street, St Lucia

- has positive support from the community and key stakeholders, noting careful consideration will need to be given to managing impacts on existing greenspace at Guyatt Park and Orleigh Park.

28. Council will now prepare a concept design and preliminary business case based on the preferred alignment for further discussion with the community in the second half of 2021. The Options B and C alignments presented during consultation will not be progressed.

29. In preparing the concept design and preliminary business case, Council will further investigate the benefits, impacts and cost of the green bridge, and will consider the potential bridge form and structure, transport and economic benefits, property impacts, constructability, and how the bridge will integrate with the surrounding environment.

30. Council will continue to keep local residents and key stakeholders informed about the project as it progresses. Council expects to complete the detailed business case for the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge by late 2021, which will be discussed with the Queensland and Australian Governments to help determine the next steps for the project, including potential funding and delivery timeframes.

Funding

31. The Green Bridges Program was funded in the 2021-22 budget under Service 1.1.3.1 Providing Active Transport Infrastructure..

Consultation

32. Councillor James Mackay, Councillor for the Walter Taylor Ward, has been consulted and supports the recommendation.

33. Councillor Jonathan Sri, Councillor for The Gabba Ward, has been consulted and supports the recommendation.

Customer impact

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

35. The Manager Transport Planning and Operations recommended as follows and the Committee agreed, with Councillors Jared Cassidy and Jonathan Sri dissenting.

36. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A**

**Draft Response**

**Petition Reference:** CA21/336223

Thank you for your petition requesting Council not proceed with Option C of the proposed St Lucia to West End Green Bridge, from Keith Street, St Lucia, to Boundary Street, West End.

Your objections have been passed on to the Green Bridges project team for consideration as part of the recent community consultation period. Continued feedback from the community and stakeholders will play a critical role in developing this project.

In November 2020, Council released a shortlist of alignment options for the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge for the community to provide feedback on. The shortlisted options were informed by a range of technical investigations including traffic and transport modelling, environmental studies, site investigations and initial cost estimates.

Council has reviewed and analysed all feedback received on the alignment options and has prepared a consultation summary document. A detailed consultation report has also been prepared that outlines the consultation process, feedback received and Council’s response to key feedback themes. These documents can be accessed on Council’s website at www.brisbane.qld.gov.au by searching ‘green bridges’.

Council will now prepare a concept design and preliminary business case based on the preferred alignment, for further discussion with the community in the second half of 2021. The Options B and C alignments presented during consultation will not be progressed.

In preparing the concept design and preliminary business case, Council will further investigate the benefits, impacts and cost of the green bridge, and will consider the potential bridge form and structure, transport and economic benefits, property impacts, constructability, and how the bridge will integrate with the surrounding environment.

Council will continue to keep local residents and key stakeholders informed about the project as it progresses. Council expects to complete the detailed business case for the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge by late 2021, which will be discussed with the Queensland and Australian Governments to help determine the next steps for the project, including potential funding and delivery timeframes.

If you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact the project team on 1800 318 166 during business hours, or by email at greenbridges@brisbane.qld.gov.au.

Please advise the other petitioners of this information.

Thank you for raising this matter.

**ADOPTED**

#### C PETITION – REQUESTING COUNCIL NOT PROCEED WITH OPTION A OF THE PROPOSED ST LUCIA TO WEST END GREEN BRIDGE, FROM GUYATT PARK, ST LUCIA, TO ORLEIGH PARK, WEST END

**CA21/336893**

**154/2021-22**

37. A petition requesting Council not proceed with Option A of the proposed St Lucia to West End Green Bridge, from Guyatt Park, St Lucia, to Orleigh Park, West End, was received during the Autumn Recess 2021.

38. The Manager Transport Planning and Operations, Brisbane Infrastructure, provided the following information.

39. The petition contains 409 signatures. Of the petitioners, 400 live in the City of Brisbane and nine live outside of Brisbane.

The Green Bridges Program

40. Council is building new green bridges across Brisbane which will make it even easier to get around our city on foot, by bike or scooter, or by connecting with public transport.

41. The Green Bridges Program aims to develop a linked network of cross-river connections that will enable residents and visitors to replace car-based trips with public and active travel, and assist in making our city a cleaner, greener place to live.

42. The program currently comprises new green bridges linking Kangaroo Point to the Central Business District (CBD), Toowong to West End, St Lucia to West End, as well as a new crossing at Breakfast Creek, connecting Albion and Newstead.

St Lucia to West End Green Bridge

43. The St Lucia to West End Green Bridge will cater for pedestrians and cyclists and create a vital active travel network between the growing communities in West End and St Lucia as well as the University of Queensland (UQ). Together with the Toowong to West End Green Bridge, it will connect to the city’s existing active transport networks, enhancing the river loop cycling and walking experiences.

44. The new green bridge will:

- improve active transport connections to St Lucia and UQ, particularly from the inner south, inner west and CBD

- deliver greater accessibility to public transport for St Lucia residents, including high‑frequency bus services in West End travelling to the CBD and Fortitude Valley

- create a more direct route between the Bicentennial Bikeway and UQ.

45. From 23 November 2020 to 31 March 2021, Council invited the community to have their say on a shortlist of preferred alignments and landing locations for the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge. During this period, Council sought feedback on the following alignment options:

- Option A – Guyatt Park, St Lucia to Orleigh Park, West End

- Option B – Munro Street, St Lucia to Ryan Street, West End

- Option C – Keith Street, St Lucia to Boundary Street, West End.

46. The shortlisted options were informed by a range of technical investigations including traffic and transport modelling, environmental studies, site investigations and initial cost estimates.

47. Council has reviewed and analysed all feedback received on the alignment options and has prepared a consultation summary document. A detailed consultation report has also been prepared that outlines the consultation process, feedback received and Council’s response to key feedback themes. These documents can be accessed on Council’s website at [www.brisbane.qld.gov.au](http://www.brisbane.qld.gov.au) by searching ‘green bridges’.

48. Key feedback from residents and stakeholders on the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge included:

- general positive support for Option A (Guyatt Park to Orleigh Park), with 64% of survey respondents completely or somewhat supportive of this alignment

- requests for impacts to greenspace at landing locations to be minimised, with some residents objecting to any impacts to Guyatt Park

- limited support for Option B (Munro Street to Ryan Street) and some support for Option C (Keith Street to Boundary Street), with concerns from some residents about the impacts of these alignments on local communities, particularly in relation to private property requirements

- some residents do not consider the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge as a priority, or made suggestions for other projects in the local area

- interest in more information being made available, including a business case, to outline the demand for the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge and the benefits it will deliver.

49. Following initial technical investigations and feasibility assessments, and the outcomes of community consultation, Option A connecting Guyatt Park to Orleigh Park (near Morry Street) has been identified as the preferred alignment for the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge.

50. This alignment has been selected because it:

- provides direct connectivity to high-frequency public transport, including CityGlider and CityCat services

- would attract substantially higher patronage compared to other options, based on initial transport modelling

- enhances access to greenspace on both sides of the river

- integrates with riverside recreation and active transport networks

- provides a comfortable bridge grade for all users

- does not require resumption of private homes or property

- enhances walking and cycling access to UQ from West End, via Macquarie Street, St Lucia

- has positive support from the community and key stakeholders, noting careful consideration will need to be given to managing impacts on existing green space at Guyatt Park and Orleigh Park.

51. Council will now prepare a concept design and preliminary business case based on the preferred alignment for further discussion with the community in the second half of 2021. The Options B and C alignments presented during consultation will not be progressed.

52. In preparing the concept design and preliminary business case, Council will further investigate the benefits, impacts and cost of the green bridge, and will consider the potential bridge form and structure, transport and economic benefits, property impacts, constructability, and how the bridge will integrate with the surrounding environment.

53. Council will continue to keep local residents and key stakeholders informed about the project as it progresses. Council expects to complete the detailed business case for the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge by late 2021, which will be discussed with the Queensland and Australian Governments to help determine the next steps for the project, including potential funding and delivery timeframes.

Funding

54. The Green Bridges Program was funded in the 2021-22 budget under Service 1.1.3.1 Providing Active Transport Infrastructure.

Consultation

55. Councillor James Mackay, Councillor for the Walter Taylor Ward, has been consulted and supports the recommendation.

56. Councillor Jonathan Sri, Councillor for The Gabba Ward, has been consulted and supports the recommendation.

Customer impact

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

58. The Manager Transport Planning and Operations recommended as follows and the Committee agreed, with Councillors Jared Cassidy and Jonathan Sri dissenting.

59. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A**

**Draft Response**

**Petition Reference:** CA21/336893

Thank you for your petition requesting Council not proceed with Option A of the proposed St Lucia to West End Green Bridge from Guyatt Park, St Lucia, to Orleigh Park, West End.

Your objections and concerns have been passed on to the Green Bridges project team for consideration as part of the recent community consultation period. Continued feedback from the community and stakeholders will play a critical role in developing this project.

In November 2020, Council released a shortlist of alignment options for the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge for the community to provide feedback on. The shortlisted options were informed by a range of technical investigations including traffic and transport modelling, environmental studies, site investigations and initial cost estimates.

Council has reviewed and analysed all feedback received on the alignment options and has prepared a consultation summary document. A detailed consultation report has also been prepared that outlines the consultation process, feedback received and Council’s response to key feedback themes. These documents can be accessed on Council’s website at www.brisbane.qld.gov.au by searching ‘green bridges’.

Council will now prepare a concept design and preliminary business case based on the preferred alignment, for further discussion with the community in the second half of 2021. The Option B and C alignments presented during consultation will not be progressed.

In preparing the concept design and preliminary business case, Council will further investigate the benefits, impacts and cost of the green bridge, and will consider the potential bridge form and structure, transport and economic benefits, property impacts, constructability, and how the bridge will integrate with the surrounding environment.

Council will continue to keep local residents and key stakeholders informed about the project as it progresses. Council expects to complete the detailed business case for the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge by late 2021, which will be discussed with the Queensland and Australian Governments to help determine the next steps for the project, including potential funding and delivery timeframes.

If you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact the project team on 1800 318 166 during business hours, or by email at greenbridges@brisbane.qld.gov.au.

Please advise the other petitioners of this information.

Thank you for raising this matter.

**ADOPTED**

#### D PETITION – REQUESTING COUNCIL NOT PROCEED WITH OPTION B OF THE PROPOSED ST LUCIA TO WEST END GREEN BRIDGE, FROM MUNRO STREET, ST LUCIA, TO RYAN STREET, WEST END

**CA21/390676**

**155/2021-22**

60. A petition requesting Council not proceed with Option B of the proposed St Lucia to West End Green Bridge, from Munro Street, St Lucia, to Ryan Street, West End, was received during the Autumn Recess 2021.

61. The Manager Transport Planning and Operations, Brisbane Infrastructure, provided the following information.

62. The petition contains 121 signatures. Of the petitioners, 118 live in the City of Brisbane and three live outside of Brisbane.

The Green Bridges Program

63. Council is building new green bridges across Brisbane which will make it even easier to get around our city on foot, by bike or scooter, or by connecting with public transport.

64. The Green Bridges Program aims to develop a linked network of cross-river connections that will enable residents and visitors to replace car-based trips with public and active travel, and assist in making our city a cleaner, greener place to live.

65. The program currently comprises new green bridges linking Kangaroo Point to the Central Business District (CBD), Toowong to West End, St Lucia to West End, as well as a new crossing at Breakfast Creek, connecting Albion and Newstead.

St Lucia to West End Green Bridge

66. The St Lucia to West End Green Bridge will cater for pedestrians and cyclists and create a vital active travel network between the growing communities in West End and St Lucia as well as the University of Queensland (UQ). Together with the Toowong to West End Green Bridge, it will connect to the city’s existing active transport networks, enhancing the river loop cycling and walking experiences.

67. The new green bridge will:

- improve active transport connections to St Lucia and UQ, particularly from the inner south, inner west and CBD

- deliver greater accessibility to public transport for St Lucia residents, including high‑frequency bus services in West End travelling to the CBD and Fortitude Valley

- create a more direct route between the Bicentennial Bikeway and UQ.

68. From 23 November 2020 to 31 March 2021, Council invited the community to have their say on a shortlist of preferred alignments and landing locations for the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge. During this period, Council sought feedback on the following alignment options:

- Option A – Guyatt Park, St Lucia to Orleigh Park, West End

- Option B – Munro Street, St Lucia to Ryan Street, West End

- Option C – Keith Street, St Lucia to Boundary Street, West End.

69. The shortlisted options were informed by a range of technical investigations including traffic and transport modelling, environmental studies, site investigations and initial cost estimates.

70. Council has reviewed and analysed all feedback received on the alignment options and has prepared a consultation summary document. A detailed consultation report has also been prepared that outlines the consultation process, feedback received and Council’s response to key feedback themes. These documents can be accessed on Council’s website at www.brisbane.qld.gov.au by searching ‘green bridges’.

71. Key feedback from residents and stakeholders on the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge included:

- general positive support for Option A (Guyatt Park to Orleigh Park), with 64% of survey respondents completely or somewhat supportive of this alignment

- requests for impacts to greenspace at landing locations to be minimised, with some residents objecting to any impacts to Guyatt Park

- limited support for Option B (Munro Street to Ryan Street) and some support for Option C (Keith Street to Boundary Street), with concerns from some residents about the impacts of these alignments on local communities, particularly in relation to private property requirements

- some residents did not consider the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge as a priority, or made suggestions for other projects in the local area

- interest in more information being made available, including a business case, to outline the demand for the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge and the benefits it will deliver.

72. Following initial technical investigations and feasibility assessments, and the outcomes of community consultation, Option A connecting Guyatt Park to Orleigh Park (near Morry Street) has been identified as the preferred alignment for the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge.

73. This alignment has been selected because it:

- provides direct connectivity to high-frequency public transport, including CityGlider and CityCat services

- would attract substantially higher patronage compared to other options, based on initial transport modelling

- enhances access to greenspace on both sides of the river

- integrates with riverside recreation and active transport networks

- provides a comfortable bridge grade for all users

- does not require resumption of private homes or property

- enhances walking and cycling access to UQ from West End via Macquarie Street, St Lucia

- has positive support from the community and key stakeholders, noting careful consideration will need to be given to managing impacts on existing greenspace at Guyatt Park and Orleigh Park.

74. Council will now prepare a concept design and preliminary business case based on the preferred alignment, for further discussion with the community in the second half of 2021. The Option B and C alignments presented during consultation will not be progressed.

75. In preparing the concept design and preliminary business case, Council will further investigate the benefits, impacts and cost of the green bridge, and will consider the potential bridge form and structure, transport and economic benefits, property impacts, constructability, and how the bridge will integrate with the surrounding environment.

76. Council will continue to keep local residents and key stakeholders informed about the project as it progresses. Council expects to complete the detailed business case for the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge by late 2021, which will be discussed with the Queensland and Australian Governments to help determine the next steps for the project, including potential funding and delivery timeframes.

Funding

77. The Green Bridges Program was funded in the 2021-22 budget under Service 1.1.3.1 Providing Active Transport Infrastructure.

Consultation

78. Councillor James Mackay, Councillor for the Walter Taylor Ward, has been consulted and supports the recommendation.

79. Councillor Jonathan Sri, Councillor for The Gabba Ward, has been consulted and supports the recommendation.

Customer impact

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

81. The Manager Transport Planning and Operations recommended as follows and the Committee agreed, with Councillors Jared Cassidy and Jonathan Sri dissenting.

82. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A**

**Draft Response**

**Petition Reference:** CA21/390676

Thank you for your petition requesting Council not proceed with Option B of the proposed St Lucia to West End Green Bridge from Munro Street, St Lucia, to Ryan Street, West End.

Your objections have been passed on to the Green Bridges project team for consideration as part of the recent community consultation period. Continued feedback from the community and stakeholders will play a critical role in developing this project.

In November 2020, Council released a shortlist of alignment options for the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge for the community to provide feedback on. The shortlisted options were informed by a range of technical investigations including traffic and transport modelling, environmental studies, site investigations and initial cost estimates.

Council has reviewed and analysed all feedback received on the alignment options and has prepared a consultation summary document. A detailed consultation report has also been prepared that outlines the consultation process, feedback received and Council’s response to key feedback themes. These documents can be accessed on Council’s website at www.brisbane.qld.gov.au by searching ‘green bridges’.

Council will now prepare a concept design and preliminary business case based on the preferred alignment, for further discussion with the community in the second half of 2021. The Option B and C alignments presented during consultation will not be progressed.

In preparing the concept design and preliminary business case, Council will further investigate the benefits, impacts and cost of the green bridge, and will consider the potential bridge form and structure, transport and economic benefits, property impacts, constructability, and how the bridge will integrate with the surrounding environment.

Council will continue to keep local residents and key stakeholders informed about the project as it progresses. Council expects to complete the detailed business case for the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge by late 2021, which will be discussed with the Queensland and Australian Governments to help determine the next steps for the project, including potential funding and delivery timeframes.

If you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact the project team on 1800 318 166 during business hours, or by email at greenbridges@brisbane.qld.gov.au.

Please advise the other petitioners of this information.

Thank you for raising this matter.

