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## PRESENT:

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

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

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

## OPENING OF MEETING:

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

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

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

Are there any apologies?

 Councillor LANDERS.

## APOLOGY:

**394/2021-22**

An apology was submitted on behalf of Councillor Ryan MURPHY and he was granted leave of absence from the meeting on the motion of Councillor Sandy LANDERS, seconded by Councillor Sarah HUTTON.

Chair: Confirmation of minutes please.

## MINUTES:

**395/2021-22**

The Minutes of the 4668 (ordinary) meeting held on 7 December 2021, copies of which had been forwarded to each Councillor, were presented, taken as read and confirmed on the motion of Councillor Sandy LANDERS, seconded by Councillor Sarah HUTTON.

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

Chair: Councillors, we have public participants today. I’d like to call on Mrs Leigh Ellwood-Brown and Mrs Madeline Wright, who will address the Council—the Chamber, on purple park benches and domestic violence awareness.

Mrs Ellwood-Brown and Mrs Wright, I believe we have you co-located and you’ll be brought online. You have five minutes to address Council.

**Mrs Leigh Ellwood-Brown and Mrs Madeline Wright – purple park benches and domestic violence awareness**

Mrs Leigh Ellwood-Brown: Thank you. Can you see us? Oh yes, sorry. Thank you. Good afternoon, Mr Chair, LORD MAYOR and Councillors. My name is Leigh Ellwood-Brown and my colleague is Madeline Wright. We represent Soroptimist International of Brisbane and Soroptimist International of Brisbane South. Since the charter of our clubs in Brisbane in 1949 and 1990, our clubs have volunteered for women and girls in Brisbane for a collective of 114 years. Founded in 1921, Soroptimist International, or SI as we are known, is a global volunteer movement of around 72,000 club members in 121 countries that advocates for human rights and gender equality for women and girls.

 We have 21 of our own United Nations (UN) representatives in seven UN centres around the globe. Our advocacy work and on-the-ground projects directly contribute to helping women and girls access their human rights across the world. We’d like to have on your record our appreciation, Mr Chair, LORD MAYOR and Councillors of the Brisbane City Council recognising our 100-year centenary of Soroptimist International by hosting a civic reception for us on 5 October 2021. Also, the lighting up of the bridges and city in our Soroptimist colours of blue and gold on 30 September 2021. Social media beamed these images of our beautiful city around the globe.

 The World Bank states that gender-based violence, or violence against women and girls, is a global pandemic that affects one in three women in their lifetime. In Queensland, the police stats reflect in excess of 110,000 domestic and family violence occurrences in a nine-month timeframe from 1 July 2020 to 31 March 2021. Family, domestic and sexual violence is a major national health and welfare issue that can have lifelong impacts for victims and people who use violence, the perpetrators. Purple is the colour associated worldwide with the domestic violence (DV) awareness movement.

 Purple bench seats were first installed in Nova Scotia, Canada, in 2015, to mark the 25th anniversary of the death of local woman, Barb Baillie, who was murdered by her violent husband. Since then, purple benches have appeared across America and, more recently, in Australia to honour the victims of domestic and family violence and to increase awareness of the issues faced every day by some women and children. Local councils within Australia that have already placed purple bench seats in critical locations at Logan, Gold Coast, Northern Territory, Western Australia, Victoria and New South Wales. Each bench displays a plaque with details of local domestic violence support contacts.

 When people see a purple bench or sit on a purple bench, they take the time to remember the victims of domestic violence and to reach out and assist anyone they think may be in a vulnerable situation. The plaque provides the key contacts to find help for such a situation. The most important point of the purple benches is to start a conversation. Soroptimist of Brisbane and Brisbane South clubs ask for the partnership of Brisbane City Council for the placement of purple bench seats in each suburb in key positions, such as outside the family court, outside libraries or children’s playgrounds, places that women would routinely gather.

 To summarise, a bench seat coloured purple that represents the international DV awareness movement, displaying a plaque for local DV support contacts and placed in carefully calculated positions where women would normally gather, will hopefully help many women and girls around Brisbane. In return, we offer to provide volunteer partnership for citywide projects or awareness programs for homelessness of women and girls, or violence against women and girls. We thank you for your time and consideration today. Please do not hesitate to ask for further information if you would like. Thank you for listening.

Chair: Thank you very much, Mrs Ellwood-Brown and Mrs Wright.

Councillor HOWARD, I see your hand up. Are you responding please on behalf of Council?

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

Councillor HOWARD: Thank you, Mr Chair and through you, Mr Chair, can I thank Mrs Ellwood-Brown and Mrs Wright for their presentation today. It’s always difficult, of course, when we have to do these things via Zoom, but your message is such an important one and I know the work of the Soroptimists is just so very important. I really want to thank you for raising this awareness. The Schrinner Council is fully aware of the importance of addressing domestic violence across Brisbane and, as a Council, we’re proud to support a number of mechanisms to do so.

 Of course, while the Queensland Government is the lead agency for domestic and family violence prevention and response in Queensland, in May 2020, Council released our *Domestic and Family Violence Strategy*, which aims to support the right of all people to live free from violence, abuse or intimidation. This strategy highlights that Council has an important role to play in educating and supporting the community on their responsibilities to stop behaviours and acts of violence before they start.

 This support is often done in partnerships with community organisations just such as yours. Some of the actions within our Domestic and Violence Strategy include providing domestic and family violence leave for all our Brisbane City Council staff, fundraising for charities and support services and promoting these services to employees, delivering the Community Housing Partnership that provides housing to some of our more vulnerable residents and through working with community organisations, such as Micah Projects, Communify and Beyond DV, to deliver services to our vulnerable residents through our Pathways out of Homelessness Grant Program.

 Council also has a record supporting awareness campaigns and initiatives in Brisbane, including the Zonta Says NO to Violence Against Women campaign and the Red Bench Project with Red Rose International. Now we’ve supported the Red Rose Foundation going back several years in raising awareness for domestic violence through the installation of a number of red benches across high-profile locations in Brisbane, such as Stones Corner and within the Powerhouse park.

 Council recognises that there is still much work to be done, especially in collaboration with community organisations such as Soroptimist International, to both raise awareness and address the issues of domestic violence. It’s great to know that Council has a history working with your organisation and noting that for the past five years, Soroptimist International have been the recipients of Seniors Celebration Donation and the Lord Mayor’s Community Fund and we certainly look forward to continuing to engage with you and your efforts through the purple bench initiative.