**ADOPTED**

#### E PETITION – REQUESTING COUNCIL NOT PROCEED WITH THE PROPOSED ST LUCIA TO WEST END GREEN BRIDGE

**CA21/390744**

**156/2021-22**

83. A petition requesting Council not proceed with the proposed St Lucia to West End Green Bridge, was received during the Autumn Recess 2021.

84. The Manager Transport Planning and Operations, Brisbane Infrastructure, provided the following information.

85. The petition contains 97 signatures. Of the petitioners, 95 live in the City of Brisbane and two live outside of Brisbane.

The Green Bridges Program

86. Council is building new green bridges across Brisbane which will make it even easier to get around our city on foot, by bike or scooter, or by connecting with public transport.

87. The Green Bridges Program aims to develop a linked network of cross-river connections that will enable residents and visitors to replace car-based trips with public and active travel, and assist in making our city a cleaner, greener place to live.

88. The program currently comprises new green bridges linking Kangaroo Point to the Central Business District (CBD), Toowong to West End, St Lucia to West End, as well as a new crossing at Breakfast Creek, connecting Albion and Newstead.

St Lucia to West End Green Bridge

89. The St Lucia to West End Green Bridge will cater for pedestrians and cyclists and create a vital active travel network between the growing communities in West End and St Lucia as well as the University of Queensland (UQ). Together with the Toowong to West End Green Bridge, it will connect to the city’s existing active transport networks, enhancing the river loop cycling and walking experiences.

90. The new green bridge will:

- improve active transport connections to St Lucia and UQ, particularly from the inner south, inner west and CBD

- deliver greater accessibility to public transport for St Lucia residents, including high‑frequency bus services in West End travelling to the CBD and Fortitude Valley

- create a more direct route between the Bicentennial Bikeway and UQ.

91. Feedback from the community has played a critical role in the development of the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge to date.

92. Initial consultation on the bridge was undertaken in late 2019 as part of the Green Bridges Program early planning phase. Feedback indicated approximately 50% of survey respondents would use the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge daily or weekly. Many people also indicated they were opposed to this bridge catering for buses or public transport. As a result, Council has progressed planning for the green bridges as a pedestrian and cycling connection only.

93. Further to the initial consultation phase in late 2019, Council has undertaken a range of technical investigations and studies on potential alignments and landing locations for the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge.

94. From 23 November 2020 to 31 March 2021, Council invited the community to have their say on a shortlist of preferred alignments and landing locations for the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge.

95. During this period, Council sought feedback on the following alignment options:

- Option A – Guyatt Park, St Lucia to Orleigh Park, West End

- Option B – Munro Street, St Lucia to Ryan Street, West End

- Option C – Keith Street, St Lucia to Boundary Street, West End.

96. The shortlisted options were informed by a range of technical investigations including traffic and transport modelling, environmental studies, site investigations and initial cost estimates.

97. Council has reviewed and analysed all feedback received on the alignment options and has prepared a consultation summary document. A detailed consultation report has also been prepared that outlines the consultation process, feedback received and Council’s response to key feedback themes. These documents can be accessed on Council’s website at www.brisbane.qld.gov.au by searching ‘green bridges’.

98. Key feedback from residents and stakeholders on the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge included:

- general positive support for Option A (Guyatt Park to Orleigh Park), with 64% of survey respondents completely or somewhat supportive of this alignment

- requests for impacts to greenspace at landing locations to be minimised, with some residents objecting to any impacts to Guyatt Park

- limited support for Option B (Munro Street to Ryan Street) and some support for Option C (Keith Street to Boundary Street), with concerns from some residents about the impacts of these alignments on local communities, particularly in relation to private property requirements

- some residents do not consider the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge as a priority, or made suggestions for other projects in the local area

- interest in more information being made available, including a business case, to outline the demand for the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge and the benefits it will deliver.

99. Following initial technical investigations and feasibility assessments, and the outcomes of community consultation, Option A connecting Guyatt Park to Orleigh Park (near Morry Street) has been identified as the preferred alignment for the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge.

100. This alignment has been selected because it:

- provides direct connectivity to high-frequency public transport, including CityGlider and CityCat services

- would attract substantially higher patronage compared to other options, based on initial transport modelling

- enhances access to greenspace on both sides of the river

- integrates with riverside recreation and active transport networks

- provides a comfortable bridge grade for all users

- does not require resumption of private homes or property

- enhances walking and cycling access to UQ from West End, via Macquarie Street, St Lucia

- has positive support from the community and key stakeholders, noting careful consideration will need to be given to managing impacts on existing greenspace at Guyatt Park and Orleigh Park.

101. Council will now prepare a concept design and preliminary business case based on the preferred alignment for further discussion with the community in the second half of 2021. The Option B and C alignments presented during consultation will not be progressed.

102. In preparing the concept design and preliminary business case, Council will further investigate the benefits, impacts and cost of the green bridge, and will consider the potential bridge form and structure, transport and economic benefits, property impacts, constructability, and how the bridge will integrate with the surrounding environment.

103. Council will continue to keep local residents and key stakeholders informed about the project as it progresses. Council expects to complete the detailed business case for the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge by late 2021, which will be discussed with the Queensland and Australian Governments to help determine the next steps for the project, including potential funding and delivery timeframes.

Funding

104. The Green Bridges Program was funded in the 2021-22 budget under Service 1.1.3.1 Providing Active Transport Infrastructure.

Consultation

105. Councillor James Mackay, Councillor for the Walter Taylor Ward, has been consulted and supports the recommendation.

106. Councillor Jonathan Sri, Councillor for The Gabba Ward, has been consulted and does not support the recommendation.

Customer impact

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

108. The Manager Transport Planning and Operations recommended as follows and the Committee agreed, with Councillors Jared Cassidy and Jonathan Sri dissenting.

109. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A**

**Draft Response**

**Petition Reference:** CA21/390744

Thank you for your petition requesting Council not proceed with the proposed St Lucia to West End Green Bridge as part of the Green Bridges Program.

Your objection has been passed on to the Green Bridges project team for consideration as part of the recent community consultation period. Feedback from the community has and will continue to play a critical role in the development of the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge.

Initial consultation on the bridge was undertaken in late 2019 as part of the Green Bridges Program early planning phase. Feedback indicated approximately 50% of survey respondents would use the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge daily or weekly. Many people also indicated they were opposed to this bridge catering for buses or public transport. As a result, Council has progressed planning for the green bridges as a pedestrian and cycling connection only.

Further to the initial consultation phase in late 2019, Council has undertaken a range of technical investigations and studies on potential alignments and landing locations for the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge.

In November 2020, Council released a shortlist of alignment options for the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge for the community to provide feedback on. The shortlisted options were informed by a range of technical investigations including traffic and transport modelling, environmental studies, site investigations and initial cost estimates.

Council has reviewed and analysed all feedback received on the alignment options and has prepared a consultation summary document. A detailed consultation report has also been prepared that outlines the consultation process, feedback received and Council’s response to key feedback themes. These documents can be accessed on Council’s website at www.brisbane.qld.gov.au by searching ‘green bridges’.

Council will now prepare a concept design and preliminary business case based on the preferred alignment for further discussion with the community in the second half of 2021. The Option B and C alignments presented during consultation will not be progressed.

In preparing the concept design and preliminary business case, Council will further investigate the benefits, impacts and cost of the green bridge, and will consider the potential bridge form and structure, transport and economic benefits, property impacts, constructability, and how the bridge will integrate with the surrounding environment.

Council will continue to keep local residents and key stakeholders informed about the project as it progresses. Council expects to complete the detailed business case for the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge by late 2021, which will be discussed with the Queensland and Australian Governments to help determine the next steps for the project, including potential funding and delivery timeframes.

If you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact the project team on 1800 318 166 during business hours, or by email at greenbridges@brisbane.qld.gov.au.

Please advise the other petitioners of this information.

Thank you for raising this matter.

**ADOPTED**

Chair: Councillor WINES, the Infrastructure Committee report please.

### 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 31 August 2021, be adopted.

Chair: Is there any debate?

Councillor WINES: A brief debate, Mr Chair. So the Committee had a presentation on the recently completed Hoyland Street project at Bracken Ridge. As Councillors should know by now a 900 metre stretch of road linking the Gympie Road section near Strathpine to other parts of the northern suburbs around Norris Road. It links two two-lane roads into this—what was once upon a time a one-lane road. Now making it a safer, more convenient road for the outer north. One that I’m sure—that I trust if Councillor LANDERS were here that she would be very appreciate of it, as would her residents.

The project also saw work on a bikeway, new plantings and the project itself has seen an increase in the operational safety, there’s no longer a merge. As we heard last week there were seven crashes over the six-year period up to 2019. That—the recently completed works which occurred on 9 August—we’ve had no record of any crashes since that point. So the operation is ongoing and it is a very good one. Part of a network of roads for Bracken Ridge that will make the road use operation out there even better for those residents.

We considered a number of petitions. One was a local concern in your own constituency, Mr Deputy Chair, which I trust has been settled at the local level. There were two petitions concerning the interaction of Cross River Rail with traffic near the Dutton Park train station. Some comments in advance of that—that we note inside the draft response attachment that the Coordinator-General approved the Request for Project Change 8 (RfPC-8) in November of 2020. Council has no authority to amend or refuse new approved work.

So disappointingly—and it is disappointing that we have to advise residents that, as a result of the Coordinator-General’s decision and the request on the RfPC-8. Council is not in a position—it is not permitted to refuse a direction of the Coordinator-General. I am very sympathetic to the residents there, but Council must accept that direction.

In regard to comments about the B-double vehicles. It also says in the response, in regard to the approval of B-double vehicles for the southern portal of work site, the RfPC-8 does not apply to the use of B-double vehicles for the southern portal. A B‑double vehicle permit is still required for travel on that road outside of the approved B-double network. B-double networks permits are issued by the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator and Council is not aware of any proposal to expand the use of B-doubles around the southern portal.

So, as I say, I must apologise to the people who have signed that petition. I find it very disappointing to have to be the one to pass this news on to them, but Council, as I say, must accept the direction of the Coordinator-General.

Councillor WINES: Earlier in Question Time, we heard a question to the LORD MAYOR from the Councillor for Tennyson in regards to a pedestrian crossing or pedestrian refuges on Honour Avenue Chelmer about a carry over. I can indicate to the Councillor that the carryover was not in the budget that was passed at mid-year. However, $100,000 was allocated through the first budget review process so that $100,000 is allocated to that project. Work will continue on it; design will continue and hopefully a potential pedestrian crossing or pedestrian crossing—excuse me—a pedestrian refuge.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: Councillor JOHNSTON has indicated that it’s a budget cut. I would indicate to her—that was through an interjection—I’d indicate to her that some work has actually already occurred on the project—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: —and then—and the interjection again was just planning and planning does consume the wages of the city planners who do do the work and I believe there are a number of proposals put forward for that space, which has consumed some of the allocation. However, there still remains $100,000 of what was allocated which we provided through the first budget review process and we remain optimistic we’ll be able to address the concerns and allocations.

*At that time, 4.09pm, the Deputy Chair, Councillor Steven TOOMEY, assumed the Chair.*

Deputy Chair: Thank you, Councillor WINES.

Is there further debate?

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes. I rise to speak on item C

**Seriatim - Clause C**

|  |
| --- |
| Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON requested that Clause C, PETITIONS – REQUESTING COUNCIL REFUSE TO WIDEN THE INTERSECTION AT ANNERLEY ROAD, CORNWALL STREET AND KENT STREET, ANNERLEY; PROVIDE A SAFE CROSSING POINT ACROSS CORNWALL STREET, BETWEEN ANNERLEY ROAD AND KENT STREET; AND WORK WITH THE QUEENSLAND GOVERNMENT TO DELIVER SAFER PATHWAYS TO SCHOOLS, PUBLIC TRANSPORT AND THE PRINCESS ALEXANDRA HOSPITAL, be taken seriatim for voting purposes. |

Deputy Chair: Thank you.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Now, firstly there is something that I agree with Councillor WINES on. Unfortunately, we do have to abide by the decision of the Coordinator-General. However, what Councillor WINES I think is unaware of is that the Coordinator‑General conditioned the Cross River Rail authority to work with Council, Brisbane City Council, to manage the impacts of the project on the Brisbane City Council road network. That is actually a written condition of the project change requirements.

Now, I lobbied very hard to have additional safety improvements included as part of the scope of the Cross River Rail project, but they were not supported. So when Councillor WINES stands up and says it’s not us, it’s the Cross River Rail or it’s the Coordinator-General, that is absolutely untrue. The conditions and the requirements of the delivery of this project is that the Cross River Rail authority must work with Brisbane City Council to deliver the road safety improvements around this project.

Now, he’s the new Infrastructure Chairman and he probably has not read all of the project change applications. He’s probably not read all of the different variations of the EIS (Environmental Impact Statement) over the past decade on Cross River Rail. I have.

Deputy Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, just before you go on. Can I remind you to call Councillors by their proper title, please? Just don’t refer to him as ‘him’, Councillor WINES would be more preferred. Come on.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Deputy Chair: No, no, no. I’m just playing it straight off the bat, Councillor SRI, and I don’t think you need to interrupt either.

Councillor JOHNSTON: So no ‘his’ or ‘hers’ any more either?

Deputy Chair: Please continue.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Okay. Fair enough.

Councillor SRI: Point of order, Chair.

Deputy Chair: Point of order, Councillor SRI.

Councillor SRI: I just respectfully invite you to reconsider that advice. We can use ‘him’ and ‘her’ in the Chamber surely. We don’t need to refer to people by their full name every time. That would be ridiculous.

Deputy Chair: Well, I thought most—it has been a common convention that we use Councillors’ correct terms and we direct that through the Chair. That’s been a standard for some time now, Councillor SRI.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Deputy Chair: I wasn’t in the Chair. Thank you.

Councillor JOHNSTON, please continue.

Councillor JOHNSTON: I am just going to respect your ruling, Mr Deputy Chairman, and every single time now someone says ‘him’ or ‘her’ in this place, I’m going to raise it as a point of order because you’re, with all due respect, interpreting that the wrong way. It’s going to cause chaos. So Councillor—

Deputy Chair: Sorry, before you go on. I just wouldn’t want anybody to refer to you in the wrong sense and to respect—

Councillor JOHNSTON: I’m referred to as ‘her’ all the time. I don’t have a problem, I identify as ‘her’, if it helps. So that’s no problem from my point of view. You know, ‘Councillor JOHNSTON’ or ‘her’ would be fine. I’d even go with ‘Nicole’, but I know that’s not the rules. So, you know.

Deputy Chair: No.

Councillor JOHNSTON: So anyway. It’s fine, you’ve made the rule. I’m just going to ask for it to be enforced now and I’m sure your side will take it up with you.

Deputy Chair: Happy to do so. Thank you.

Councillor JOHNSTON: So let me be clear. Councillor WINES’ statement that he can do nothing about this is false. The Cross River Rail authority certainly have to work with Council to make the changes that they’ve done. Now that includes all Council roads. These are Council roads; Cornwall Street, Rust Street and Annerley Road. At Annerley Road, Council removed the median strip to enable big semi-trailers to make the turn around the corner.

The trucks could not physically turn the corner on the intersection of Annerley Road and Cornwall Street to get around into Rust Street. Council modified, modified, the road network to allow this to happen. Helped them, facilitated it, made it easier. In my view, this is a retrograde step. We have no safe crossing point across Cornwall Street between Hefferan Park and Dutton Park station. It’s something that I have raised many, many times in this place we’ve petitioned on.

This petition again calls for a safe crossing point. So this is what Council did, they’re saying no to a safe crossing point at this location and meanwhile widening the road to allow big trucks easier turning ability around the corner. Now that is the wrong priorities. The right priorities are to be in place arrangements to make it safe for pedestrians to cross between a Council park and a very busy rail station and PA (Princess Alexandra) Hospital precinct.

This Council has refused to do so and it is putting lives at risk. Now, Councillor WINES says it’s not me. It’s not—Councillor WINES says it’s not Councillor WINES—is ‘me’ okay? Are you okay with ‘me’?

Deputy Chair: I’m fine with ‘me’.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Okay. Great. Thanks. Good to know.

Councillor WINES says it’s not me, it’s the Coordinator-General. They’re the bad party in all of this. So let’s be clear, he’s clearly unaware—damn it—Councillor WINES is clearly unaware that the Coordinator-General has conditioned the Cross River Rail authority to work with Brisbane City Council.

I think Council has failed in its duty of care to residents who live in this part of Annerley and Dutton Park by a long way. Cross River Rail project is happening and certainly there are ways in which we can mitigate the impacts of these major projects on the local community, but this Council refuses to consider even any ideas.

But this project change application, I’m not even sure that Council made a submission. They’ve only just started making submissions, to my knowledge, because I’ve been complaining to the Coordinator-General and Council that they are doing all these things without thinking about the impact on our local community.

It is—you don’t need to apologise for the Coordinator-General’s behaviour in all of this, Councillor WINES, through you, Mr Deputy Chairman. You need to apologise for Council’s inaction for dealing with the safety improvements that are necessary for this part of Annerley, to mitigate the impacts of a major project and hundreds and hundreds of trucks a day on small suburban roads that are not cut out for it.

When this Council prioritises removing road infrastructure and widening roads for trucks and refuses to put in a safe crossing point on a busy intersection where there is none, that is an appalling outcome for the community. That is solely in the responsibility of this Council, that is solely within the purview of your department within the Infrastructure Committee and it is appalling that you want to try and push the blame on to somebody else when Council could have stood up here as a party to this arrangement and negotiated a better outcome for the residents of Annerley, a safer way for people to get to work, school, shops and all of the hospital facilities that they rely on.

The failure to do that reflects poorly on this Council, was a decision of this Council and it is just a shameful thing that now Councillor WINES is seeking to blame somebody else when these are Council roads, Council was conditioned to do this work and they should, they should, be prioritising pedestrian safety in this extremely busy location. So shame on Council.

Deputy Chair: Is there any further debate?

Councillor SRI.

Councillor SRI: Thanks, Chair. I rise to speak on the petition regarding the project change and the Cross River Rail intersection changes.

I’m going to be a little easier on Councillor WINES. I’m conscious that probably he wasn’t really involved in much of the decision-making on this until recently, but this is an actual genuine serious problem and it’s a serious impediment to accessibility, not just to the train station, but of the hospital.

I understand that Council feels it’s to some extent constrained by what the State Government decides and what’s imposed upon it, but as Councillor JOHNSTON pointed out, we do have levers available to us and having closely witnessed how Council officers negotiate with the State Government around both Cross River Rail impacts, but also around the Queens Wharf casino and also around the new high school and my electorate, I’ve noticed that there’s great variation in how assertively Council officers put the case when they’re in negotiations with those State Government officers.

Sometimes Council officers take a really strong line and they say we’re not going to support this, we’re going to fight you every step of the way and in taking a strong line are able to extract concessions and—to achieve positive outcomes for the community by taking, I guess, a more assertive negotiation position and we’ve seen that particularly with some projects where Council and the State Government are negotiating outcomes.

Whereas in other projects, Council essentially rolls over and I feel like maybe that’s kind of what’s happened with this one where—and if Councillor WINES wants to get up and correct the record, I’d welcome that, but it feels like maybe we haven’t put the case strongly enough and we haven’t taken a firm enough position in negotiating with the State Government.

This is a multi-billion dollar project and I know from experience that when even a single local Councillor starts to cause issues for the State Government, they can splash a bit of money around to make a problem go away. I suspect that if Council took a more assertive position on negotiations like this, we could have at least extracted some concessions out of the State Government where they would agree to kick in a bit more money towards some of these redesigns themselves so that Council doesn’t have to bear those costs.

I worry that Council’s strategic approach here has been too compliant and too submissive and hasn’t done a good job of representing the interests of the city as a whole. So I am genuinely disappointed about the diminished access around this intersection. It’s always been a major safety hazard and I worry with more trucks using this area it’s going to get even worse.

The hospital access has been a long-standing issue where you’ve got lots of people walking to the PA Hospital, people with disabilities, people who struggle to navigate the neighbourhood at the best of times and then they have to find their way to cross busy Cornwall Street without even a pedestrian priority crossing of some kind. It’s quite cruel really to say to people there’s the hospital, it’s just right there, but no, you can’t cross the road because there’s giant trucks coming through every few minutes.

I think the Administration could probably do better and I encourage Councillor WINES to go back to the officers and ask are you sure there’s no way we can tweak this or make some other change to just at least partially mitigate the negative impacts of all those large trucks going through; a short stretch with a lower speed limit and some speed bumps, for example, maybe a wombat crossing at a strategically located point.

There’s always a design solution where there’s the political will and I’ve seen in recent years Council officers do some pretty innovative stuff where they really need to and where there’s support from the Administration to do so. So I’m willing to accept that maybe the standard design solutions aren’t viable at this location because of the specific nature of this particular area, but I do, you know, knowing this area quite well, it’s just at the southern corner of my ward, I do think there would be ways that we could improve pedestrian safety without spending millions and millions of dollars.

I think it would be good if the Council officers were empowered to take—to be a little more creative and a little more innovative and told we want you to solve this problem, we want you to improve pedestrian safety and pedestrian connectivity across Cornwall Street, what options could work here rather than simply saying we had a brief look at it, none of the standard options work, we don’t have any money anyway so we’re just going to say too bad to the petitioners.

I agree that these areas are challenging and I’m sure Councillor WINES will have many more such challenging issues over the coming years with this portfolio, but I do think looking at this area and seeing what Council has been able to do in other sites around the city that there would be options available. So I hope and I ask that the Administration doesn’t just dismiss this and say sorry, State Government has done it, nothing we can do now; that the Administration just go back and have one more look at it and see if we can’t make it a little bit easier for those people to get to the hospital and the train station. I don’t think that’s too much to ask. Thank you.

Deputy Chair: Thank you, Councillor SRI.

Are there any further speakers?

Councillor WINES, right of reply.

Councillor WINES: Thank you, Deputy Chair.

I just wanted to make a few comments in response to those. Can I thank both Councillors for their comments today and their contribution to the debate over that item, item C, I believe from memory.

Just for the context. I think it’s important for Councillors to recall what Cross River Rail means to the State Government. Cross River Rail has been a centrepiece of multiple governments over many years to address a long-running public transport shortcoming in the inner city to be able to deliver enough trains through that section.

There was the current iteration of Cross River Rail, there’s been a range of them in the last six years and before that the BaT (bus and train) Tunnel. Even Cross River Rail was something that discussed and if memory serves, and I’m pretty sure I’m right, the Minister who proposed Cross River Rail was the Minister for Transport, a lady who at the time was called Annastacia Palaszczuk. So this is a project very close to the Premier’s heart no doubt and one that she has had personal interest in for more than 10 years.

I offer that as a greater context about why the State may take a harder line on some things here than in other incidences. However, I will make—I will say this to the two Councillors who spoke earlier, I will make an undertaking to them that I will consider what they’ve said today and I will have a discussion with officers about it and we’ll see if there are any opportunities to respond to their concerns.

Deputy Chair: Thank you, Councillor WINES.

We’ll now put the motion.

All those in favour, say aye.

*Councillors say aye.*

Deputy Chair: Sorry, my apologies. We have C voting on its own. Thank you, Jade.

So we will now put items A and B together.

**Clauses A and B put**

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

Deputy Chair: We will now put item C.

**Clause C put**

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

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

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 15 - The Right Honourable, the LORD MAYOR, Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER, DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Krista ADAMS, and Councillors Greg ADERMANN, Adam ALLAN, Tracy DAVIS, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Sarah HUTTON, James MACKAY, Kim MARX, Peter MATIC, David McLACHLAN, Ryan MURPHY, Steven TOOMEY and Andrew WINES.

NOES: 6 - The Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Jared CASSIDY, and Councillors Peter CUMMING, Steve GRIFFITHS, Charles STRUNK, Jonathan SRI and Nicole JOHNSTON.

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 – HOYLAND STREET UPGRADE - BETTER ROADS FOR BRISBANE PROGRAM

**157/2021-22**

1. The Program Director Civil and Transport, Project Management, Brisbane Infrastructure, attended the meeting to provide an update on the Hoyland Street Upgrade – Better Roads for Better Brisbane Program. He provided the information below.

2. The Committee was shown a Google Maps image that highlighted where the Hoyland Street upgrade is taking place.

3. This corridor is an important east-west arterial route linking the Gympie Arterial Road and the Gateway Motorway. It also connects the Moreton Bay area with the northern Brisbane suburbs. The corridor is predominantly a four-lane road (two lanes in each direction), except for the 900‑metre section of Hoyland Street, between Kluver Street and Bracken Ridge Road, which is only two lanes.

4. The existing corridor carries over 20,000 vehicles every weekday, with heavy vehicle traffic making up between six and eight per cent of this. Three crashes were reported on this two-lane section of the corridor, from 2014 to 2018, two of which resulted in hospitalisation.

5. The total project budget was $12 million. It was funded by the Better Roads for Brisbane program, with a $1 million contribution from the Australian Government (under the Urban Congestion Fund program).

6. The Committee was shown a Google Maps image from December 2020, which showed how the two‑lane section of Hoyland Road looked prior to the start of the upgrade.

7. The scope of the project included:

- widening the current two-lane configuration of Hoyland Street to four lanes, with central median strip and road verge treatment

- providing two-phase traffic signal protection at the Hoyland Street and Kluver Street intersection, to improve the safe crossing for pedestrians and cyclists at the northern and eastern left-slip lanes

- upgrading the sodium street lighting to LED lighting

- landscape treatment.

8. The Committee was shown an image of the project plan, highlighting the changes made.

9. A number of project benefits were identified, including:

- removal of the two-lane restriction

- improved travel time reliability during peak traffic flow periods

- improved safety for all road users

- improved safety for pedestrians and cyclists with increased accessibility to already established active transport facilities along Hoyland Street

- the upgrade complements the Gympie Arterial Road and Strathpine Road interchange upgrade.

10. The Committee was shown two images of the road widening construction, which commenced in January 2021, in progress.

11. Practical completion of the project was on 9 August 2021, five months ahead of schedule. The project was delivered under budget, with no major issues or complaints.

12. Following a number of questions from the Committee, the Civic Cabinet Chair thanked the Program Director Civil and Transport for his informative presentation.

13. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

#### B PETITION – REQUESTING COUNCIL STOP THE IMPLEMENTATION OF LINE MARKING ON WOONGARRA STREET, THE GAP

**CA21/349050**

**158/2021-22**

14. A petition from residents, requesting Council stop the implementation of line marking on Woongarra Street, The Gap, was received during the Autumn Recess 2021.

15. The Manager, Transport Planning and Operations, Brisbane Infrastructure, provided the following information.

16. The petition contained 33 signatures. Of the petitioners, 15 live on Woongarra Street, 17 live on other streets within the suburb of The Gap, Herston and Ashgrove, and one lives outside the City of Brisbane.

17. Woongarra Street has a speed limit of 50 km/h and is classified as a neighbourhood road in Council’s road hierarchy under *Brisbane City Plan 2014*. Neighbourhood roads connect to the major road network, providing direct property access and are suitable for most types of vehicles. Attachment B (submitted on file) shows a locality map.

18. Council was made aware of concerns with visibility at the crest in Woongarra Street, east of the intersection with Warralong Street, by a request received in August 2020, via The Gap Ward Office.

19. As a result of this request, Council’s Transport Network Officers, Transport Planning and Operations, Brisbane Infrastructure, undertook a review of the crest and identified insufficient sight lines for opposing drivers. This review identified that parked vehicles over this stretch of Woongarra Street forced drivers to travel up the centre of the road which creates a risk of a collision with oncoming vehicles. To manage this risk, Council proposed parking restrictions to ensure clear passageways in both directions for motorists to stay on the correct side of the road. Further to this, Council proposed a solid centreline to assist drivers in positioning their vehicles to remain on the correct side of the road and to prohibit the passing of slow vehicles that may be entering or exiting driveways. These recommendations are in accordance with the current design guidelines and engineering best practice. The proposal was reviewed and endorsed by a Registered Professional Engineer of Queensland (RPEQ).

20. The Gap Ward Office notified directly impacted residents of the proposal in late 2020 via letter. A total of 24 letters were sent and 13 responses were received. Out of the 13 responses, nine residents were in support of the proposal and four opposed the proposal. The notification received a 54% response rate and a 69% support rate. Notwithstanding the high response and support rates, the feedback received from the notification to residents was further reviewed by an RPEQ and a decision was made to implement the proposal based on safety needs. The linemarking was installed on 21 April 2021. Attachment C (submitted on file) shows a plan of the line marking.

21. Due to the reasons above, there are no plans to change the parking restrictions in Woongarra Street.

Consultation

22. Councillor Steven Toomey, Councillor for The Gap Ward, has been consulted and supports the recommendation.

Customer impact

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

24. The Manager recommended as follows and the Committee agreed.

25. **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:** CA21/349050

Thank you for your petition requesting Council stop the implementation of no parking lines on Woongarra Street, The Gap.

Your request for no parking lines to not be implemented has been noted. Council was made aware of concerns with visibility at the crest in Woongarra Street, east of the intersection with Warralong Street, by a request received in August 2020, via The Gap Ward Office.

Council’s Transport Network Officers, Transport Planning and Operations, Brisbane Infrastructure, undertook a review of the crest and identified insufficient sight lines for opposing drivers. This review identified that parked vehicles over this stretch of Woongarra Street forced drivers to travel over the middle of the road which creates a risk of a collision with oncoming vehicles. To manage this risk, Council proposed a solid centreline and parking restrictions, in accordance with the current best engineering practise and design guidelines. The proposal was reviewed and endorsed by a Registered Professional Engineer of Queensland (RPEQ).

The Gap Ward Office notified directly impacted residents in late 2020 via letter. A total of 24 letters were sent and 13 responses were received. Out of the 13 responses, nine residents were in support of the proposal and four rejected the proposal. The notification received a 54% response rate and a 69% support rate. Notwithstanding the high response and support rates, the feedback received from the notification to residents was further reviewed by an RPEQ and a decision was made to implement the proposal based on safety needs.

Due to the reasons above, there are no plans to change the parking restrictions in Woongarra Street.

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

Should you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact Mr Kevin Chen, Senior Transport Network Officer, Transport Planning and Operations, Brisbane Infrastructure, on (07) 3178 2019.

Thank you for raising this matter.

**ADOPTED**

#### C PETITIONS – REQUESTING COUNCIL REFUSE TO WIDEN THE INTERSECTION AT ANNERLEY ROAD, CORNWALL STREET AND KENT STREET, ANNERLEY; PROVIDE A SAFE CROSSING POINT ACROSS CORNWALL STREET, BETWEEN ANNERLEY ROAD AND KENT STREET; AND WORK WITH THE QUEENSLAND GOVERNMENT TO DELIVER SAFER PATHWAYS TO SCHOOLS, PUBLIC TRANSPORT AND THE PRINCESS ALEXANDRA HOSPITAL

**CA21/17669 and CA21/99311**

**159/2021-22**

26. Two petitions from residents, requesting Council refuse to widen the intersection at Annerley Road, Cornwall Street and Kent Street, Annerley; provide a safe crossing point across Cornwall Street, between Annerley Road and Kent Street; and work with the Queensland Government to deliver safer pathways to schools, public transport and the Princess Alexandra Hospital, were received.

27. One petition (CA21/17669) was received during the Summer Recess 2021. The second petition (CA21/99311) was presented to the meeting of Council held on 2 February 2021, by Councillor Nicole Johnston, and received.

28. The Manager, Transport Planning and Operations, Brisbane Infrastructure, provided the following information.

29. The first petition contains 213 signatures. Of the petitioners, 175 live within Tennyson Ward, 36 live in other wards of the City of Brisbane and two live outside the City of Brisbane. The second petition contains 36 signatures. Of the petitioners, 34 live within Tennyson Ward and two live in other wards of the City of Brisbane.

30. The petitioners are concerned about the safety of pedestrians and cyclists, including school children, using Annerley Road, Cornwall Street and Kent Street, near Dutton Park railway station and the Princess Alexandra (PA) Hospital, with the potential increase of heavy vehicle movements for the adjacent Cross River Rail (CRR) Southern Portal construction site in Kent Street.

31. The CRR project’s Tunnel, Station and Development contract incorporates the construction of a new underground rail link from Dutton Park to Herston, and the construction of four new underground rail stations. The Southern Portal is proposed to be constructed between Dutton Park railway station and the new Boggo Road railway station, adjacent to the PA Hospital.

32. The CRR project is being delivered by the Cross River Rail Delivery Authority (CRRDA) and its contractors. The approval authority for the CRR project under the *State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971* is the Coordinator-General (CG).

33. On 18 August 2020, the CRRDA applied to the CG to evaluate an eighth proposed change to the CRR project. The CRRDA’s Request for Project Change 8 (RfPC-8), requested the following.

- The use of Annerley Road, Cornwall Street and Kent Street, Annerley, as heavy vehicle access routes to the Southern Portal construction site.

- A whole of project change to remove the existing work time limitation of 10pm, where works were required to be undertaken after 10pm in accordance with road closure certificates granted by Council, and other approvals from Queensland Rail.

34. The RfPC-8 was issued for public comment by the CG between 5 September and 2 October 2020. Following consideration of the submissions and additional material provided by the CRRDA, the CG approved RfPC-8 on 16 November 2020. Consequently, the approved changes now constitute the approved development for the CRR project.

35. The petition requests Council refuse to widen the intersection at Annerley Road, Cornwall Street and Kent Street, to facilitate unrestricted B-double and heavy vehicle truck movements as part of the revised CRR work plan.

36. As the CG approved the RfPC-8 in November 2020, Council has no authority to amend or refute the new approved work plan.

37. Reference to heavy vehicles in RfPC-8 relate to construction vehicles that are allowed on Queensland public roads as-of-right. This includes semi-trailers, dump trucks, truck-and-dog and concrete trucks. Except in special circumstances, Council has no authority to prohibit the use of as-of-right vehicles on public roads.

38. The petition refers to the approval of B-double vehicles for the Southern Portal work site. The RfPC-8 does not apply to the use of B-double vehicles for the Southern Portal site. A B-double permit is required for travel on a road outside of the approved B-double network. B-double permits are issued by the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator. Council is not aware of any proposal for the use of B-double vehicles for the Southern Portal work site.