 Going forward, I would encourage you to reach out to your local Councillor to determine an appropriate location that may be best suited to install a purple bench and certainly to raise that awareness and provide support to those experiencing domestic violence. So again, Mrs Ellwood-Brown and Mrs Wright, thank you for taking the time today to address Council and for the collective work of the Soroptimist International to raise awareness in this very important issue. Thank you very much.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor HOWARD.

## QUESTION TIME:

Chair: We move on to item 4 on the agenda, Question Time.

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

 Councillor ATWOOD, I see your hand raised, question to you.

**Question 1**

Councillor ATWOOD: My question is to the LORD MAYOR. LORD MAYOR, two weeks ago you announced another relief package for Brisbane businesses and community groups which have been affected by the latest coronavirus outbreak. Can you please update the Chamber on how important targeted relief like this is, including what other relief could be provided from other levels of government?

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you for the question, Councillor ATWOOD. Certainly it wasn’t the start to the year that we were all hoping for from a pandemic point of view. There was a great sense of optimism in the second part of last year in the lead up to Christmas. We saw confidence returning in many ways, we saw a lot more people out and it’s interesting because when you look at foot traffic in the Queen Street Mall, it does tell you a lot about how people are feeling and how they’re viewing their—I guess, desire to come out and about. In the lead up to the end of last year, we saw foot traffic in the Queen Street Mall getting to 88% of pre-pandemic levels. So it was really approaching very close to normal levels and we saw a lot of people out.

 But then going into the beginning of this year, we saw a lot of that activity evaporate overnight. Now obviously we’re now approaching two years into this pandemic and it is the first time that we have had any large-scale community transmission of COVID. So we’re seeing that play out in front of us and we’re all watching very carefully and we’re all taking the appropriate precautions. But one of the things that so many people have done is they’ve decided to stay away from the shops, stay away from offices, stay away from hospitality venues and we’ve seen the evidence of that right across the economy.

 So in recent times, we’ve seen foot traffic in the Queen Street Mall, for example, drop to less than half of pre-pandemic levels. I think from memory it was 46% of pre-pandemic levels, so it went from 88% before Christmas, down to 46%. That is indicative of the challenges that many businesses are facing. We know that a lot of the State and Federal programs that existed in the beginning of the pandemic now have come to an end, or have wound back. So I thought it was appropriate as the leader of this city to make sure we do what we can to provide support in a way that we can—targeted support in a way that we know made a difference in the beginning of the pandemic.

 So we’ve implemented a package which I announced recently of support for local businesses, using the same techniques and targeting that we used in the beginning of the pandemic. Things such as waiving fees for food and hospitality-related businesses and businesses that have contact with Council, businesses that pay rent to Council, including community groups as well and other organisations that pay rent to Council.

 So we’ve implemented that, we did it proactively and it has been remarkably well received across the community. Obviously many businesspeople would like to see more happening at all three levels of government and I note with interest the package that was introduced by the New South Wales Government just in recent days of $1 billion of support. Now obviously I’ve said in previous meetings on previous occasions that our support, because we are a Council and because of the much lower size of our budget, has to be targeted.

 So we target that support to the businesses that we deal with, the businesses that we have touch points with or the businesses that we regulate. But over and above that, we’ve supported so many more businesses through our procurement policies. We’ve seen in the past 12 months almost $1 billion of contracts going to local businesses here in Brisbane and South East Queensland. That in itself has made a remarkable difference as well. So we’ll continue doing our part to make sure that we are Australia’s most small business-friendly Council.

 That is something that has been part of our DNA from day one as an Administration, it’s something we believe in, something we will continue to support. This latest package of relief for at least one quarter is something that we believe is the right thing to do at the right time. Obviously we’ll track the business conditions and economic conditions over the coming weeks and if we’re still in the same situation that we were in going into the second quarter, then we’re obviously happy to consider further relief at that time. But obviously I think it’s all of our hope that the economy will recover and that as we come out of the other side of this Omicron peak, that people will come out again.

 We’ve heard the Premier’s messaging just in recent days that it’s back to school soon and also back to the office soon. So hopefully that will deliver a positive flow-on effect right throughout the community and throughout business, so that those businesses that are really struggling right now can get their customers back and those community groups that are struggling right now can get their members back, the sports clubs that are struggling can get their players back and get back to what we will see as a new—

Chair: LORD MAYOR, your time has expired.

Further questions?

 Councillor COOK.

**Question 2**

Councillor COOK: Thank you, Mr Chair. My question is for the LORD MAYOR. LORD MAYOR, you are not only a former student of the Citipointe Christian College, but also now a Citipointe parent. It is also listed on your public register of interests that you have made a donation of $500 or more to the Citipointe Foundation Trust. We know you are aware of the enrolment contract Citipointe has implemented, which states in part that the college will only enrol a student on the basis of the gender that corresponds to their biological sex. Another clause states that the college has the right to exclude a student from the college should they not adhere to the doctrinal precepts, including those as to biological sex.

 In 2016, you voted against a motion to support the legalisation of same-sex marriage. In 2020, you refused to remove petitions containing discriminatory, inaccurate and offensive statements, as well as hate speech about the LGBTQIQ+ community from the Brisbane City Council website. You’ve never attended Pride events in the city and last night you have issued a statement saying you have concerns about the Citipointe contract, but you haven’t said what those concerns are, or if you agree with the contents of the contract or not. LORD MAYOR, do you agree with Citipointe’s homophobic and transphobic position as laid out in their enrolment contract?

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor COOK. Now I wonder if we’ll see in this Council meeting something different from Labor or the same. They ask the question, time and time again, week after week.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, thank you, Mr Chairman. This is a serious issue, the Meetings Local Law requires the LORD MAYOR to answer the question, not debate it. I would ask you to draw the LORD MAYOR back to the answer of the question, which he’s not doing.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, the LORD MAYOR was about 15 seconds into responding to the question. He has the floor.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you and the point I was making is that questions are asked week in, week out. I answer those questions but members of the Opposition, including Councillor JOHNSTON herself, actually never appear to actually listen to the answer that is being given. What they have week after week is a pre-prepared political strategy and no doubt a motion to come. I certainly hope—

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, point of order.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, Mr Chairman, the Meetings Local Law requires the LORD MAYOR to answer the question, not debate it as he is clearly doing. Can you please ask him to abide by the Meetings Local Law and answer the question?

Chair: Thank you, Councillor JOHNSTON, the LORD MAYOR is answering the question.

 LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you and so—

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

Chair: No, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: I want to move dissent and I’m allowed to move dissent in your ruling under the Meetings Local Law. You’ve ruled against my point of order and my next point of order is to move dissent in your ruling. Are you allowing me to do so?

|  |
| --- |
| **396/2021-22**Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON moved, seconded by Councillor Steve GRIFFITHS, that the Chair’s ruling be dissented from. Upon being submitted to the Chamber, the motion of dissent was declared **lost** on the voices. |

Councillor JOHNSTON: Division.

*The division lapsed for want of a seconder.*

Chair: LORD MAYOR, you have the floor.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair. As I was saying, I certainly hope that things are different this week and that Councillor COOK and her colleagues and Councillor JOHNSTON actually listen to the answers that I give and not just resort to their pre-prepared political—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: So I have made it clear already on the public record that I have concerns with what has been put forward by the school. I have taken these up directly with the Principal of the school. In terms of the contract, I have not signed a contract. So in terms of whether I support the views that Councillor COOK was referring to, the answer is really simple, Councillor COOK and that is no.

Chair: Thank you.

 Further questions?

Councillor HUANG.

**Question 3**

Councillor HUANG: Thank you, Mr Chair. My question is to the Chair of the Finance and City Governance Committee, Councillor CUNNINGHAM. Councillor CUNNINGHAM, the Schrinner Council is working hard to be the most small business-friendly Council in the country. Could you please update the Chamber on how our seven-day payment policy is working to achieve this goal?

Chair: Thank you.

Councillor CUNNINGHAM.

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: Thank you, Mr Chair and thank you, Councillor HUANG, for the question. The Schrinner Council is committed to being Australia’s most small business-friendly Council. We’ve just heard from the LORD MAYOR about the relief package to support small business during this Omicron wave and of course, that’s not the only support we have seen from the Schrinner Council during this pandemic. We have invested over $60 million in emergency support for small business and our community. While fee relief and rent waivers provide vital support in the short term, we have also done the hard work to make sure that our support for business permeates all our interactions with the sector.

 When I speak to local businesses in my ward, they tell me how important cash flow is to their operations. I don’t need to dwell on how challenging the past two years have been for our entire community, but boosting cash flow to local businesses during uncertain economic times is critical, so that staff can keep getting paid, keeping food on the table for families and covering the normal expenses of running an enterprise. In April 2020, we made the switch to seven‑day payment terms for suppliers, a dramatic improvement from the standard 30-day terms.

 This was a key part of the Schrinner Council’s economic recovery plan for Brisbane. Last year this policy meant that $800 million, yes, that’s right, $800 million, over 140,000 invoices, was paid to more than 3,500 businesses within seven days. This is benefiting sectors such as the building and construction companies, waste management, battery suppliers and plumbing services. We’ve received so much positive feedback and support from Brisbane residents for this initiative.

 I want to read a quote from Mr Rui Lopes, he’s the General Manager of Murarrie’s Eagle Alliance Earthmoving. He says, ‘on any given day our team is operational on over 30 Council project sites. The introduction of the seven-day payment terms has made a huge difference. While we stringently balance our cash reserves, the payment terms provide a cash flow boost, enabling us to further support our suppliers during these challenging times.’ So Mr Chair, you can see how this seemingly simple change to how we process invoices has had a massive positive flow-on effect for the local economy.

 By working efficiently and daring to challenge the status quo, we can create better outcomes for everyone. Through you, Mr Chair, I applaud the LORD MAYOR for having the foresight and the conviction to introduce this policy. I know there are lots of enterprises and therefore local families who recognise this as a significant achievement. It doesn’t end there with payment terms though. This goes hand in hand with our buy local procurement policy, giving extra weighting to local suppliers bidding to do work for their city. Our target is for 80% of our significant procurement spend to be with local suppliers.

 Mr Chair, we continue to meet and beat this target. In the 2017-18 financial year, local buy was at 67%. Since mid-2019, just over 80% of the procurement spend, or $2.5 billion, has gone directly into the pockets of local businesses. In the 2021 calendar year alone over $1 billion was invested with local firms, representing 83% of our procurement spend. From sparkies and plumbers to gardeners and labourers, the local businesses we engage with every day undertake work that is helping to make Brisbane even better.

 The Schrinner Council continues to engage with key stakeholders to ensure we’re doing everything we can to support the local economy. Councillor ADAMS heads up the Small Business Roundtable, which is continuing the important work done by Councillor ALLAN with the Economic Recovery Taskforce when the pandemic commenced. Feedback that we have received from the community is they want it to be easier to do business with Council and they want more opportunities and preference given to local suppliers wherever it is possible. So that’s exactly what we’ve done, Mr Chair. To truly support the economy takes more than words and promises; it requires commitment and action and that’s what we’re doing.

Chair: Councillor CUNNINGHAM, your time has expired.

Further questions?

Councillor SRI.

We can’t hear you, Councillor SRI. We might come back to you.

I’ll take a further question.

Councillor CASSIDY.

**Question 4**

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair. My question is to the LORD MAYOR. LORD MAYOR, Citipointe Christian College has recently come under fire for an enrolment contract it’s requiring parents to sign. You have used your position as LORD MAYOR to promote this school in an official video recorded in your office and you’ve said in that—and I quote, ‘as a former student and now Citipointe parent, I will always have a special place in my heart for this school.’ LORD MAYOR, considering your personal beliefs and as a Citipointe parent and past student and public advocate for this school, will you now join the calls of tens of thousands of other Brisbane residents calling on this school to scrap that despicable contract?

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Mr Chair, as I predicted, Councillor CASSIDY did not listen to the last response that I gave. I made my position very clear and I suggest that Councillor CASSIDY listen to the answers that I’ve given in this place.

Councillor CASSIDY: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: That was a very different question. Councillor COOK asked the LORD MAYOR whether he would sign the contract and he said he wouldn’t sign the contract. My question is whether he would join the calls of tens of thousands of Brisbane residents in calling on this school to scrap that contract.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor CASSIDY.

 Have you got anything more to add to your answer, LORD MAYOR?

LORD MAYOR: I’m already on the record, Mr Chair, as having stated I have concerns with the contract. I’m already on the record just earlier saying I haven’t signed the contract and I’m already on the record saying I’ve raised my concerns directly with the school. What is also on the record is that the school has made it clear that they’re reviewing their approach and the contract. I’m also given some comfort by the public statements made by the Principal that say Citipointe does not judge students on their sexuality or gender identity and we would not make a decision about their enrolment in the college on that basis. So those things are all on the public record. I have answered the question and I have been very clear. Thank you, Mr Chair.

Chair: Thank you, LORD MAYOR.

Further questions?