39. The Project-wide Imposed Conditions for the CRR project requires the development and adherence to Construction Traffic Management Plans (CTMP), relevant sub-plans for the CRR project and individual construction activity sites. Consequently, the contractor for the Southern Portal is required to develop and receive approval for a site specific CTMP. The contractor must consult with and receive the approval of Council where there are impacts on local Council roads.

40. Council officers worked closely with the contractor in developing adequate and safe improvement measures as part of preparing the CTMPs to maintain the safety of pedestrians and cyclists during the construction period. These improvements, included in the approved CTMP, are summarised as follows.

- Provision of segregated bi-directional shared use pedestrian and cyclist path along Kent Street.

- Additional kerb ramps at the intersection of Cornwall Street and Kent Street, to improve pedestrian and cyclist access to the footpath adjacent to Dutton Park railway station.

- Relocation of existing taxi drop-off bay in Cornwall Street, to improve sight lines for pedestrians and cyclists.

- Installation of additional signage and threshold paint to aid safe pedestrian movements in Cornwall Street and Kent Street.

41. The above works resulted in a minor re-configuration of the intersection of Cornwall and Kent Streets, however there was no widening of the intersection of Annerley Road and Cornwall Street.

42. The request in RfPC-8 for extended work times beyond 10pm are intended to apply only to locations and situations where a relevant authority would normally permit nighttime works (e.g. works on arterial roads or extended rail line track closures) or where the works involve continuous construction activities that could not be halted mid-construction (e.g. extended concrete pours). The request did not apply for, nor was approval given for, unrestricted construction activities on the whole of the CRR project. Consequently, the provision of temporary road closure certificates to facilitate works after 10pm are not dissimilar to other major construction sites in Brisbane.

43. The petition requested Council provide a safe crossing point for school children, commuters, cyclists and local residents across Cornwall Street, between Annerley Road and Kent Street. Attachment B (submitted on file) shows a locality map.

44. Council officers undertook a preliminary review of the potential to provide a pedestrian crossing over Cornwall Street, between Annerley Road and Kent Street. However, given the very short distance between the two intersections being approximately 25 meters, high vehicle volumes and limited sight distance from Annerley Road, the implementation of a non‑signalised pedestrian crossing is not considered feasible or safe at this location.

45. It is noted that signalised pedestrian crossings of Annerley Road are provided at the adjacent Annerley Road and Rusk Street; and Annerley Road, Cornwall Street, Nobel Street and Railway Terrace intersections.

46. Separate to the above, the section of Cornwall Street, at the Annerley Road intersection, was listed in the 2020-21 road resurfacing program, and this work was undertaken and completed in May 2021.

47. The petition also requested Council work with the State Government to deliver safer pathways to schools, public transport and the PA Hospital. Council is committed to making school travel safer by supporting several infrastructure initiatives to provide for children and school communities, and encourage safety on the roads around our schools. In particular, the Safer Paths to School program improves pathways and completes missing sections of footpaths to nearby schools. These improvements ensure teachers, students and families can get to school safer on safe and connected pathways.

48. As part of the CRR project, Council is working with the State Government to enhance pedestrian links to all new and existing public transport facilities along the CRR corridor. This includes the provision of a new pedestrian and cycle bridge between the PA Hospital and the Boggo Road railway and bus stations.

Consultation

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

Customer impact

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

51. The Manager recommended as follows and the Committee agreed, with Councillors Steve Griffiths and Charles Strunk dissenting.

52. **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 References:** CA21/17669 and CA21/99311

Thank you for your petitions requesting Council refuse to widen the intersection at Annerley Road, Cornwall Street and Kent Street, Annerley; provide a safe crossing point across Cornwall Street, between Annerley Road and Kent Street; and work with the Queensland Government to deliver safer pathways to schools, public transport and the Princess Alexandra (PA) Hospital.

The Cross River Rail (CRR) project’s Tunnel, Station and Development contract incorporates the construction of a new underground rail link from Dutton Park to Herston and the construction of four new underground rail stations. The Southern Portal is proposed to be constructed between Dutton Park railway station and the new Boggo Road railway station, adjacent to the PA Hospital.

The CRR project is being delivered by the Cross River Rail Delivery Authority (CRRDA) and its contractors. The approval authority for the CRR project under the *State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971* is the Coordinator-General (CG).

On 18 August 2020, the CRRDA applied to the CG to evaluate an eighth proposed change to the CRR project. The CRRDA’s Request for Project Change 8 (RfPC-8), requested the following.

- The use of Annerley Road, Cornwall Street and Kent Street, Annerley, as heavy vehicle access routes to the Southern Portal construction site.

- A whole of project change to remove the existing work time limitation of 10pm, where works were required to be undertaken after 10pm in accordance with road closure certificates granted by Council, and other approval from Queensland Rail.

The RfPC-8 was issued for public comment by the CG between 5 September and 2 October 2020. Following consideration of the submissions and additional material provided by the CRRDA, the CG approved RfPC-8 on 16 November 2020. Consequently, the approved changes now constitute the approved development for the CRR project.

Your request that Council refuse to widen the intersection at Annerley Road, Cornwall Street and Kent Street, to facilitate unrestricted B-double and heavy vehicle truck movements as part of the revised CRR work plan has been noted.

As the CG approved the RfPC-8 in November 2020, Council has no authority to amend or refute the new approved work plan.

Reference to heavy vehicles in RfPC-8 relate to construction vehicles that are allowed on Queensland public roads as-of-right. This includes semi-trailers, dump trucks, truck-and-dog and concrete trucks. Except in special circumstances, Council has no authority to prohibit the use of as‑of-right vehicles on public roads.

In regard the approval of B-double vehicles for the Southern Portal work site. The RfPC-8 does not apply to the use of B-double vehicles for the Southern Portal site. A B-double permit is required for travel on a road outside of the approved B-double network. B-double permits are issued by the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator. Council is not aware of any proposal for the use of B-double vehicles for the Southern Portal work site.

The Project-wide Imposed Conditions for the CRR project requires the development and adherence to Construction Traffic Management Plans (CTMP), relevant sub-plans and individual construction activity sites. Consequently, the contractor for the Southern Portal is required to develop and receive approval for a site specific CTMP. The contractor must consult with and receive the approval of Council where there are impacts on local Council roads.

Council officers worked closely with the contractor in developing adequate and safe improvement measures as part of preparing the CTMPs to maintain the safety of pedestrians and cyclists during the construction period. These improvements, included in the approved CTMP, are summarised as follows.

- Provision of segregated bi-directional shared use pedestrian and cyclist path along Kent Street.

- Additional kerb ramps at the intersection of Cornwall Street and Kent Street, to improve pedestrian and cyclist access to the footpath adjacent to Dutton Park railway station.

- Relocation of existing taxi drop-off bay in Cornwall Street, to improve sight lines for pedestrians and cyclists.

- Installation of additional signage and threshold paint to aid safe pedestrian movements in Cornwall Street and Kent Street.

The above works resulted in a minor re-configuration of the intersection of Cornwall and Kent Streets, however there was no widening of the intersection of Annerley Road and Cornwall Street.

The request in RfPC-8 for extended work times beyond 10pm are intended to apply only to locations and situations where a relevant authority would normally permit night-time works (e.g. works on arterial roads or extended rail line track closures) or where the works involve continuous construction activities that could not be halted mid-construction (e.g. extended concrete pours). The request did not apply for nor was approval given for unrestricted construction activities on the whole of the CRR project.

In regard to your request for Council to provide a safe crossing point for school children, commuters, cyclists and local residents across Cornwall Street, between Annerley Road and Kent Street. Council officers undertook a preliminary review of the potential to provide a pedestrian crossing over Cornwall Street, between Annerley Road and Kent Street. However, given the very short distance between the two intersections approximately 25 metres, high vehicle volumes and limited sight distance from Annerley Road, the implementation of a non‑signalised pedestrian crossing is not considered feasible or safe at this location.

It is noted that signalised pedestrian crossings of Annerley Road are provided at the adjacent Annerley Road and Rusk Street; and Annerley Road, Cornwall Street, Nobel Street and Railway Terrace intersections.

Separate to the above, the section of Cornwall Street at the Annerley Road intersection was listed in the 2020-21 road resurfacing program, and this work was undertaken and completed in May 2021.

In regard to your request, that Council work with the State Government to deliver safer pathways to schools, public transport and the PA Hospital. Council is committed to making school travel safer by supporting several infrastructure initiatives to provide for children and school communities, and encourage safety on the roads around our schools. In particular, the Safer Paths to School program improves pathways and completes missing sections of footpaths to nearby schools. These improvements ensure teachers, students and families can get to school safer on safe and connected pathways.

As part of the CRR project, Council is working with the State Government to enhance pedestrian links to all new and existing public transport facilities along the CRR corridor. This includes the provision of a new pedestrian and cycle bridge between the PA Hospital and the Boggo Road railway and bus stations.

Should you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact Mr Lindsay Enright, Inner City Planning Manager, Transport Planning and Operations, Brisbane Infrastructure, on (07) 3403 5012.

**ADOPTED**

Deputy Chair: I declare the motion passed. Thank you.

We’ll now move on to the next item which is City Planning and Suburban Renewal Committee.

Councillor ALLAN.

### CITY PLANNING AND SUBURBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE

Councillor Adam ALLAN, Civic Cabinet Chair of the City Planning and Suburban Renewal Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Sarah HUTTON that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 31 August 2021, be adopted.

Deputy Chair: Councillor ALLAN.

Councillor ALLAN: Thank you, Mr Chair.

In the Committee last week we had a presentation. It was an update on the BNE Local and Liveable project. This key initiative is one of 14 actions in the Council’s Design-led City strategy which aims to create liveable places with vibrant neighbourhood centres for the community and visitors to enjoy.

As an activation program, the idea is to find ways to improve and bring interest to under-used spaces across our city through the use of temporary place-making elements, including street furniture, creative lighting and artwork, wayfinding signage, pot plants and garden beds. There were three sites selected in the first year of the program, including Ellen Grove, Park Road at Milton and Nundah.

In Nundah, the heart of the Northgate Ward, the project area focused on Station Street and Aspinall Street. The concept of this location was to increase pedestrian traffic through the village, add a splash of colour and personality and support the new Suburban Business Hub and I was fortunate to work with a local community group to help install that particular project. This was very much a short‑term temporary activation and place-making elements will soon be moved to new sites.

Particularly in this location there was a really clever use of augmented reality which I think really captured the imagination of the Nundah Village community. The Ellen Grove project tied in with recent footpath upgrades undertaken through the Capital Works program and looked to create a more comfortable and attractive space with additional seating and shade sails for school kids to wait after school for parent pick up. Some of these elements, given their great success and improvement to the space, will remain in place and others will move on.

Park Road was a bit of a mix between the two. There were obvious safety issues around the public park about midway up the street, particularly at night. The installation of catenary and up-lighting, along with timber seating, wayfinding signage and a splash of colour has done wonders for this little pocket park and now is an inviting and safe space for locals and visitors to enjoy day or night.

Given this is an experimental and therefore agile program, Council will evaluate its learnings from the first year to identify potential improvements as we roll this program out across the city. All in all, the BNE Local and Liveable supports the Schrinner Council’s aspirations of creating a rich tapestry of vibrant connected communities. This is all about our commitment to the suburbs of Brisbane. I’ll leave further debate to the Chamber.

Deputy Chair: Thank you, Councillor ALLAN.

Is there any further debate? There doesn’t appear to be anybody.

Councillor ALLAN?

We’ll now put the report.

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

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

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

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE:**

Councillor Lisa Atwood.

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – BNE LOCAL AND LIVEABLE

**160/2021-22**

1. The Design Brisbane Manager, City Planning and Economic Development, City Planning and Sustainability, attended the meeting to provide an update on BNE Local and Liveable projects. He provided the information below.

2. As a key initiative of Council’s *Design-led City - a design strategy for Brisbane* (the strategy), the program ensures future design in Brisbane is sustainable and responds to the local environment, community, culture, and climate.

3. BNE Local and Liveable (BLL) is one of 14 actions of Council’s strategy to undertake demonstration and pilot projects. These projects are important for testing new and innovative ideas that could have a wider application across Brisbane. BLL helps to deliver on the strategic priority of creating great places for Brisbane. The strategy’s 12 design values help to shape all BLL project design outcomes.

4. This an experimental program, and learnings from the first year (2020-21 financial year) will be used to improve the program.

5. BLL is an activation program that supports Brisbane City Council’s commitment to creating a city of neighbourhoods, with a primary purpose to create liveable places with vibrant neighbourhood centres for the local community and visitors to enjoy. Temporary placemaking elements are used to enhance neighbourhood identity and encourage community connection. The budgets for BLL selected sites are intentionally small and the projects focus on testing ideas in-place.

6. The three Year 1 sites explored a number of delivery scenarios:

- Ellen Grove – followed a community co-design plan and a small streetscape project

- Nundah – followed a destination plan facilitated by economic development, and the establishment of a Suburban Business Hub. A creative lighting project is planned for the village in 2022-23

- Park Road, Milton – a lead-in project as part of a Village Precinct Project that allowed early testing of business stakeholders’ ideas.

7. The Ellen Grove project area is focused on the corner of Waterford Road and Bluebird Avenue. The concept of this is location was to create comfortable areas for the community to sit and stay at their local shopping centre and increase sense of place by celebrating local identity. The activation ideas tested in the project area included:

- shade sails and ’twig’ seats

- a ‘Welcome to Ellen Grove’ mural

- games on the ground.

8. The Nundah project area focused on Station and Aspinall Streets, Nundah. The concept of this location was to increase pedestrian traffic through the village, add a splash of personality and support the new Suburban Business Hub. The activation ideas tested in the project area included:

- a splash of personality

- urban play with interactive experiences.

9. The Park Road, Milton, project area focused on Adam Smiddy Park, located on the corner of Park Road and Gordon Street. The concept of this location was to build on the public space network with an enhanced destination to support the whole-of-precinct experience. The activation ideas tested in the project area included:

- lighting for safety and ambience

- outdoor lounges

- subtropical plants

- precinct wayfinding.

10. The Committee was shown the following:

- a locality map of first-year BLL sites at Nundah, Milton and Ellen Grove

- a number of images, a site plan, a video and community feedback of the Ellen Grove project area

- a locality map of the Nundah Business Hub, and a number of images, a video, a site plan and community feedback of the Nundah project area

- a number of images, a site plan and community feedback of the Park Road project area.

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

12. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

Deputy Chair: We’ll now move on to the next report. Environment, Parks and Sustainability Committee.

Councillor DAVIS, please.

### ENVIRONMENT, PARKS AND SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE

Councillor Tracy DAVIS, Civic Cabinet Chair of the Environment, Parks and Sustainability Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Sarah HUTTON, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 31 August 2021, be adopted.

Deputy Chair: Councillor DAVIS.

Councillor DAVIS: Thank you, Mr Chair.

Our Committee presentation last week was on the Wildlife Conservation Partnership program.

The Wildlife Conservation Partnership program is one of the many initiatives Council undertakes as part of the Community Conservation Partnerships program. To date, the Community Conservation Partnerships program has delivered bushland and waterway improvements on 1,013 sites comprising over 3,500 hectares which has been delivered on public and private land, supported by more than 9,000 volunteers and partners.

This partnership program has four key components. The Wildlife Conservation Partnership was established in 1996 and supports private landholders. Just under 50% of Brisbane’s biodiversity values are contained on private ownership and the Wildlife Conservation Partnership provides the city with an opportunity to actively involve 186 landholders to collectively manage more than 2,500 hectares.

The program provides five agreement types, each providing a different level of protection and assistance and they range from non-binding agreements with the landowner that provides information and assistance for bushland restoration through to a covenant which is registered on the property title making it binding and all landowners as well as financial support.

Council has a goal of achieving 40% natural groundcover with 75% of Brisbane’s natural habitat being connected and healthy. These goals are achievable with private landowners’ support and investment.

Another component is Habitat Brisbane which was established in 1990 and supports more than 160 Habitat Brisbane groups to restore natural habitat on public land. We estimate there are over 6,200 volunteers that help restore 583 hectares of key waterways and bushland across the city. Additionally, community conservation assistance was established in 2013 and Council and community have been working in partnership to deliver $4.2 million worth of works within 483 high priority bushland and waterway restoration sites. Council has provided the assistance funding through support, not funds to undertake the restoration works.

Mr Chair, it was a very interesting presentation and I commend the report to the Chamber and leave further debate to the Chamber.

Deputy Chair: Thank you, Councillor DAVIS.

Is there further debate? No one is rising.

Councillor DAVIS, no reply? No.

We will now put the report.

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, and Sandy Landers.

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE:**

Councillor David McLachlan.

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – WILDLIFE CONSERVATION PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM

**161/2021-22**

1. The Manager, Natural Environment, Water and Sustainability, City Planning and Sustainability, attended the meeting to provide an update on the Wildlife Conservation Partnerships Program. He provided the information below.

2. The Community Conservation Partnerships Program (CCPP) is a program of initiatives supporting groups and individuals to improve Brisbane’s natural environment. To date it has delivered bushland and waterway improvements on 1,013 sites, comprising over 3,500 hectares. CCPP is delivered on public land and private properties and has supported nearly 9,000 volunteers and partners.

3. The CCPP has four key components: the Wildlife Conservation Partnerships Program (WCPC) which is delivered on private property, Habitat Brisbane delivered on public land, the Creek Catchment Program which is delivered on both public and private land, and Community Conservation Assistance (CCA).

4. In Council’s 2021-22 Annual Plan and Budget, WCPP is aligned with Service 3.1.1.2 Partnerships for a Clean Green City. The program has close alignment with strategy documents *Brisbane Vision 2031* and *Brisbane. Clean, Green, Sustainable 2017-2031,* and has goals of achieving 40% natural habitat cover on mainland Brisbane, and 75% of Brisbane’s natural habitat being connected and healthy.

5. The Committee was shown a map illustrating the spread of conservation partnerships across Brisbane, in particular, properties participating in the five levels of the WCPP program. The introductory and non‑binding levels of the program are Working Towards Wildlife, the introductory level, and Land for Wildlife (LfW), the most common level of participation. The General Voluntary Conservation Agreement, the Higher Voluntary Conservation Agreement and the Voluntary Conservation Covenant are all legally binding and offer financial support to landowners to assist them in delivering the program’s conservation outcomes, and to compensate them for the work they do for the residents of Brisbane.

6. Approximately 50% of biodiversity values are contained in private ownership. Targets of between 40% and 75% are possible with private land investment. WCPP is funded by the Bushland Preservation Levy and complements the Bushland Acquisition Program. It supports 786 landowners across 2,543 hectares and has been running for 23 years. Five officers deliver the program, which provides landowners with individual Bushland Management Plans, free trees, training and resources. Properties must be larger than 5,000 square metres to be eligible for inclusion in the program.

7. Land for Wildlife South East Queensland (LfWSEQ) is a cooperative regional platform that cost‑effectively delivers on specified Local Government Association (LGA) objectives and provides Brisbane members with services and support. It is governed by a steering committee in accordance with LGA governing documents and associated targets. It has been running since 1998 and supports 13 South East Queensland Local Government Areas. The program has grown strongly since it commenced in 1998, and there are currently 5,000 LfWSEQ properties across South East Queensland, comprising over 70,000 hectares.

8. WCPP partner numbers have grown strongly since it commenced in 2013-14, and the program now has 786 partners comprising 2,543 hectares. In 2020-21, 68 new LfW partners registered, and 18,380 plants were provided. The program completed 35 CCA projects worth $224,000 and provided 49 nest boxes to landowners. The program has received a 96% satisfaction rating from program partners, and it has directly benefited local industries including nurseries, rural supplies stores and contractors.

9. In 2020-21 WCPP participants made the following contributions:

- 79,822 plants sourced

- 98,202 plants planted

- 189,960 hours of conservation activities

- $1.04 million spent by partners on conservation activities

- $9.62 million total estimated partner contribution to the city.

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

11. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

Deputy Chair: We will now move on to City Standards Committee.

Councillor MARX.

### CITY STANDARDS COMMITTEE

Councillor Kim MARX, Civic Cabinet Chair of the City Standards Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Sarah HUTTON, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 31 August 2021, be adopted.

Deputy Chair: Councillor MARX.

Councillor MARX: Thank you, Mr Chair.

Just briefly. We had a presentation on the Animal Rehoming Centre enhancements that have taken place at Willawong. We had a grant that was given to us and we were able to use that to do some reconstruction work. Mainly one of the things we did was installation of new cat condos which, at the time of the presentation, had been started, but weren’t finished, but they are now finished. We’re also looking at—we’re doing a new invasive species building and the Committee has made a comment that they would be keen to have a site visit so I will be planning to organise that for them some time in the new session when we start after recess again. Thank you, Mr Chair.

Deputy Chair: Thank you, Councillor MARX.

Is there further debate?

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes. I rise to speak on item B.

**Seriatim - Clause B**

|  |
| --- |
| Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON requested that Clause B, PETITION – REQUESTING THAT COUNCIL NOT REMOVE THE FIG TREE IN PALM AVENUE, SHERWOOD, be taken seriatim for voting purposes. |

Councillor JOHNSTON: The petition before us today is from residents in Palm Avenue and nearby Hall Street and Egmont Street requesting that a smallish fig tree in Palm Avenue, Sherwood, be retained.

There are a few issues with the tree without question, but when it comes to trees, I think all Councillors know that residents either desperately love their tree or they desperately want the tree gone. There’s usually not a lot of in between.

In this case, we very clearly have a group of residents who live in a small dead‑end street with no real thoroughfare other than for local residents who wanted the fig tree retained and they petitioned Council to keep it. I tabled that petition on 25 May 2021.

Now instead of considering the residents’ petition, this Council cut the tree out. They did that on 8 July. So they didn’t have the courtesy to consider the residents’ request in this petition before Council. It’s not the first time it’s happened in my ward. We had a problem down the end of Stevens Lane in Yeronga where this happened as well.

Now as I said last week in Committee, I’ve got enormous respect for our arborists. They do a very hard job and they do it very well. In this case, I do not agree with their decision and I find it reprehensible that Council failed to even consider the request of the residents, that Council went ahead and did this without any consideration of their request. This is a democratic Chamber. This Council says that it consults and listens to residents, but that’s clearly not the case. Clearly not the case.

If residents petition for something, it comes up to this place and this place makes the decision about what’s going to happen. That didn’t occur. This tree was cut down a month ago and residents’ views on this issue were completely ignored. I find that just reprehensible.

It gets worse though. So I’ve had a chat to the resident who’s the head petitioner. She says Council has planted a poinciana. They couldn’t put the poinciana back where the fig was, so they’ve placed the poinciana on the frontage of another resident. It’s under powerlines and under the telephone lines. Poinciana is not a native species and this has been planted in a location where Council doesn’t actually plant trees anymore.

So the outcome, which is a replacement tree for the fig, a native that was cut down, is to put in a poinciana which is not native. Yes, under powerlines. So not only did Council ignore the residents’ requests, they didn’t even plant a native tree that is suitable for the location as a replacement. This is an epic fail.

This petition, in my view, should be withdrawn. It is appalling that Council treats residents with such little respect and it is beyond me why Council is not putting a native tree back into this area. Why there wasn’t even some consultation with the residents about what they might want. What’s wrong with this Council and what this LNP Administration, the culture that they have created is we’re just going to do what we want and we don’t care what you think. We don’t listen to your views, we are not interested in your feedback. We’re not even going to respect the democratic process of having a discussion in this place about an outcome before Council goes and does what they want.

In this case, a native tree that residents want kept has been cut down and a non‑native, which is a messy street tree, has been planted and will grow up and cause problems in this future under these powerlines. More cost to Council as well. This could not have been more poorly handled, more poorly handled, in my view. Last week when I raised these issues in Committee, I was attacked by yourself, Mr Deputy Chairman, but I don’t think it’s good enough that this has happened in the way that it’s happened.

I’ve written to every resident and I’ve told them your views, I’ve told them the views of the LNP and I am appalled, appalled, that the Council, who is responsible for the good management of our streets and our suburbs and a Council that says it listens to residents did not do so. Shame on you.

Deputy Chair: Is there further debate?

Councillor MARX? No.

Now I put the report. All those in favour say—sorry, my apologies. I have it noted here and I’ve failed again.

My apologies, Councillor JOHNSTON.

We will now put item A.

**Clause A put**

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

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

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 14 - The DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Krista ADAMS, and Councillors Greg ADERMANN, Adam ALLAN, Tracy DAVIS, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Sarah HUTTON, James MACKAY, Kim MARX, Peter MATIC, David McLACHLAN, Ryan MURPHY, Steven TOOMEY and Andrew WINES.

NOES: 6 - The Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Jared CASSIDY, and Councillors Peter CUMMING, Steve GRIFFITHS, Charles STRUNK, Jonathan SRI and Nicole JOHNSTON.

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 – ANIMAL REHOMING CENTRE ENHANCEMENTS

**162/2021-22**

1. The Manager, Compliance and Regulatory Services, Lifestyle and Community Services, attended the meeting to provide an update on Animal Rehoming Centre Enhancements. She provided the information below.

2. Council’s animal rehoming centres provide an essential place of refuge, safety, reuniting and care for animals lost or otherwise separated from their family.

3. Warra Animal Rehoming Centre was constructed in 1970 and Willawong Animal Rehoming Centre was constructed in 1960. The facilities were showing age and no longer suited the growing demand of the community. It was identified that investment was required to improve the facilities and meet community demand.

4. The facilities are both run by the Animal Welfare League of Queensland, who work hand in hand with Council.

5. In 2014, site enhancements were not initially included in funding granted, with only maintenance funds included. Council allocated $1.5 million in 2019 for enhancement of both facilities. Additionally, in 2021 the Queensland Government granted $1 million of funding for the facilities through the South East Queensland Community Stimulus Program (SEQ CSP). Future investment drivers are still present and there is a commitment to ongoing investment in the animal rehoming centres.

6. A number of upgrades have been made to the facilities over the last four years, or are currently underway, including:

- 2018 – Warra cat condominiums were replaced, air conditioning and fans were installed, and kennel floors were resurfaced

- 2019 – the roads were resurfaced, murals painted, and exercise yards upgraded at Warra

- 2020 – CCTV cameras were installed, a new retail facility was built at Warra, and new kennels and exercise yards were built at Willawong

- 2021 – mobile duress alarms were added for safety, a Colourbond fence was installed and a new building for invasive species is underway at Willawong.

7. The $1 million grant funding from the SEQ CSP will be invested in the Willawong Animal Rehoming Centre. Enhancements include the replacement of Willawong cat condominiums, and refurbishment of the administration building and dog intake area.

8. The design, procurement, and construction of the enhancements from the SEQ CSP grant are expected to be completed by the end of the 2021-22 financial year. The invasive species facility is expected to be completed in late September 2021.

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

10. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

#### B PETITION – REQUESTING THAT COUNCIL NOT REMOVE THE FIG TREE IN PALM AVENUE, SHERWOOD

**CA21/562857**

**163/2021-22**

11. A petition from residents, requesting that Council not remove the fig tree in Palm Avenue, Sherwood, was presented to the meeting of Council held on 25 May 2021, by Councillor Nicole Johnston, and received.

12. The Executive Manager, City Standards, Brisbane Infrastructure, provided the following information.

13. The petition contains seven signatures.

14. Council received a request on 29 December 2020 about exposed tree roots on the footpath and branches through power and NBN lines at 13-15 Palm Avenue, Sherwood. On 4 February 2021, the Senior Technical Officer Arboriculture, South Region, Program Planning and Integration, City Standards, Brisbane Infrastructure, inspected the trees. The officer subsequently scheduled works on the Cocos palm tree, and arranged a canopy lift for the jacaranda tree at 15 Palm Avenue and the removal of one juvenile weeping fig tree at 13 Palm Avenue. The weeping fig tree was planted on the nature strip outside of Council’s tree planting specifications by a private resident. Tree removal was completed on 8 July 2021, with the stump and root grinding being completed on 19 July 2021.

15. The exposed surface roots of the semi-mature weeping fig tree indicate that the soil profile is shallow and heavily compacted. The vigorous tree roots will therefore cause unmanageable damage to private and Council infrastructure in search of water and nutrients. The nature strip does not provide sufficient space to sustain a mature weeping fig tree within the streetscape environment. In addition, the weeping fig tree exhibits structural defects such as ingrown bark tissue and crossing branches which will become points of weakness as the tree matures (as shown in Attachment B, submitted on file).

Consultation

16. Councillor Nicole Johnston, Councillor for Tennyson Ward, does not support the recommendation.

17. All others are in agreement with the recommendation.

Customer impact

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

19. The Executive Manager recommended as follows and the Committee agreed, with Councillor Nicole Johnston dissenting and Councillor Peter Cumming abstaining.

20. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A**

**Draft Response**

**Petition Reference:** CA21/562857

Thank you for your petition requesting that Council not remove the fig tree in Palm Avenue, Sherwood.

Council has completed an onsite investigation and considered your request.

Council values the trees in our city as they contribute significantly to the environment both ecologically and aesthetically. These values are supported by Council’s tree policy which ensures the preservation of Council trees, therefore, tree removal is considered an important issue.

It was determined that the weeping fig tree was planted outside of Council’s tree planting specifications by a private resident on the nature strip and does not meet Council standards.

The exposed surface roots of the semi-mature weeping fig tree indicate that the soil profile is shallow and heavily compacted, and the vigorous tree roots are in search of water and nutrients, which will cause unmanageable damage to private and Council infrastructure.

The nature strip does not provide sufficient space to sustain a mature weeping fig tree within the streetscape environment. In addition, the weeping fig tree exhibits structural defects such as ingrown bark tissue and crossing branches which will become points of weakness as the tree matures.

Therefore, due the above information Council removed the juvenile weeping fig tree in Palm Avenue, Sherwood on 8 July 2021.

Please let the other petitioners know of this information.

Should you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact Ms Anastasia Browne, Regional Coordinator Arboriculture, South Region, Program Planning and Integration, City Standards, Brisbane Infrastructure, on (07) 3407 0639.

Thank you for raising this matter.

**ADOPTED**

Deputy Chair: Community, Arts and Nighttime Economy Committee.

Councillor HOWARD, how are you?

### COMMUNITY, ARTS AND NIGHTTIME ECONOMY COMMITTEE

Councillor Vicki HOWARD, Civic Cabinet Chair of the Community, Arts and Nighttime Economy Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Sarah HUTTON, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 31 August 2021, be adopted.

Deputy Chair: Councillor HOWARD, you have the call.

Councillor HOWARD: Thank you, Mr Deputy Chair, and of course as you all know, you like me to update you on what’s happening to the nighttime economy and through the Chair to Councillor CUMMING in particular I know that this is something that you are very interested in.

So, can I tell you that Brisbane has never looked better than with our wonderful Brisbane Festival and it is aptly called ‘Brightly Brisbane’. There have been some wonderful events that have been happening just in the last couple of days. Of course, the Brisbane Festival is occurring right throughout September, but just to mention a few.

We had the opening. There was a little bit of rain, but that doesn’t stop it when people are wanting to have a good time and of course we also then had the opening of *Boy Swallows Universe* which is fantastic by our local Trent Dalton. Of course, we then went on to launch the Art Boat and I don’t know if any of you have seen that sailing down the river, but it’s absolutely fantastic and it’s sold out so they’re hoping that they can get some more tickets being—sorry, what was—no, it wasn’t the Subway and I know through you, Mr Chair, I know that I believe Councillor WINES did see the Subway. You saw the Subway as well. So I did not—I did not see the Subway, but I can certainly tell you that the Art Boat is fabulous and particularly at night.

So, I am talking about our nighttime economy and of course the wondering street serenades and I know very many of you in the Chamber have been behind the Street Serenades in your suburb and I really appreciate that you do that because I think it’s fabulous for each of our suburbs within Brisbane to have that wonderful opportunity to be there.

Last night, I attended the celebrations for Brazil’s Independence Day which is actually today and happened in 1822 so they’ve been independent for quite a while, but our bridge will be lit up tonight in green, yellow and blue for Brazil’s Independence Day. I just want to thank Honorary Consul Val who is doing an amazing job for the wonderful people here in Brisbane and there’s some fantastic people who all know how to have a good time and they’re very much looking forward to seeing the bridge lit up in their colours today.

So moving to the report. Last week we had the Community Venues Project Manager give his very first presentation to the Committee on our Council Aquatic Centres and I think that the Committee were able to ask lots and lots of questions, which was really great, and we learnt of course that Council runs 22 of our public swimming pools across Brisbane and that although the visitation to Council pools was impacted by COVID-19, more than four million visits were recorded to Council’s swimming pools with three million visits in the previous year. So fantastic to see that when people can get out and about and to use our pools that was able to be done.

Council operates an ongoing enhancement and refurbishment program across the pool network with the intention of growing visitation and increasing the ways in which visitors engage with the centres. I know that through you, Mr Chair, Councillor CUMMING asked a question regarding the number of Council pools which are heated and whether they remain open year-round and I’m able to inform the Chamber that we have 41 pool basins which are heated all year round. A further six pool basins are heated either side of the summer season.

We work with the lessees on the appropriate operating models, taking into account patronage and costs. So that’s the answer to that question that you asked, Councillor CUMMING, and on that note, I will ask it to be passed.

*At that time, 4.46pm, the Chair, Councillor David McLACHLAN, resumed the Chair.*

Chair: Thank you, Councillor HOWARD.

Is there any further debate? No further debate.

The motion before us is the report of the Community, Arts and Nighttime Economy Committee 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 (Chair), Councillor Sandy Landers (Deputy Chair), and Councillors Peter Cumming, Steve Griffiths, James Mackay and Steven Toomey.

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – COUNCIL AQUATIC CENTRES

**164/2021-22**

1. The Community Venues Project Manager, Community Facilities, Lifestyle and Community Services, attended the meeting to provide an update on Council Aquatic Centres. He provided the information below.