Councillor TOOMEY.

Councillor SRI: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Point of order? Who’s making a point of order?

Councillor SRI: Sorry, Chair, Councillor SRI. I was just checking you can hear the microphone now.

Chair: We can hear you now, I’ll come back to you soon, Councillor SRI.

Councillor SRI: Thank you.

Councillor CASSIDY: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor CASSIDY.

**397/2021-22**

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

*That Brisbane City Council condemns the discriminatory practice of the Citipointe Christian College and joins calls for its enrolment contract to be recalled.*

Chair: Thank you, Councillor CASSIDY. Under 12(3) you need to establish the requirements under section 9(3) of the Meetings Local Law as to why you’ve put this motion forward for debate today. You have three minutes.

Councillor CASSIDY: Yes, thanks very much, Chair. This motion couldn’t have been submitted as a notified motion because this LNP LORD MAYOR did not make any public statements until well after 1pm yesterday, but when he did make a statement and he’s repeated them today, he left a lot of people scratching their heads. We still don’t really know the position of this city’s leader on this important issue. Labor Councillors call on each and every Councillor here to stand up and condemn this discrimination.

 We need to show integrity and we need to show leadership. As the governing body of this city we have a responsibility to take a stand on such matters. Each and every Brisbane resident deserves the right to feel safe, accepted and confident in themselves and their place in their own city. This enrolment contract clearly discriminates based on the gender and sexuality of children. The contract states, and I’ll quote, ‘the college will only enrol the student on the basis of the gender that corresponds to their biological sex’.

 It goes on to say they have the right to exclude a student from the college should they not adhere to the doctrinal precepts, including those as to biological sex. Part of that enrolment contract also states that any form of sexual immorality, including, but not limited to adultery, fornication, homosexual acts, bisexual acts, bestiality, incest, paedophilia and pornography, is sinful and offensive to God and is destructive to human relationships and society.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Point of order, Mr Chair.

Councillor CASSIDY: Chair, putting homosexuality and bisexuality in the same category as bestiality—

DEPUTY MAYOR: Point of order, Mr Chair.

Chair: Excuse me, Councillor CASSIDY, just on a point of order.

 Councillor ADAMS.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Three minutes to say why he couldn’t get it on by one o’clock yesterday, not to debate the motion please.

Chair: Thank you. Councillor CASSIDY, you can continue.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair. It’s 2022 and there is no place in our society for such backwards and discriminatory views.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Point of order, Mr Chair.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor ADAMS.

DEPUTY MAYOR: I ask you to make a ruling on whether he is sticking with the local laws, which means he needs to explain why it couldn’t be on the papers by one o’clock yesterday. If it is moved we can debate it, but not in this three minutes.

Chair: Thank you.

 Councillor CASSIDY, you need to establish why you were unable to put this for debate as a motion before one o’clock today.

Councillor CASSIDY: Yes, thanks very much, Chair. I’ve been very clear about that. Not just Councillors in this place here today, but all residents around Brisbane were waiting with bated breath to hear their LORD MAYOR making a public statement condemning this contract from this school, a school that he is such a big public advocate for. We didn’t get that yesterday and we still haven’t got that today. That’s why we should debate this as a Council, to show that this Council has integrity and leadership, unlike our LORD MAYOR.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Point of order, Mr Chair.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor ADAMS.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Again, not the debate; why wasn’t it on the motion? If he’s done the answer to why not one o’clock, let’s move on to the vote.

Chair: Okay, I think you’ve established your point, Councillor CASSIDY. You are moving into a motion debate point rather than establishing the reason for why this couldn’t be on the agenda earlier than one o’clock today. Can you conclude.

Councillor JOHNSTON, do you have a point of order?

Councillor JOHNSTON: I do have a point of order. So Councillor ADAMS’ point of order was to direct you to stop Councillor CASSIDY speaking. So can you clarify how you’re dealing with that point of order? Either she would have to move the put motion, which I don’t know that she can do in a procedural motion, or her request to you was out of order. If you’re making a ruling that Councillor CASSIDY is being—not meeting the requirement to establish urgency, that doesn’t mean that he doesn’t have three minutes to do so. So could you please clarify whether or not you’re acting at the direction of Councillor ADAMS to stop Councillor CASSIDY speaking, or whether you are enforcing the Meetings Local Law regarding urgency?

Chair: Thank you, Councillor JOHNSTON.

 I’m making my own decisions in this regard. I believe that Councillor CASSIDY has the legitimate right, as he has, to raise the issue and I asked him to come to a conclusion.

Councillor CASSIDY: I have, thanks, Chair.

Chair: Thank you.

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

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

Chair: We continue with Question Time.

 Councillor TOOMEY.

**Question 5**

Councillor TOOMEY: Thank you, Chair. My question is to the Chair of City Standards Committee, Councillor MARX. Councillor MARX, the Schrinner Council continues to lead the way by being a clean, green and sustainable city. Could you please update the Chamber on how a recent food waste recycling announcement will further improve the city’s recycling efforts?

Chair: Thank you.

 Councillor MARX.

Councillor MARX: Yes, thank you, Chair and through you, I thank Councillor TOOMEY for the question. As Councillor TOOMEY knows, the Schrinner Council is fighting the war on waste and the launch of this pilot is another indication that we are succeeding. Six-thousand households across 30 suburbs will be invited to join the pilot at the beginning of March and it’s the next step towards the citywide scheme potentially preventing up to 100,000 tonnes of food waste from going to landfill every year. The pilot alone is expected to divert 2,000 tonnes of food waste from landfill and what better way to support the environment and take the next step in improving our recycling efforts, than by delivering a program with an immediate impact in our communities.

 Mr Chair, the positive results of this pilot program don’t stop there. By the time our food waste recycling pilot is expanded across the city, it could reduce unnecessary food waste by nearly 100,000 tonnes a year. The Schrinner Council’s winning the war on waste by delivering programs that not only proactively reduce its existence, but turn it into valuable compost and mulch which can be reused. So this food waste recycling pilot is about diverting food waste such as fruit and vegetable scraps out of the general waste bin, away from landfill and disposing of it through the green waste bin. Currently about one-quarter of the average household bin is food waste.

 Now the pilot that we’re starting to roll out is an opportunity to not only explore how we can provide a service to minimise food waste, but also educate residents on how they can reduce this at the same time. As this Chamber knows, there’s no one more serious about reducing waste than the Schrinner Council. So throughout the pilot we will be asking for feedback from the participants to ascertain what works best in Brisbane’s subtropical climate and also the infrastructure that would be required for a city of our size.