2. Council runs 22 public swimming pools across Brisbane. Although visitation to Council pools was impacted by COVID-19 in 2020, in 2020-21 more than 4 million visits were recorded to Council swimming pools, up from more than 3 million visits in 2019-20. Investment in new pools and other associated ‘dry‑land’ facilities has contributed to increases in four-year and eight-year average attendances. Council’s most popular pools are the Sandgate Aquatic Centre, the Yeronga Park Memorial Swimming Pool, the Parkinson Aquatic Centre, the Langlands Park Memorial Pool and the Centenary Aquatic Centre and Health Club.

3. Attendance levels across the pool network in 2020-21 ranged from 14,870 at the Spring Hill Baths, to 370,602 at the Sandgate Aquatic Centre. Attendance levels varied as a result of the facilities available, programs offered, location, and patron demographics. October to March are the peak months for attendance at Council aquatic centres.

4. Attendance at Learn to Swim classes comprises approximately 30% of pool visits. Since 2012‑13, total pool attendance has grown strongly. The attendance categories ‘Other Aquatic Adult’, ‘Learn to Swim Child’, ‘General Swim Adult’ and ‘Fitness Centre Total Attendance’ are the largest attendance categories. The introduction of fitness facilities and health services at pool complexes is contributing to the strong growth of attendance numbers.

5. Council operates an ongoing enhancement and refurbishment program across the pool network, with the intention of growing visitation and increasing the ways in which visitors engage with the centres. In 2021‑22, the Sandgate Aquatic Centre’s 50 metre pool filters were replaced and its café and kiosk were upgraded, leading to attendance nearly doubling. In 2022, additional land will be acquired to expand the Parkinson Aquatic Centre, and a refurbishment of the Newmarket 50 metre pool will commence. In 2023‑24, the Chermside Aquatic Centre will be upgraded. It is anticipated that between 2013-14 and 2023‑24, approximately $86 million will have been invested in Council pools.

6. Other maintenance activities currently scheduled include the maintenance of the indoor pools at the Colmslie Aquatic Centre, the Emily Seebohm Aquatic Centre and the Runcorn Swimming Pool; and periodic maintenance of the 50 metre and diving pools at the Centenary Aquatic Centre.

7. Work is currently underway at the Centenary Aquatic Centre and Health Hub, where damaged windows are being replaced on this heritage listed building. This work is on track for completion in September 2021.

8. The Newmarket Pool refurbishment in 2021-22 will include the renewal of the pool basin, and replacement of plant, filters and heating equipment.

9. Recently completed works at the Musgrave Park Pool include the installation of a ‘pop up’ swim wall to allow the pool to be used by multiple user groups simultaneously, enabling more community classes to be run at the pool.

10. The Colmslie Pool will undergo access and inclusion upgrades, primarily for indoor program pool users. Adult change facilities will be accessibility compliant once automatic doors are installed, with the intention of reducing waiting times for users of the change facilities.

11. Following a number of questions from the Committee, the Chair thanked the Community Venues Project Manager for his informative presentation.

12. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

Chair: We now move on to the Finance and City Governance Committee report.

Councillor HUANG.

### FINANCE AND CITY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

Councillor Steven HUANG, A/Civic Cabinet Chair of the Finance and City Governance Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Sarah HUTTON, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 31 August 2021, be adopted.

Chair: Is there any debate?

Councillor HUANG.

Councillor HUANG: Yes, thank you, Mr Chair.

The Committee presentation last week was on an update from our Chief Information Officer on Innovation in Council. Innovation in Council looks at ideas that are new or applied differently, that changes the product or a process for the better and which improves outcomes for residents.

Council has an Innovation Pathways group to provide leadership, coaching and guidance, focusing on innovation ideas from sources, including Better Brisbane proposals, internal innovation ideas, ICT (information and communications technology) roadmaps, Smart City initiatives, innovation pipelines.

During the presentation, we learned about some specific examples of innovation in action at Council. We are using AI (artificial intelligence) and machine learning capabilities to assist Council officers to better understand Committee sentiment and to assist with data analysis, previously processed manually. For example, we can use machine learning to analyse audio files to assist in investigating customer complaints about things like noises from barking dogs.

We are maintaining and expanding the public Internet of Things that work and are collecting data from sensors in the field, which is then made available for reporting analysis, this play at decision-making. Examples include moisture sensors to aid initiatives such as koala fodder plantation, better street trees for Brisbane. Smart water metres to support increased water efficiency. Smart traps to aid in managing invasive species and smart bin trials.

Council is also working with QUT as part of their Business Capstone Program providing real world issues for students to pitch innovative solutions. I’ll just leave the further debate to the Chamber.

Chair: Any further discussion?

The motion before us the report of the Finance and City Governance Committee meeting.

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

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

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

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE:**

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

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – INFORMATION SERVICES INNOVATION UPDATE

**165/2021-22**

1. The Chief Information Officer, Information Services, Organisational Services, attended the meeting to provide an update on Council’s information services innovation activities over the last 12 months. He provided the information below.

2. Innovation is the application of ideas to help deliver the *Brisbane Vision 2031* and align with the principles in Council’s *Corporate Plan 2021-2022 to 2025-2026*. Council’s focus is on innovation as Council:

- is future-focused

- drives community value

- measures its performance on the delivery of outcomes

- values data as an asset and applying technology as an enabler

- harnesses opportunities from change and business disruption.

3. The Innovation Pathways Group:

- ensures collaboration across Council

- engages in the *Better Brisbane Proposal* process

- aligns to strategic direction

- follows Council policies and procedures

- assists Council officers to explore innovative ideas, while managing risk and protecting Council’s interests.

4. Robotic process automation (RPA) is programming code created to automate repetitive processes. RPA grows the efficiency of processes and systems Council uses to deliver services and outcomes through continual improvement. RPA has identified and assessed six pilot processes, resulting in four being implemented and now in use. A business requestable RPA service has been established, with six additional automations implemented.

5. Internet of things (IoT) is designed to increase capacity of automated information gathering to enable faster, more accurate and real time performance monitoring. Foundational ingestion patterns and methods have been developed to aid the delivery of IoT solutions. Council has established an internal IoT Working Group.

6. Council established the AI (artificial intelligence) and Machine Learning Panel in 2018. The AI and Machine Learning Panel uses timely data to inform Council of how assets and infrastructure are performing and explore the use of predictive analytics to manage assets more efficiently and cost‑effectively across the whole-of-life. The AI and Machine Learning Panel:

- analyses customer sentiment from contacts with Council

- analyses neighbourhood planning feedback

- utilises RPA services

- analyses sounds to assist investigations of noise complaints

- analyses resource allocation.

7. Council continues to participate in the Queensland University of Technology Capstone Program, engaging with undergraduate students. Council’s Student Capstone Program projects include:

- Interactive Cemetery Tour

- Wayfinding Application

- Urban Heat Island interactive map

- Carbon Emission home visibility game.

8. Following a number of questions from the Committee, the A/Civic Cabinet Chair thanked the Chief Information Officer for his informative presentation.

9. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

Chair: Councillors, I draw to your attention the Notice of Motion at item 6 on the Agenda.

Councillor SRI, that’s your motion. Would you like to read it, please?

## CONSIDERATION OF NOTIFIED MOTION – SPACE FOR TREES IN NEW DEVELOPMENT:

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

**166/2021-22**

The Chair of Council (Councillor David McLACHLAN) then drew the Councillors’ attention to the notified motion listed on the agenda, and called on Councillor Jonathan SRI to move the motion. Accordingly, Councillor Jonathan SRI moved, seconded by Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON, that—

*Brisbane City Council resolves to progress with the formal process to amend Acceptable Outcome 29.2 of the Multiple Dwelling Code in Brisbane City Plan 2014, so that Multiple Dwelling developments are required to provide ground-level deep planting areas that are a minimum of 25% of the site area.*

Chair: Councillor SRI, is there any debate?

Councillor SRI: Thanks, Chair. I was very excited to hear last week that the Mayor said he thought the changes proposed in the Brisbane Future Blueprint document from 2018 didn’t go far enough when it came to greener buildings and more sustainable development.

The Mayor acknowledged that his predecessor—sorry, I’m not sure. Am I allowed to say ‘his’? Anyway, look, I’m going to say it and hopefully Councillor TOOMEY will forgive me.

The Mayor acknowledged that his predecessor, Graham Quirk, had committed to 15% deep planting in new developments and seemed to say that that didn’t go far enough and I though well, that’s great to hear from LORD MAYOR Adrian SCHRINNER, that there’s a genuine interest here in exploring how we can make new developments in this city greener.

I don’t need to bore the Chamber with a long explanation of why it’s important to support the delivery of more trees in inner city areas. Trees provide so many positive ecosystem services. They’re really valued by local residents and of course they’re important in terms of habitat, connectivity, cleaning the air, *et cetera*.

The problem, really, we have though is that private property developers want to use as much of their site as possible to maximise yield and make as much money as they can from new development sites. But what I’ve learnt in conversations with many of those private developers, who are active in my area, is that they don’t necessarily mind if rules around build and design or how much greenery is included in new development. They don’t necessarily mind if those rules are tightened up a bit or if the standards are higher, as long as those standards are enforced consistently.

Maybe this is something that Councillor ALLAN can reflect on a little bit is that if all developers in this city were required to meet a higher standard of deep planting, whether it’s 15% or 20% or 25%, then there’s no market disadvantage to anyone of those private developers. They can all just factor that into their models and schemes and we’ll end up with developments that still deliver an increase in the supply of housing, but also create more room for trees.

So for those Councillors who don’t know the deep planting, the term deep planting refers to trees that have enough room for their roots, that are actually planted in the ground, in the soil itself, as opposed to trees or bushes that might be planted in concrete planter boxes or raised garden beds or balcony gardens, *et cetera*.

As I flagged recently in the Chamber, it’s been concerning recently to start to see some developers try to argue that trees on rooftops or on balconies are a sufficient substitute for genuine deep planting and I’ve talked at length about why that’s not the case. But really what I wanted to hammer home here today is that there is an opportunity for Brisbane to do better and to ensure that new developments include space for trees.

It’s not a radical proposal. The Council already accepts the principal that we should mandate and require developers to provide space for new trees and for trees in new developments. I’m simply suggesting that that requirement should be increased a little bit. So the proposal on the table, the wording of the motion, refers to 25% of the site area. So that would 25% of the entire site set aside for trees. It’s up to developers to decide where on the site they want those trees to go, it’s up to them to decide whether they plant them along boundaries or in one area or as part of an internal courtyard, *et cetera*. It’s not particularly prescriptive.

It still leaves 75% of a private development site for the other things we need to achieve, including open space requirements, but also the building footprint itself. So, if you look at other cities around the world, you’ll see that there’s wild divergences in terms of deep planting requirements in new developments. Some cities and some jurisdictions within Australia don’t require minimum deep planting areas at all and we see that particularly in some of the Council areas around Sydney where they’ve lost a huge amount of tree cover and where new developments have really led to a predomination of concrete and steel and built form with very little greenery to offset that.

In other councils though, we’re seeing that requirements around site cover and deep planting force developers to provide much more greenery and tree canopy cover within their development sites and that’s yielding very positive outcomes for those local council areas. In fact, those are the areas and regions that people are most keen to live in because they have the benefit of so much greenery, particularly in the inner city where there’s so much built form.

I think it’s important to highlight that Brisbane City Council’s own canopy cover strategy identifies the need to create and provide more canopy cover within private development sites. I think it’s a 40% target that Council has set and this goal of providing more trees across the city. That goal can only be met on current numbers and modelling if there are more trees included in private development sites.

But the problem we’re seeing right now, again and again and again, in this city is that developers are cutting down established trees to make way for new private development. Even in outer suburban areas we’re seeing this on a massive scale, but in the inner city it’s felt particularly acutely because there are so few trees to begin with.

The damage is cumulative. It might not seem like much if one tree on one development site is cut down to make way for a new tower, but when literally every site, every one of those old backyards or the spaces around our warehouses, on every one of those sites, trees are being removed to make way for new development. We end up losing hundreds of trees and I would estimate that in the five years I’ve been a Councillor, we’ve probably lost a couple of thousand large trees to new development in my electorate and that’s not an exaggeration.

Some of these sites, it’s wholesale clearing of the few trees that are left within the precinct. So this amendment is brought here in good faith to have a conversation about what level of tree cover and what percentage of sites we think it’s appropriate to require developers to deliver ground level trees.

The Mayor last week articulated his frustration that we don’t make time for genuine respectful debates in this Chamber about our competing visions for the city and I’m doing that here today and my vision for this city is very clear. I think we should require developers to set aside more of their site footprints for deep planted trees.

This is a proposed amendment to the Multiple Dwelling Code and what that means is that specific neighbourhood plans might still be able to override it in certain circumstances. So, maybe there are certain parts of the city where, for whatever reason, Council might decide, oh, actually, in this area we don’t need developers to set aside 25% of the site for trees. If Council makes that call, it can do that via the neighbourhood planning process. It can set up specific neighbourhood plans in specific areas and say to those residents, hey, you don’t get any trees.

If Council wants to go down that route, this particular motion doesn’t stop that happening. But what this motion does is call for us to start that formal process, to amend the City Plan and require 25% deep planting within the Multiple Dwelling Code. Councillor ALLAN has flagged that Council’s already started the process of amendments in terms of a 15% deep planting requirement, up from the current 10%.

I welcome that, but I’m very frustrated and disappointed that it’s taken such a long time. Because we’ve waited several years now for the Council to—I mean, the Mayor who announced it is retired now, he’s not even here anymore. So, it really shouldn’t have taken the Council that long to get to the point where they’re progressing that 15% amendment. But what I’m suggesting now is that if the Mayor is committed to doing better than the Future Brisbane Blueprint, then this is the opportunity.

Let’s increase the amount of land that’s set aside at ground level for deep planted trees. If developers want to put more trees on their rooftops or their balconies or whatever, then great, that’s good, fair play to them, but what we need is that space at ground level. That’s particularly important, not just in terms of space for trees themselves, but also because it means that a certain proportion of the site is going to remain as impervious surfaces, which helps in terms of soaking up rainwater and mitigating flooding.

I’m sure a lot of Councillors in this place will have seen examples where new developments introduce a lot more concrete to an area. There’s a lot more hardstand. There’s less space, less room available for the water to drain away. All that water just hits the concrete and causes localised flash flooding. Requiring a larger proportion of deep planting to be set aside on private land—private development sites, is also a form of flood mitigation, because it ensures that there will be a proportion of land left, even in built-up inner-city areas, that can soak up heavy rainfall and reduce the risk of all that stormwater rushing down drains and causing flooding at short notice.

So, I’ll be interested to hear what other Councillors have to say about this debate. I’m grateful to Councillor JOHNSTON for seconding it. I encourage all Councillors to support this motion.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor SRI.

Further speakers?

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, okay. Maybe you’re going to get the cone of silence, too, Councillor SRI. I rise to speak on the motion before us today and put on the record, look, my support for this. It is a bold step from where we are, which is 10%, but I have extreme concerns with the way that the development assessment process unfolds in my ward when it comes to multiple unit dwellings. So, the current rules essentially say that 10% of your site should be set aside for landscaping, including vegetation, that that is supposed to be exclusive of driveways, pathways, setbacks, bin areas, *et cetera*. That’s not what happens in practice.

So, in my ward—sorry, I’ll come back. The other thing that the current multi-unit dwelling code says that there should be a maximum 45% site cover for medium density, low-to-medium density and character infill. Blocks should be a minimum of 600 or 800 square metres. So, technically speaking, if you’re following the code, your site footprint is supposed to be 45% of the site. That leaves 55% of the site, or the balance of the site, for other purposes, including setbacks, open space, landscaping.

Now, 45 and 25 takes us to 70%—yes, good—70%, still leaving 30% for open space requirements, which can generally be met within that and still leaves a little bit of wiggle room. The fundamental problem that we are having is that the town planners in Brisbane City Council are allowing 60%-plus site cover in multiple unit dwellings as standard. Even 60% would be normal in what I see every day in my ward with the type of site cover.

Then the developer will argue, well, the driveway’s not included, so that’s extra. We’re not meeting open space requirements and certainly, in most cases, the thing that suffers the most is the requirement for deep plantings. Now, I remember when all this came through and these provisions were put in and they were mandated this way to make sure that developers weren’t using the same spaces to meet their minimum requirements. That is absolutely what is going on though.

If you follow the code requirements, there is plenty of room for the maximum building footprint of 45%. You could easily fit 25% ground cover. It is supposed to be at natural ground level, not, as they’re doing nowadays in higher density areas, trying to count the skinny little pot plant on the roof as a tree. It is critically important that we are putting in vegetation into these areas where multi-unit dwellings go in.

In my ward, there is barely room to walk around a six-storey building. Front setbacks are reduced. Rear setbacks are reduced. There’s no proper open space at ground level. The only open space you get now is essentially what’s on the roof, if they put a rooftop courtyard in, which is exposed to the sky. The rear setback essentially gets a few tiny, little trees and the front setback is occupied by car parking, the pump station to meet the fire safety requirements and, if you are lucky, a metre of little, tiny grasses from the front of the block.

These are appalling planning decisions that have become engrained in the way this Administration is assessing developments in areas like mine, which are low‑to‑medium density and medium density. They are leading to absolutely appalling planning outcomes by Council. We also know that the first thing a developer does when they identify a block that they want to turn into units, is they cut down every tree on the site. That is always the first indication we know that a development is coming—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: —because a block is completely denuded of landscaping. So, in my view, even within the current town planning scheme, there would be space for 25% deep planting, absolutely space for it. The problem is that Council has interpreted the code in a way that is maximising the building footprint. That instead of restricting that to what the code requires and allowing complementary spaces for the other uses as the code intends—open space, landscaping, setbacks, driveways—they’re not doing that.

The things that are suffering, without question, are (1) setbacks, (2) useable open space for residents, and (3) landscaping and deep planting. They are sacrificed every single time. I don’t actually—I don’t know that I’ve seen a multi-unit dwelling come through my ward that would meet all the acceptable solutions. I don’t think I’ve ever seen one. So, in my view there is plenty of scope to do this within the existing City Plan requirements.

Because I look forward to hearing from Councillor ALLAN, because my maths is pretty good here, 45% is your maximum site cover, that leaves 55% for all the other requirements. Now 25% of that being trees would be an excellent outcome. This Council says it supports greening our environment, it supports saving backyards. None of those things are actually true when it comes to development applications. It just fundamentally does not happen.

This is one way that we can ensure greenspaces in our suburbs where there is increasing density. It will help cool suburbs. It will provide shade for residents who do want to sit outside. It provides a buffer between properties. In my area, the setbacks between the buildings are reduced, which is such a fire risk. It will say it’s nine metres or 12 metres, they reduce it down to the side setback of 1.5 or two metres and then 1.5 on the other side. These are huge, big buildings, right next to each other. There are appalling planning decisions being made.

This is a really good step in addressing the lack of proper deep planting and landscaping around multi-unit dwellings. It is technically possible now. It would certainly be a good amendment to make. I support it.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Further speakers?

Councillor HUTTON.

Councillor HUTTON: Thank you, Chair. I rise to speak on this motion. I think we can all agree that the sustainability and building design is a top priority for the Schrinner Council.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor HUTTON: Our city is actually one of the fastest growing cities in Australia. It’s expected that 3.1 million people will call Brisbane home by 2030. In Administration, we are faced with tough decisions about priorities and trade-offs every single day. The reality is, we are a city with a limited available land supply, but an ever-increasing demand for new housing. As Australia’s largest local government and the country’s only carbon-neutral government, we are taking real and practical action to tackle issues that a growing city inevitably faces.

Last year, the LORD MAYOR introduced the Green Building Initiative—sorry, Incentive Policy to encourage well-designed, green and more energy-efficient buildings, through not only greater deep planting requirements, but green walls, podium plantings, green rooves and facades. We have a comprehensive set of strategies and guidelines that champion quality design and design excellence in buildings, like Design-led City and Buildings that Breathe. We are constantly updating and amending City Plan to ensure that design and character are prioritised in every decision.

Recently, we saw the introduction of minimum dimensions for deep planting, which requires an unobstructed dimension of four metres in any direction. Now, Mr Chair, I certainly do not claim to be a planning expert, but after doing some homework on this subject and hearing the debate before us in the Chamber, there are significant consequences to the motion before us. That notably being, building design and development feasibility and housing supply and affordability.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor HUTTON: Much like everything in life, there must be a balance. When that balance is tipped too far in one direction, something has got to give. You end up with the push-pull effect. I am perplexed to see what Councillor SRI proposes to surrender in return for more than a quarter of a site being dedicated to deep planting and landscaping, because by the time you factor in the space required for car parking, driveways and pathways, communal open space, private open space and service areas, there’s really not much room left.

My only assumption, based on previous commentary from Councillor SRI, is that under his proposal, that there would be less or in fact no car parking requirements on these developments. For the medium low-rise developments, in particular, where car parking is typically located at the ground floor, creating a workable solution is virtually impossible. I’ll be very interested to understand how Councillor CASSIDY and the Opposition will be supporting this motion today, with potentially no car parking in multiple dwelling developments.

Even basement parking would be problematic, with 25% of the site completely ruled out. In my view, this amendment is, by stealth, reducing the amount of car parking for new development.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor HUTTON: Either that, or we’ll take a hit on the number of units capable of being delivered and ending up with a massive undersupply of housing, which certainly doesn’t help Councillor SRI’s affordability woes. We know that based on the feedback received during consultation on the Blueprint, and even issues that we deal with on a daily basis as Councillors, ensuring we have adequate parking and achieve good quality design outcomes is an absolute must. You’re right, Councillor SRI—

Councillor SRI: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor SRI.

Councillor SRI: Will the Councillor take a question?

Councillor HUTTON: No, sorry.

Chair: Sorry, Councillor SRI.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor HUTTON: As Councillor SRI mentioned in his speech, the Future Blueprint that the LORD MAYOR mentioned last week will be increasing to 15%. As an Administration, we cannot support the motion before us. I call the Opposition Councillors to join with voting against this motion.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Thank you.

Further speakers?

I now put the—oh, Councillor SRI, sorry. Yes, you have right of reply.

Councillor SRI: Thanks, Chair. Thanks for the debate to those few who participated. I have really fond memories of growing up in West Chermside and climbing trees. We call it West Chermside. The posh kids called it Chermside West, but that was fun. It was a good thing for a kid to be able to do, learn how to climb a tree. These days though, even you go out to Chermside, which is certainly not the inner city, it’s the middle or outer suburbs, there are plenty of new apartments being built, even out there, where there aren’t any trees on site that are large enough for a kid to climb.

The balance that the Council is striking at the moment is manifestly out of keeping with the best interests of the city long term and out of keeping with resident expectations. Now, the previous speaker referred to the Future Blueprint consultation. Hands up, this is a quick poll, it’s not a trick question, hands up who remembers the question in the online survey where Council asked us how much of the site we wanted set aside for deep planting? The question where they say, how much of a development site should be set aside for trees?

Does anyone—hands up who remembers that question? No, I don’t remember that question either, because it wasn’t asked. There wasn’t actually any meaningful consultation about what percentage of site areas should be set aside for trees.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor SRI: There was very strong feedback from residents in general terms that they wanted more trees than greenspace. That came through even in the flawed and limited consultation that the Administration ran, but the Council has not consulted the people of Brisbane about how much tree cover they think is appropriate on private development sites. I think we should be. I don’t think it’s satisfactory, I don’t think it’s democratic for this Administration to presume to know the minds of the people of Brisbane when you haven’t actually bothered to ask them.

But what I do know, is that the Administration is constructing a false binary, by suggesting that requiring developers to provide more trees on site necessarily means changes to parking ratios and parking maximums. There’s enough space on these development sites to deliver adequate car parking for residents, to deliver adequate open space and provide more trees. If Administration Councillors are receiving advice from developers that this isn’t feasible or that it won’t be commercially viable to develop when we’re required to provide 25% of the site as trees, you are being lied to by those developers.

We don’t have to look to other cities for the proof. We can look at our own city and our own built form and see that for many years it was quite common for high‑density developments and for older apartment blocks to include ample space for trees around the building site.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor SRI: There are many older apartment buildings in our city where they’ve been setback quite a way from property boundaries or from rear boundaries and room for large trees has been included within the site boundaries. That was profitable to do back then, when presumably demand for housing in general was a lot lower. So, surely, it’s profitable now. The idea that we have to sacrifice something in order to make room for trees is nonsensical and is contradicted by the evidence before us in our own city.

Now, residents are very clear on this. They want to see more trees include within new developments. They want to see enough space set aside for them, so that we don’t have issues down the track with tree root conflicting with building foundations and that sort of thing. I know we’ve all seen that as well, where we don’t set aside enough room for trees and they end up in conflict with other forms of infrastructure, but the simple fact is that there is room available. Again, it’s a matter of physics.

You can see that developers in the past in this city have been able to deliver more trees as part of new developments. So, something has gone wrong in the recent past in the last few years, where Council has stopped requiring or developers have stopped caring about the importance of providing trees within new developments. We’re losing them in large numbers and we’re losing the space for them.

But to Councillor HUTTON’s question, if developers do have to give up something, I’d suggest they could give up a little bit of concrete. Because I’m seeing these new developments in the inner city and there’s a huge amount of space which is taken up by hard landscaping, by concrete, by non-essential impervious surfaces. At the very least, some of that space could be set aside for trees.

But you know what, if we have to end up with some of these three-bedroom apartments not having three bathrooms, so that we can have room for a few more trees at ground level, that’s an okay trade-off as well. I’m going to say on the record, someone can attack me for it later, a three-bedroom apartment doesn’t need three bathrooms.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor SRI: If we get a bit more thoughtful about how these developments are designed, there’s plenty of space within these site footprints to deliver substantial yield, without any meaningful impact on the supply of housing, while also creating more space for trees and nature. Council has been highlighting how difficult it is to find space for public parkland, particularly in inner city areas, and how difficult it is to find space for street trees and trees in public spaces. The Council’s own strategy requires that we provide some of the tree canopy cover for the city on private land.

So, to vote down this motion would, in some senses, be an attack on Council’s own tree canopy strategy. If Council says that it wants to meet its 40% tree canopy target, then how is it going to meet that target if it’s not requiring developers to provide more trees on private land? I did also just want to flag, though, that this argument around requiring trees to be delivered on private developments is going to somehow reduce the supply of housing is utterly nonsensical.

We’ve heard from the State Government and from the Planning Minister in estimates and budget estimates, that Brisbane City Council’s existing zoning for new development has an ample supply, an ample latent supply of land zone for new housing. There are thousands of blocks across this city that have already been zoned for high-density development and accumulatively can deliver well above the State Government regional plan target of 188,000 dwellings. There are literally thousands of sites capable of being developed.

So, even if all of those sites, 25% of the land has to be set aside for trees, there’s still going to be enough new potential housing supply coming through the system, but I can see that the Administration’s got its own ideas about how many trees, what percentage of trees should be required on new development sites. I guess, all I’d say to the Administration is that, at the very least, do what you promised to do three‑and‑a-half years ago and amend the plan to get us up to 15%. Ten per cent is woefully inadequate, 15% is still inadequate. Heck, I’d settle for 20%, but I think 25% would be better.

There’s plenty of evidence that it’s possible. It doesn’t conflict with any of our city’s other goals. It’s what residents want. I think it’s even what some property developers want, they just want consistency of the rules being applied. So far, the only arguments I’ve heard against this amendment are, oh, we might not have room for car parking, which is not true, or it might reduce the supply of housing, which is also not true.

So, I’m not really sure what other arguments the Administration has, or can offer against this proposal, other than they don’t like it, because it just feels weird to make space for trees. That seems to be about the thrust of it. There’s really no other sound argument the Administration has offered. This doesn’t even cost the Council anything, it’s simply saying to developers, hey, set aside a bit of room in your new developments for nature. Like I said, this is something that people support.

So, I guess, this motion’s probably going to be voted down today, but I’m going to be raising this issue again and again and again until we see some movement on this. Because as the LORD MAYOR said, one of the things that makes Brisbane special is that there’s so much greenery and so much tree canopy cover around our city’s footprint, but right now, we’re losing that. If every site was developed according to Brisbane City Council’s current City Plan, we would lose thousands more trees across the city, because they wouldn’t be required to be protected.

So, yes, I’d be interested to see where the Labor Party falls on this. I was a little curious that no one commented on the motion, but hopefully this can be the start of a conversation and we can see a bit more movement from the Administration.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor SRI: Because it was fundamentally embarrassing that they so quicky introduced amendments regarding town houses and so quicky introduced amendments regarding car parking after the Brisbane Future Blueprint process and yet this commitment to 15% deep planting, which seems like a fairly minor and simple change to make, has still taken so many years to deliver. Why the wait? Why have we been waiting so long for a couple of trees? Let’s see how people vote. I commend the motion to the Chamber.

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

I will now put the motion.

As there was no further debate, the Chair submitted the motion to the Chamber and it was declared **lost** on the voices.

Thereupon, Councillors Jonathan SRI and Nicole JOHNSTON 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 Peter CUMMING, Steve GRIFFITHS, Charles STRUNK, Jonathan SRI and Nicole JOHNSTON.

NOES: 12 - The DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Krista ADAMS, and Councillors Greg ADERMANN, Adam ALLAN, Tracy DAVIS, Vicki HOWARD, Sarah HUTTON, James MACKAY, Kim MARX, Peter MATIC, David McLACHLAN, Steven TOOMEY and Andrew WINES.

Chair: Thank you.

## PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS:

Chair: Councillors, are there any petitions?

Councillor HOWARD.

Councillor HOWARD: I have a petition to reinstate parking in Elizabeth Street.

Chair: Thank you.

Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks, Chair. I have a petition on behalf of Councillor COOK, petitioning to save Toogoolawah Park.

Chair: Any further petitions?

Councillor MARX.

Councillor MARX: Yes. Thank you, Mr Chair, I have a petition on behalf of Councillor MATIC, for safer bike passage.

Chair: Thank you.

No further petitions? May I have a motion for the receipt of the petitions, please?

**167/2021-22**

It was resolved on the motion of Councillor Sarah HUTTON, seconded by Councillor Steve GRIFFITHS, 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** |
| CA21/1042696 | Vicki Howard | Requesting Council remove or relocate the bike lane and reinstate parking in Elizabeth Street, Brisbane City. |
| CA21/1042826 | Jarred Cassidy on behalf of Kara Cook | Requesting Council oppose the construction of an access road through Tugulawa Park, Bulimba, to a proposed private development, and retain the use of the existing access road. |
| CA21/1042953 | Kim Marx on behalf of Peter Matic | Requesting Council construct dedicated bike lanes to service the inner north-west of Brisbane. |

## GENERAL BUSINESS:

Chair: Councillors, are there any statements required as a result of an Office of Independent Assessor or Councillor Ethics Committee order? No?

We move on to General Business.

Are there any matters of General Business?

Councillor ADERMANN.

Councillor ADERMANN: Yes, thank you, Chair. As Councillor HOWARD mentioned earlier, with Brisbane Festival now in full swing, I’d like to give a special shout-out to Joe Klocek, a resident of Chapel Hill in my ward, but more important, the lead actor in the stage version of *Boy Swallows Universe*, which is now playing at the Cremorne Theatre.

For as long as I’ve known the Klocek family, which harks back to when our children attended Chapel Hill State School, Joe has had his sights set only on becoming an actor. Acting is a tough gig, as anyone associated with the entertainment industry will tell you, but through hard work and determination, Joe is now making Australian audiences sit up and take notice. Joe is back home at the moment with parents, Roly and Judy, and brother Daniel, but has spent much of the past decade living and working interstate to secure roles on stage and screen.

His television credits already include *Harrow*, *Nowhere Boys*, *Patricia Moore*, *Neighbours* and *Barracuda*. On the big screen, he has appeared in *Children of the Corn*, *Pirates of the Caribbean* and *Dead Men Tell No Tales*, but for me, the role that really brought him to our attention was playing the younger character of lead actor Eric Bana in the Australian film, *The Dry*. In *Boy Swallows Universe*, Joe plays the role of Eli Bell, which depicts much of the earlier life of award-winning *The Courier-Mail* feature writer and author, Trent Dalton.

I had the pleasure of attending a preview performance of the show last week and couldn’t be more proud of our local lad made good. The play itself goes for almost three hours and Joe is on stage for the entire time and didn’t miss a beat. Chair, can I suggest that anyone with an interest in great local theatre and talent, that they get along to the Cremorne Theatre between now and early October to see Joe in *Boy Swallows Universe*. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor ADERMANN.

Further General Business?

Councillor STRUNK.

Councillor STRUNK: Thank you, Chair. I just rise to speak about one event that I attended last Sunday over at the Landmark Restaurant, over at Sunnybank Hills. That was the—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor STRUNK: Yes, it’s a great restaurant. I tell you what, I’ve never seen so much food.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor STRUNK: Oh, it was amazing. Anyway, it was in support of a—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor STRUNK: —Miss Vietnam-Queensland Chapter’s fashion—it was a fashion show basically or a fashion competition.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor STRUNK: I had a good time, yes. Most of us had a really, really good time, but it was organised by the Vietnamese Chapter here in Australia, the Queensland Chapter, I should say, which was fundraising for the Vietnamese Boat People’s Museum. For the first time ever, the Vietnamese Community in Australia is aiming to develop and build Australia’s first Vietnamese-Australian Museum and Community Centre, in recognition of the settlement of the Vietnamese refugees here in Australia. It is to collect and preserve and exhibit the Vietnamese culture, history and identity, an insight also into the on-going journey of the Vietnamese community here in Australia.

As I say, it was a fantastic event put on by the Vietnamese Chapter, headed up by Dr Cuong Bui, Cuong was the actual—did all the physical organisation. Quite an amazing young woman, works for Queensland Police Department in a support role or an administrative role, and finds time to put on a huge event. Honestly, there was singing, dancing and it wasn’t just a Vietnamese singing and dancing presentation, we had the Brazilian Dance Troupe up from the Gold Coast, which was mentioned a little bit earlier here today, unbelievable what they can do. Anyway.

But we had some really great singers. You could tell some of these Vietnamese singers were professional probably back in their own countries many, many years ago, but still can belt out a song. As I said before, the food was unbelievable. Honestly, it was a fundraiser, but it was the quickest three-and-a-half hours I’ve ever spent in my life. It was because they just kept things going. Now, we had the fashion show. There were four rounds in the fashion show. They picked me as one of the judges. I’m an aficionado, don’t you know? But honestly, it was an absolute hoot.