 At this point in time, once the LORD MAYOR made the announcement some two years ago that we would be looking into this program, the team have been working to get the start of infrastructure for Stage 1 up and running. As people who are aware of this would know, you can’t just expect people to suddenly turn up and drop all their food scraps into an open hardstand, which is where all the green waste goes at the moment. You actually have to have an enclosed building for it to go into, to deal with not only potential odours but also any leakage that would come out as a result of the food waste.

 Now this pilot will also add to what has already been done with regard to food recycling and that’s about the free kitchen waste caddies and the rebates of up to $70 when you purchase a compost bin or a worm farm. Mr Chair, I spoke with Councillor CUNNINGHAM this week, who reported to me that she had many excited residents in Greenslopes who have reached out to her offer since the LORD MAYOR’s announcement last week. Greenslopes is just one of the 30 suburbs across Brisbane who will have been selected for the pilot. The pilot suburbs were selected based on the uptake of green bins.

 So working with the current contractors who collect our green bins, they worked through the routes that they currently undertake, worked out where the most green bins were, for the most efficient pick-up service for the green bins. That’s how those pilot subjects were chosen. Each household will then receive a letter, which they will have had by now, as Councillors you will have all received a letter letting you know what the letter said, basically inviting those residents to participate in the service, which is free of charge. They will then, if they choose to participate, receive a kitchen caddy and an education pack. The kitchen caddy is a specifically made version of the bigger green bin, it’s just a smaller one.

 It’s been designed specifically by SULO and not only is it able to go into the dishwasher to be washed out, the width of the mouth of the bin fits exactly a chopping board. So people who chop veggies and all that up on the board can fit straight into the bin. So a lot of thought, time, effort and money has gone into getting this ready for residents to do. So all they do is, if they choose to participate, they place their food waste including their fruit and veggies into the green bin and that’s collected as a normal part of the green bin collection process.

 So the Schrinner Council wants to help residents divert food waste from landfill and our food waste recycling program will help us build a cleaner, greener future for Brisbane. I look forward to speaking to residents on the outcome once they’ve had their trial. Thank you, Mr Chair.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor MARX.

Councillor SRI, I think we can hear you this time.

Councillor SRI.

Councillor SRI: Thanks, Chair. Yes, hopefully you can hear me and I trust everyone is okay at the start of 2022.

**Question 6**

Councillor SRI: My question is also to Councillor MARX and I gave her a heads-up about this one so she’s not caught completely unawares. Councillor MARX, a couple of weeks ago I had a meeting with a resident of Toowong who’s currently homeless, he’s been homeless for some time and he’s sleeping in his car.

 The Council officers recently gave him a fine specifically for the offence of sleeping in his vehicle. I’ve had a chat with some of the Council officers and I do understand some of the background context and circumstances leading up to this, but it does make me wonder—I guess really my question is what is the point of fining a homeless person for sleeping in their car? I guess to phrase that point eloquently—

Chair: Excuse me just a moment, Councillor SRI.

 There are Councillors talking in the background with their microphones not muted. Can you just check if you’re—

Councillor SRI: The Streaming Guys account isn’t muted. I think they’ve fixed it now. Anyway, I was going to ask Councillor MARX—

Councillor MARX: Sure, I got the gist of the question.

Councillor SRI: —what value or benefit does it offer to the homeless man to be fined for sleeping in his car? If we acknowledge that there is no benefit to a homeless being fined for sleeping in their car, how is the harm done to that homeless person justified by any other benefits that might flow from fining people for sleeping in their cars?

Chair: Councillor MARX.

Councillor MARX: Thank you, Mr Chair and thank you, Councillor SRI, for the question. I appreciate you gave me the heads-up on the question. I don’t have the answer for you right here in front of me because I am not aware of that particular situation. I do know that there is a homeless man that lives in Toowong. He actually lives in the park though, so I’m guessing it’s not the same person that you’re referring to and he’s certainly never been fined. I’m unaware of anyone homeless sleeping in a car that has been fined for that offence.

 The fining is about illegal camping in road sites and we’ve had this discussion regarding the Hasall Law which comes into effect today. The intention is not to fine homeless or vulnerable or at-risk people for sleeping in their cars and the new law that starts today was to give officers the capacity to have that conversation with people in their cars, find out what the situation is and we have a—

Councillor SRI: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor SRI.

Councillor SRI: Sorry to interrupt, Councillor MARX. Just to the question, it is a homeless man who is living in a park and has been fined for sleeping in his vehicle. My question was what benefit does it serve to fine homeless people for sleeping in their car?

Councillor MARX: Okay, so to be perfectly frank with you, Councillor SRI, I need to ground truth that, so that’s what I will be doing with the officers and then I can come back to you on that.

Chair: Thank you.

Further questions?

Councillor HUTTON.

**Question 7**

Councillor HUTTON: Thank you, Mr Chair. My question is to the Chair of Economic Development and the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games Committee, Councillor ADAMS. DEPUTY MAYOR, the Schrinner Council recently hosted a number of internationally renowned equestrian course designs in Brisbane. Can you please update the Chamber on how this visit went, including what preparations are underway for Olympic and Paralympic planning in 2022?

Chair: Thank you.

 Councillor ADAMS.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair and thank you, Councillor HUTTON, for the question. Yes, 2022, we’re off and running, as everybody seems to be. Even though the Games may be 10 years away, the detailed planning and the hard work has started. So we are taking the reins—pardon the pun—and putting the plans in place now, as Victoria Park will be an Olympic destination in 2032 and an iconic parkland for many more generations after. So we need to take this opportunity to develop a venue and a cross-country course in the middle of a city, with that stunning city skyline in the backdrop, alongside a major redevelopment of a public park.

 This is a very rare opportunity and it does require vision a long way out and imagination from everyone right from the outset. But rest assured, we have the best and the brightest on the job, who’ve been handpicked based on their skills and expertise in this field. The design team includes an acclaimed Australian Olympic coach and two-time Olympic medallist, a world-renowned cross-country course designer and an internationally recognised course designer and former rider.

 The team will work with the consultants Brisbane Green Consortium led by Urbis and EKS, the Victoria Park Games venue master plan consultant, that we heard from just over 12 months ago, alongside the Brisbane 2032 host city office and the Victoria Park master plan team, so that we can factor in any of the potential requirements of the temporary course design into the Victoria Park master plan as well. So undertaking this important design work early in the piece will give us the confidence to move forward with the planning and delivery of Victoria Park Vision, of course Brisbane’s biggest new park in 50 years. This is smart planning and forward thinking now will deliver a better outcome for residents in the future.

*Councillor interjecting.*

DEPUTY MAYOR: With over 64 hectares to play with, there’s plenty of room for everybody. The opportunity now that the golf course has been closed and the public park is being developed, will hit a major milestone in January this year with the introduction of our two newly appointed course designers, when they were able to tour the grounds of Victoria Park for the first time as a design team, to inspect the locations and further refine the course layout. This involved gaining an appreciation of the park’s characteristics, with consideration given to the understanding of topography. I’m not sure if anybody here, unless you’ve played golf on the course, you probably don’t recognise the steepness of some of that area through there.

 There are a lot of heritage aspects, there’s vegetation and flooding, transport and access requirements. While factoring all of these elements in, they also need to consider the television viewing, the spectators’ needs, the warmup tracks and the stabling for the competition horses as well. So they’re Australian course designer, Grant Johnston, and Australian Olympics equestrian champion, Wayne Roycroft, that visited just recently. They are two of the most revered names when it comes to equestrian and we are thrilled to have them on the team.

 Grant is a rising star in the world of cross-country course design and a former international competitor. He’s a federation equestrian international course designer and has designed multiple venues around the world, including the Australian Championships, the Olympic selection events, the 2017 Chinese National Games and the Asian Games qualifiers. Grant also has extensive infrastructure development experience on many significant Australian and local government projects.

 Wayne is a two-time Olympic bronze medallist and one of our country’s most acclaimed Olympic coaches. He led the Australian equestrian team to an impressive eight Olympic medals during his tenure, including Australia’s first equestrian gold medal on home soil. The LORD MAYOR was lucky enough to join Grant and Wayne on the site visit to tour the grounds and get a first-hand look at what will go into the course design.

 The third designer on this team is Mike Etherington-Smith who is UK-based and obviously unfortunately was unable to attend this visit due to the restrictions for international travel. But I can assure you, not only are we hoping to bring him out here in the near future, I think he is very excited about coming out here in the near future too, from what he saw from his virtual visit as well. Mike brings a level of insight and expertise that is unmatched, having been responsible for designing the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games, 2008 Beijing Olympic Games and the 2010 Kentucky World Equestrian Games cross-country course. So having these experts on the ground is a crucial first step towards delivering a draft course concept to the IOC this year.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, I believe five minutes has expired. Can we have the next question?

Chair: Incorrect.

 You have 20 seconds to complete your answer, Councillor ADAMS.

DEPUTY MAYOR: That’s what I had too, Mr Chair, thank you. Having these experts on the ground is fantastically exciting, it’s a milestone and it’s just a taste of what’s to come. Work continues behind the scenes as we map out the next decade of delivering more city shaping infrastructure, better transport and a suite of new and temporary sporting venues across the city. I look forward to updating the Chamber for my full five minutes as much as possible.

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

Further questions?

Councillor CASSIDY.

**Question 8**

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair. My question is to the LORD MAYOR. LORD MAYOR, this week we see yet another big list of contracts being awarded to non‑local companies. Something as simple as playground equipment is being shipped in from overseas. We’ve seen that before with playgrounds at the Nudgee Beach Reserve, Kookaburra Reserve, Kianawah Park, Murarrie Recreation Ground and Hanlon Park as well. Now we’re seeing it again, more contracts being awarded to companies that manufacture equipment overseas. LORD MAYOR, why does your LNP Administration continue to snub local manufacturing at a time when we need to be doing everything we can to support it?

Chair: Thank you.

 LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you for the question, Councillor CASSIDY. I’m not sure where Councillor CASSIDY is getting his information from, Mr Chair, because the report that we see in front of us right now is that 86.5% of contracts awarded are going to Brisbane and South East Queensland businesses. Not our target of 80%, but 86%. So I guess maybe a more appropriate question was why does Councillor CASSIDY and his Labor colleagues continue to mislead the people of Brisbane about what really is going on here?

 We made a very clear target that we would be striving to award 80% of contracts to local businesses and the year-to-date figure is over 90%. The one we see in front of us right here is 86.54% of contracts going to Brisbane and South East Queensland businesses. But one of the other interesting stories is what it would mean if we took or adopted Labor’s approach. Labor’s approach is very clearly—and it’s been stated numerous times—to in-house virtually everything. That’s what they have stated.

 Now never mind the fact that they outsourced grass cutting, they outsourced rubbish collection, one of the most basic fundamental services that Council offers. They outsourced the ferry contract, the operation of our ferries. So that’s their record but they claim now to be against outsourcing and that pretty much everything should be done in-house. What would that mean? That would mean almost $1 billion of work being ripped out of local businesses, families not being able to put food on their table because of Labor’s approach.

 That’s the real story here, that is the real issue here and the real implications of what would happen if we adopted the stated Labor approach. Now I don’t actually believe that their claim is legitimate, that they actually would do that. They know that there are really good reasons to have a balance between doing work in-house and also working with local business to provide services. There’s a balance to be had there, they know it, they did it when they were in administration.

 But what they’re trying to do right now is because they are losing support rapidly by the week amongst their working background supporters and that those people are thinking about the LNP or the Greens Party, they are really trying to shore up their base here by trying to con workers into thinking that it would be different under them. We know what their record was, we know that they can’t be trusted to actually do what they say they would do. We know that their comments and claims on this matter are absolutely hypocritical.

 So we will continue to do what we can to support local businesses and to get that right balance between doing things in-house and also working with local business. As I said, there are benefits to that which involve so many families having food on the table because of the work that we do through local businesses. We also know that those local businesses employ so many people in our community. So whether it’s things like helping us upgrade playgrounds, whether it is the work that local business does to support us in so many different ways and to provide so many different services, where it’s building major projects with us.

 Things like the Kangaroo Point Green Bridge, which is really gearing up construction now as we enter 2022. Whether it’s the other exciting projects that we’re delivering, all the road upgrades that we’re delivering right across the city, we’re working with local businesses and putting food on people’s table in doing so. So we’ll continue to be Australia’s most small business-friendly Council, we’ll continue to get that balance right to deliver the best outcomes for the ratepayers of Brisbane.

Chair: Thank you, LORD MAYOR.

That ends Question Time.

We now move on to item 5 on the agenda, the consideration of recommendations of the E&C during the Summer Recess.

LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair. In Question Time, in the first question that I was asked—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: You need to move this, LORD MAYOR.