But I tell you what’s the—and, of course, all the gowns or all the dresses, whether they be traditional or innovative, there was, as I say, four rounds, the contestants all made them themselves, right. If you want to have a look at some of these gowns, just have a look at my Facebook feed, because some of them are as good as any couturier could possibly manufacture anywhere in the world. Some of these gowns were just world leading, as far as I’m concerned anyway.

In the end, we had 12 contestants. You could tell they had taken months to put everything together for their five minutes of runway collectively. So, I just want to congratulate the Vietnamese community and the Vietnamese Chapter. For all of those Councillors that do have Vietnamese people living in your wards, it’s a great cause, this museum, that they’re trying to put together. It’s no secret that every one of the Chapters in every one of the States around Australia, they have a remit to raise $2 million each in five years, right. So, it’s a huge ask for all of them.

But just get out there and support them wherever you can, because it’s a really great cause. They’re a fantastic community, that really Australia should be very proud of them. I know Australia is proud of them. We just need to support them. Thank you, Chair.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor STRUNK.

Any further General Business?

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes. Just briefly, I rise to speak on a trend amongst the Council Chairs that I’ve noticed emerging the past few weeks.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: It’s really interesting, we seem to, under this new reshuffle that we’ve had—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: —that the LORD MAYOR said he needed and he appointed an extra Chair.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: So, somebody else got a bit of a job and the extra 20 grand a year, which they just pocket and don’t account for.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: A bigger car and all those kinds of things.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: So, the LORD MAYOR expanded the empire pretty significantly. He also took the opportunity to promote new people into new jobs, but I note the LORD MAYOR’s not here. He’s not been here all afternoon. He’s MIA (missing in action) and a number of the Chairs are also MIA today, as well, but not only are they not bothering to turn up to Committee, when they are here, they’re not bothering to speak to their portfolio issues. Last week, it was the motion I moved, which Councillor MURPHY didn’t speak to, but he got poor old Councillor HAMMOND to stand up and speak to.

Today, Councillor Adam ALLAN, the new Planning Chair, he couldn’t be bothered to stand up and speak to Jonathan SRI—Councillor SRI’s motion. He got Councillor HUTTON to stand up and do his work. So, I guess, I’m just wondering what’s going on on that side of the Chamber, where the Chairs get the cars, get the staff, get the money—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: —but then they get another Councillor to do the work.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: So, I’ve just noticed this trend developing. I’d just thought I’d put on the record that it’s a little bit interesting. I mean, you would think that when you get elected to a position of responsibility in this Council, where you’re the Committee Chair, you’re paid extra for doing the work and you have more staff than ever, that you would make an effort to respond to matters of substance, when motions come into this Chamber for debate, but that doesn’t seem to be happening anymore. It’s like they’re sending out the forward scout to test the waters.

Chair: Excuse me, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Any discussion, could you please take it outside the Chamber. Thank you.

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: It’s like a sending out the forward scout to test the waters. They’re holding themselves back in reserve at HQ (headquarters).

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: They don’t want to speak about an issue or get involved. Well, let me be clear—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: My expectation of the Chairs of this Council is that if they take on the responsibility of managing portfolio areas, that they should have the guts and the courtesy—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: —to stand up and respond on behalf of the Administration that they lead, when matters of public importance come to this place for debate. I think it is a really sad and lazy effort for those Chairs that are sending out other Councillors to do their work for them. I believe it is their responsibility. I just want to put on the record that I’ve noticed it in the last couple of weeks. I think that it is a really sad occurrence that that’s how the Chairs of this Council are acting.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor—

Councillor JOHNSTON: Oh, sorry, and just to finalise. I mean, all these Chairs, all these Councillors do—Councillor HUTTON, Councillor HAMMOND—is read out a prepared speech, just read it out. That’s no disrespect to Councillor HUTTON, I doubt she’s even got multi-unit dwellings in her ward at Jamboree. She does? Yes, what three? Oh, no, she’s got a retirement village out there, I’ve seen, there’s a few storeys to that. So—

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Yes. Councillor—yes, come on.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Just stick to the topic, please, Councillor JOHNSTON.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: You’ve departed from what you said you’d talk to.

Councillor JOHNSTON: So, I’m not going to put up with the DEPUTY MAYOR making those allegations on the record—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: —about me. I am speaking to the issue in General Business that I spoke to. I would ask that Councillor ADAMS withdraws those statements about me.

Chair: DEPUTY MAYOR?

DEPUTY MAYOR: I wasn’t on the microphone.

Chair: No. Thank you.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: No further General Business?

No, sorry?

Councillor JOHNSTON: Clearly, I’m—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: I’m still speaking. I asked for a withdrawal. While you were speaking, I sat down, which I’m supposed to do, correct?

Chair: Please continue, Councillor JOHNSTON. You have a few more minutes.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Thank you. Well, look, the DEPUTY MAYOR shouted very clearly across the Chamber that I’m bullying.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: Let me be clear, Councillor ADAMS doesn’t have the courtesy to stand up and speak to these substantive motions. She’s the DEPUTY MAYOR. Councillor ADAMS could stand up at any time. She’s paid even more than the Chairs. Councillor ADAMS could stand up and contribute to the debate on policy motions that are put forward, but she doesn’t choose to. She’s happy to send out—and in her own words—junior Councillors I think it was, or something like that, to do work for the Chairs. She couldn’t be bothered to do it.

So, let me be clear, I’m not bullying anyone. I’m saying very clearly, do your jobs. Sending out a Councillor who doesn’t know what they’re talking about to read a pre-prepared speech—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: —in response to a substantive motion put on the agenda, is not good form. It was really interesting, Councillor HUTTON didn’t listen to a word I said. She stood up and claimed we wanted to get rid of car parking. That’s what was written down for her to say by, presumably, Councillor Adam ALLAN’s staff, maybe someone in the LORD MAYOR’s office, I don’t know. It certainly wasn’t Councillor ALLAN, because he didn’t stand up to speak. So, let’s be clear, the LORD MAYOR in this place stands up week after week and claims the Opposition have no ideas.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: Not only do I move motions on a regular basis in this place, so do other Councillors, it is the LNP who are treating them with disrespect and who are sending out Councillors with little experience, who do not have the ability to understand the complexity of things before us. With all due respect to Councillor HUTTON, that’s what happened just a few minutes ago. If there’s only a 45% maximum site cover for a multi-unit dwelling, there is plenty of room for everything else, including setbacks, including trees and landscaping, including car parking and including all of the responsibilities that they’re supposed to meet under the code.

This little argument that something’s got to give was wrong. Just back to my point, I just think the Chairs need to reflect upon the fact that they are being paid extra to do a job that somehow now they’re not interested in doing anymore. This new‑look LNP Team—no, what’s it called, the Schrinner Council, sorry, I’d better get it right, the Schrinner Council, apparently the Chairs don’t actually have to do their job. They just delegate their job to another Councillor to do. So, this is what the Administration’s come to in this place. I, for one, have noticed it’s a trend and thought I’d put my concerns on the record.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Any further speakers in General Business?

Councillor TOOMEY.

Councillor TOOMEY: Thank you, Chair. I rise to speak on Father’s Day and also the rugby on Sunday. I’ll combine both into one if I can. I first of all want to start off by congratulating the rugby community on a fantastic season under some very, very tough circumstances, with lockdowns and training being interrupted and many of those instances. That said, the finals at Suncorp Stadium on Sunday were some of the best games of rugby I’ve had the privilege to sit and watch. I’d like to congratulate Easts Ladies on their win.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor TOOMEY: Yes, you did tell me so, DEPUTY MAYOR. I’d like to congratulate Easts Ladies on their win over GPS (Great Public Schools). I want to give a shout out to the captain of GPS, Wasie Toolis, from the famous Toolis’. Wasie has been a friend of mine for a very long time. She looked after my kids when they were in after‑school care. So, I have a great respect for Wasie, her leadership of the Ladies. She runs an outstanding outfit. It’s just on the day Easts were just that little bit better than what GPS were. I also wanted to mention the Colts 1 game.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor TOOMEY: Thank you. GPS did win that one.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor TOOMEY: It was GPS, what was it, 34 over Easts 24, in one of the most exciting games I have ever seen. I know the DEPUTY MAYOR would probably share that excitement, because I was peppering her with the scores almost every 15 seconds. It was an outstanding game of rugby, more so deserved for a Premiers’ Final than a Colts’ one, but still, hands down, the boys took home the silver.

Finally, for those colleagues of mine who peppered me during the Premiers game, thank you very much, the sledging was noted. Your Christmas cards won’t be forthcoming. I would like to congratulate UQ on their win. It was very much a really, really good win. They got up over GPS 29 to 12, on what was a really, really well-run game on their part. They did deserve to take home the silver. So, with that, I’ll finish up by saying congratulations to GPS, Easts and UQ on a fantastic rugby game. It was the best Father’s Day I have ever had. Thank you very much for putting on a great show.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Thank you, Councillor TOOMEY.

DEPUTY MAYOR.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair. I just stand to speak on the responsibilities in this Chamber. There’s only one thing we get paid for, that is to go to Committee and to be in this Chamber. We are always in this Chamber. We hold quorum in this Chamber. I would like to note that everyone, bar Councillor STRUNK in the ALP, have left, as they do every week, well and truly before the meeting has finished—

*Councillor interjecting.*

DEPUTY MAYOR: —and Councillor SRI, he is coming back in there, might have heard what the topic was before he topped—he just was leaving early this evening. Councillor JOHNSTON, for all her rhetoric, has gone home.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Any further General Business. I have one item of—

Councillor SRI: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Oh, Councillor SRI, okay, you have a point of General Business.

Councillor SRI: I just thought I’ll just state for the written record that Councillor JOHNSTON was in the Chamber. I think it’s important the record reflect that accurately.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Okay.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, point of order, Mr Chairman.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: I’m definitely here, thanks so much.

Chair: Okay, noted.

Any other General Business?

Councillor JOHNSTON: Just going to go to the loo, if that’s all right with Councillor ADAMS.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: We now have that on the record as a General Business item. Thank you very much, Councillor JOHNSTON.

I have one item of General Business and that is to ask anybody who hasn’t signed the attendance book to please sign it before you go.

With that, 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 Jonathan Sri on 1 September 2021**

**Q1.** Up until 25 August 2021, development application A005732911 for 5 Dudley St, Highgate Hill, had attracted approximately 150 to 200 public submissions opposing the application, and only a couple of submissions supporting the application. From 26 August to 30 August, around 460 new submissions supporting the application were received. These supportive submissions were mostly written using similar language, and were made at relatively consistent time intervals, in a pattern suggesting that the same three or four people were making multiple submissions under different names.

Is council able to check whether different submissions through Development.i were made from the same device or IP address?

Approximately how many different IP addresses were used to make submissions regarding DA A005732911 on 26 August, 2021?

Approximately how many different IP addresses were used to make submissions regarding DA A005732911 from 26 August to 30 August 2021?

What checks and balances does Brisbane City Council have in place to prevent an individual making multiple submissions on Development.i using the names and addresses of different residents?

**Submitted by Councillor Steve Griffiths on 2 September 2021**

**Q1.** Please advise the total amount of Brisbane City Council’s sponsorship of the 2021 Brisbane Fashion Festival, including a breakdown of in-kind contributions and direct financial contributions.

**Q2**. Please advise how many tickets were sold for the 2021 Brisbane Fashion Festival.

**Q3.** Please advise which Councillors received complimentary tickets for the 2021 Brisbane Fashion Festival.

**Q4.** Please provide a list of all events hosted by the Lord Mayor’s Charitable Trust between April 2019 and August 2021, with a breakdown as follows:-

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **EVENT DATE** | **EVENT** | **VALUE OF BCC CONTRIBUTION (IN-KIND)** | **VALUE OF BCC CONTRIBUTION** | **EVENT DATE** | **EVENT** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Q5.** Please provide a list of all grants provided by the Lord Mayor’s Charitable Trust between April 2019 and August 2021, with a breakdown as follows:-

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **DATE** | **ORGANISATION** | **PURPOSE** |
|  |  |  |

**Q6.** Please provide the following information regarding the Lord Mayor’s Charitable Trust between April 2019 and August 2021:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DONATIONS TO THE LMCT (EXCLUDING VIA RATES PAYMENTS)** | **DONATIONS TO THE LMCT VIA RATES PAYMENTS** | **TOTAL LMCT ADMINISTRATION COSTS** | **TOTAL OTHER EXPENSES** |
|  |  |  |  |

**Q7.** Please advise the current surplus of the Lord Mayor’s Charitable Trust.

**Q8.** Please provide a list of the current trustees for the Lord Mayor’s Charitable Trust, including their position/ role in the trust.

**Q9.** Please provide a list of the current ambassadors for the Lord Mayor’s Charitable Trust, including a description of their role.

**Q10.** Please provide the following breakdown of the Universal Housing Design Incentive Scheme since the scheme was announced in June 2019.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **HOUSING TYPE** | **TOTAL VALUE OF DISCOUNT AMOUNT** | **TOTAL NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS APPROVED** | **TOTAL NUMBER OF DWELLINGS/ UNITS OF ACCOMODATION** |
| Dual Occupancy |  |  |  |
| Rooming Accommodation |  |  |  |
| Residential Care Facility |  |  |  |
| Multiple Unit Dwellings |  |  |  |
| Other (please advise) |  |  |  |

**Q11.** Please advise the number of trees removed from public land in the suburb of Pallara for the following financial years:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FINANCIAL YEAR** | **NUMBER OF TREES REMOVED FROM PUBLIC LAND** |
| 2021/22 to date |  |
| 2020/21 |  |
| 2019/20 |  |
| 2018/19 |  |
| 2017/18 |  |

**Q12.** Please advise the amount of vegetation removed from private land in the suburb of Pallara for the following financial years:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FINANCIAL YEAR** | **AMOUNT OF VEGETATION REMOVED ON PRIVATE LAND** |
| 2021/22 to date |  |
| 2020/21 |  |
| 2019/20 |  |
| 2018/19 |  |
| 2017/18 |  |

**Q13.** Please advise the amount of vegetation removed as part of the development approval process in the suburb of Pallara for the following financial years:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FINANCIAL YEAR** | **AMOUNT OF VEGETATION REMOVED** |
| 2021/22 to date |  |
| 2020/21 |  |
| 2019/20 |  |
| 2018/19 |  |
| 2017/18 |  |

**Q14.** Please advise the amount of offset plantings approved by Brisbane City Council for the removal of vegetation in the suburb of Pallara for the following financial years:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FINANCIAL YEAR** | **AMOUNT OF OFFSET PLANTINGS APPROVED** |
| 2021/22 to date |  |
| 2020/21 |  |
| 2019/20 |  |
| 2018/19 |  |
| 2017/18 |  |

## 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 Steve Griffiths (from meeting on 31 August 2021)**

**Q1.** Please advise the total number of organisations on Council’s wait list for a leased facility, broken down by region and whether they are sporting or community organisations:

| **REGION** | **SPORT** | **COMMUNITY** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **CENTRAL** |  |  |
| **NORTH** |  |  |
| **SOUTH** |  |  |
| **EAST** |  |  |
| **WEST** |  |  |

***A1.***

| ***REGION*** | ***SPORT*** | ***COMMUNITY*** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Citywide* | *7* | *33* |
| *Central* | *4* | *26* |
| *North* | *6* | *22* |
| *South* | *18* | *34* |
| *East* | *14* | *40* |
| *West* | *6* | *13* |
| *No Preference* | *0* | *4* |

**Q2.** Please advise the total number of compensation claims relating to footpath injuries, with the number of successful claims and the total amount paid in compensation for the following years:-

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **YEAR** | **TOTAL CLAIMS** | **TOTAL SUCCESSFUL** | **TOTAL PAID OUT** |
| 2021 (to date) |  |  |  |
| 2020 |  |  |  |
| 2019 |  |  |  |
| 2018 |  |  |  |
| 2017 |  |  |  |
| 2016 |  |  |  |

***A2.***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***YEAR*** | ***TOTAL CLAIMS*** | ***TOTAL SUCCESSFUL*** | ***TOTAL PAID OUT*** |
| *2021 (to date)* | *73* | *5* | *$5,000* |
| *2020* | *145* | *18* | *$39,826* |
| *2019* | *138* | *24* | *$199,822* |
| *2018* | *99* | *28* | *$1,025,189* |
| *2017* | *93* | *13* | *$353,682* |
| *2016* | *91* | *12* | *$47,162* |

**Q3.** What is the cost of installing the new bollards at Victoria Park?

***A3.*** *$53,963 excl GST.*

**Q4.** Please provide details of all early works being done at Victoria Park during the 2021-2022 financial year, including a breakdown of each of the works and the amount allocated.

***A4.***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Description*** | ***Total*** |
| *Improvements to Victoria Park, including the installation of bollards to manage unauthorised vehicle access, upgrading paths, gardening and landscape works, new planting and connection to the Herston busway.* | *$511,000* |
| *Removal of golf course related equipment and facilities, including bunkers and fencing* | *$270,000* |
| *Maintenance of existing facilities and installation of temporary facilities including toilets and drinking fountains* | *$731,650* |
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