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

### ESTABLISHMENT AND COORDINATION COMMITTEE (Adoption report)

The Right Honourable, the LORD MAYOR (Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER), Chair of the Establishment and Coordination Committee, moved, seconded by the DEPUTY MAYOR (Councillor Krista ADAMS), that the report setting out the *recommendations* of the Establishment and Coordination Committee during the Summer Recess 2021-22, on matters usually considered by that Committee, be adopted.

Chair: Any debate?

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, I seek the following further information regarding the one item on the E&C report. That is there are four parks projects that are listed for endorsement today, Bridgenorth Street Park at item 2; Oriel Road Park, Ascot, at item 5; Blackwood Street Park upgrade at number 10; and Majestic Park, Coorparoo at number 11. These items are not listed in the Suburban Works Program in the budget. Could the LORD MAYOR please clarify under which schedule in the Council budget these playgrounds are funded and whether it is this year’s budget or a previous year’s budget?

Chair: Thank you.

 LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, I have no doubt that we will have an answer on that one from the Finance Chair. Before I move into the submission in front of us, I just wanted to go back to what I started saying before, which is when I was asked the first question by the Opposition I flagged that unfortunately they have a tried and tested political strategy, which is to ask a question or two, not to listen to the answer and then to move a pre-prepared motion which has no reference to what’s actually been said in response to the questions. I asked them to please consider not doing that again, but unfortunately we saw them do exactly what I predicted they would do and I think it’s really disappointing.

 I also did just want to raise, before I move on, the issue of Councillors in this place going to the media and also stating in this place where my kids go to school. My kids are very young, minor children. Now that information is mine, the information about where my kids go to school is mine. It is mine to either tell people or not and it is certainly not the Opposition’s place to tell the media—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Excuse me, Mr Chair.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, please stop interjecting.

LORD MAYOR: —to tell the media and background the media where my young children go to school. I think that is absolutely despicable and it says a whole lot about the Opposition that we have in this place. I think it is despicable.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, please stop interjecting.

Councillor SRI: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor SRI.

Councillor SRI: I think the Mayor raises a very fair issue here. Would the Mayor take a quick question?

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

LORD MAYOR: No, I’m moving on. So I would simply say that information is mine, it is my wife’s information on who we decide to tell people, but certainly not the Opposition’s to go to the national media with. Now moving on, as we always do, we consistently support our local community and major events that are happening in the community and also community causes with the lighting up of our assets. Tonight we see the Story Bridge, the Victoria Bridge, the Tropical Dome and Reddacliff Place will be lit up in red, blue and pink for the BrisAsia Festival which is back.

 It’s part of our ongoing commitment to an inclusive society, an inclusive community, that supports people from all backgrounds and brings people together. So this festival will be running from today, 1 February, through to 20 February and it actually marks the 10th anniversary of BrisAsia. We hold a unique position as the largest Australian city closest to Asia and that is something that we embrace, particularly because so many of our local residents also have a cultural background or links to the Asia-Pacific region as well. So we’re launching this event very soon, I look forward to being there at the launch in the Fortitude Music Hall.

 On Thursday, the same assets will be lit in blue and orange for the eve of World Cancer Day. The Cancer Council of Queensland has done such a fantastic job over the last 60-plus years in raising awareness and encouraging people to seek early intervention and treatment on cancer, but also raising money for cancer research which has made such a difference already in the lives of so many people. On Friday, the Story Bridge and the Victoria Bridge will be lit up in green and gold to support our Australian athletes competing in the Beijing Winter Olympics. The opening ceremony is on Friday night, before we have two full weeks of winter sport.

 This coming Sunday is the Platinum Jubilee of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II and it’s a significant day both for Queen Elizabeth and the 54 different countries within the Commonwealth. Queen Elizabeth has now ruled for 70 years and all of our assets will be lit in the colour purple to mark this occasion. A remarkable achievement for any world leader to be in that one position for 70 years and to provide such stability in such tumultuous and changing times.

 Item A is the contracts and tendering report and I already spoke a little bit about this in response to a question. But this report includes 45 contracts issued to businesses within Brisbane and South East Queensland, which equates to 86.5% of the contracts. There are only seven contracts awarded to businesses outside of that area. So year-to-date, 368 contracts have been issued to businesses within Brisbane and South East Queensland, which equates to—wait for it, 97% of contracts. Already year-to-date—and I’m talking financial year-to-date, $438 million worth of contracts going to local businesses. So that is an incredible outcome and one that we’re proud to support.

 There are a number of really good projects coming through in this particular contracts and tendering report and I happen to know that Chairs and others will speak about those great projects. But we continue our work out in the suburbs of Brisbane, whether it is suburban park upgrades, whether it is suburban road upgrades, we continue to invest 68% of our budget in the suburbs of Brisbane and that is as it should be. Obviously the CBD provides a major economic and social and cultural hub, but 68% of our Council budget goes out to the suburbs of Brisbane, where people live, where people enjoy their parks, where people are travelling along local roads and intersections and bikeways.

 We will continue through reports like this to invest in the projects that make a difference. It might be the Monier Road and Bellwood Street upgrade, it might be local park upgrades or a range of other suburban improvements that we’re making. I also wanted to point out the planning work that we’re doing for future suburban upgrades as well. There’s a significant amount of planning work that we’re investing in and focusing on, to make sure we can continue to plan for the future and to build the infrastructure that our city needs for the future. So I commend this report to the Chamber.

Chair: Thank you, LORD MAYOR.

Further debate?

Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair. I rise virtually to speak on this item, the contracts and tendering before us today. Here we have the latest list of jobs being snubbed and insecure work being promoted by this current LNP LORD MAYOR. Now let’s start with those playgrounds that I mentioned during Question Time. We can see a number of new playground contracts here and history tells us this LNP Mayor has a taste for equipment being manufactured overseas. We saw that, as I said, at numerous parks across the city in recent times, at Nudgee Beach Reserve, Kookaburra Reserve in Kuraby, Kianawah Park in Tingalpa, at the Murarrie Recreation Reserve and at Hanlon Park in Greenslopes, and this time will be no different.

 This current LNP LORD MAYOR has been caught before snubbing local jobs in the middle of an economic recovery and he’s doing it again, Chair. We see a contract in here for $1.7 million worth of insurance for the Kangaroo Point Green Bridge project. Most Brisbane residents have figured out by now how poorly any major project that this LORD MAYOR handles turns out. So he’ll need all the insurance he can get for this project, to see that it’s delivered somewhere near budget and less than a year over time as well. But what’s not fair, what’s not fair at all, Chair, is that residents have to foot the bill for this incompetence time and time again.

 Item 4 on this list is a contract for an intersection upgrade, this proposed intersection upgrade at Melton and Hows Road has been the subject of serious scrutiny, that has been ignored by the local LNP Councillor and this LNP Administration. That local LNP Councillor is, of course, Councillor Adam ALLAN. A local resident who is visually impaired has repeatedly raised concerns with Council that putting this roundabout in will mean that they can no longer safely cross that road and enjoy their local community and remain active and mobile. These concerns clearly haven’t been taken into account and thanks to the LNP, our city is becoming even more inaccessible for vulnerable residents. Just disgraceful leadership.

 Contract 7 on this list is for the demolition of property for parkland. Now perhaps this is the contract to bulldoze the East Brisbane Bowls Club, but we know that this LNP Administration is duplicitous when it comes to the East Brisbane Bowls Club. We know they’ve been secret in their manipulation of that plan for that site and we know that they’re going to do everything that they can to keep the timing of that demolition secret. So there’s hardly any detail in this contract. I called the file on these contracts just in case, just in case there was a little bit of extra information that went to E&C, but of course there’s nothing in that file whatsoever. It’s shrouded in secrecy, just like the entire Mowbray Park vision has been.

 Item 8 is contracts for road feasibility studies. One of the companies contracted is based in Texas. Not Texas in South West Queensland, but Texas in the United States of America (US), their office is in Dallas. That doesn’t sound very local to me, LORD MAYOR. The LORD MAYOR clearly cares about jobs everywhere else apart from Brisbane. Once again here in black and white, right before us all, this LNP Council is snubbing local jobs in the middle of an economic recovery.

 Contract 13 is for the Indooroopilly roundabout upgrade. For those who have forgotten about that project, that’s the one that blew out by $60 million before work even started on this current LNP Mayor’s watch. Of course, who picks up the tab for that? The ratepayers of Brisbane every single time.

 Contract 18 is for painting and decorating for $4.6 million and that’s very much ongoing work. It’s quite clear that this current LNP LORD MAYOR would rather spend $4.6 million flogging a useless app than bringing these services in-house to ensure that we have good, secure, stable jobs. Council owns hundreds of facilities, Chair, and amenities right across the city and is responsible for maintenance on many, many of those, but we obviously don’t have a team of in-house painters to do that basic maintenance. So if a painting job needs doing, if we had an in-house team we’d be able to send them out within minutes.

 However, by having this contracted out and having lists of external providers, that process can wait months for these jobs to be done. It of course would also secure permanent jobs bringing this work in-house and support more apprenticeships being offered by Brisbane City Council as well. So there are so many ways that this Council could be benefiting Brisbane residents by bringing this work in‑house, but the LNP, who are in charge at the moment, refuse to do so. This current LNP Mayor would rather create a disposable workforce at the expense of people’s livelihoods. Very similar story at contract 22 on this list as well, Chair, with $23 million in ongoing traffic signal works being contracted out.

 Item 20 on this list is numerous contracts for digital and creative services as well. There are a number of companies that have been awarded contracts that are based in the US and have their headquarters in New York and in Chicago. We know when it comes to designing that failed Brisbane App, this LORD MAYOR snubbed local businesses for that one and paid a Melbourne company instead. So this LORD MAYOR’s modus operandi, Chair, has not changed. We’re still seeing this current LNP Mayor snub local jobs in the middle of an economic recovery when we need them as secure as possible.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor CASSIDY

Further speakers?

Councillor WINES.

Councillor WINES: Thank you, Mr Chair. I just rise to speak to the contracts and tendering and I want to make some comments regarding the reflections made upon some of our projects by Councillor CASSIDY in particular. Can I speak firstly to the Melton–Hows project in Nundah. The Melton–Hows project is right next to Toombul shops, it’s very much the Toombul shops precinct. It’s part of a greater network of roads that need to be upgraded for improved access for both pedestrians and motorists. It’s also part of a network that serves that particular community coming off the arterial roads that feed into the industrial and airport precincts, as well as the Gateway Motorway.

 The accusation levelled at the project was that somehow an individual with a vision impairment had been to a detriment as a result of the project is a deeply flawed accusation and completely not true. That particular individual has been in consistent contact with Council. We have made a number of variations to the project to ensure that that particular individual can continue to access the shops that she depends upon.

We have also improved pedestrian access around the project to better reflect the needs of that particular individual. Both her and all individuals who would want to access the services provided by that shopping centre. So I reject absolutely the assertions that this project is removing the ability of a person to move around, considering how far and how much has been done to address those particular concerns. To the extent that even the Human Rights Commission has been involved and we’ve been working with them to ensure that this thing works properly for people with vision impairment.

 The other item, of course was the Indooroopilly roundabout. Something we know more recently as the Moggill Road Upgrade. The expansion of the scope of works means that this particular road upgrade will span from the Follies—the Toowong Centre all the way out to the Western Freeway. The expanse will mean that this provides a much greater benefit for the citizens and residents of Western Brisbane.

 Also this roadwork—many people choose to diminish it by reflecting on it as a roundabout upgrade. It is much more like a rail overpass and it will be a significant piece of work. That will become clearer in the near term as works become more obvious on that site. I look forward to both of these projects. Which will materially improve the way of life of all Brisbane residents and in particular those who reside near them. Both for motorists and for pedestrians.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor WINES.

 Further speakers? Further speakers?

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, thank you, Mr Chairman, I note that the LORD MAYOR said the Finance Chair would respond to my questions. I am awaiting that information, but I’ll speak to, again, the one item that is in the E&C report item A, contracts and tendering. Firstly it is a bit shocking that over the past two months this is the only thing that the—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: —E&C Administration’s been able to put up, given the very significant issues going on in the city at the moment. I didn’t get a question today, so I’m sure the issues I want to raise will still be there next week. But what struck me about the contracts and tendering are that there are four major park projects listed in this report. All of them are in LNP areas.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: All of them are for very large amounts. So that’s contract 2, Bridgnorth Street Park, Carindale, $465,000; that’s in an LNP ward. Contract 5, Oriel Park, Ascot; that’s in an LNP ward, that’s $300,000. Then we have the Blackwood Street, Rochedale upgrade; that’s in the LNP ward. That one actually may be in the budget. There was a Rochedale—that’s for sort of $540,000. The fourth one is Majestic Park at Coorparoo, that’s for $214,000; that’s also in an LNP award.

 I guess one of the interesting things I see, because there are so little park projects undertaken in my ward. I think we’ve had two that have actually been delivered over the last decade. Turley Street and I’ve got—which was a replacement playground—and Fairfield dog off-leash area which is on this year.

 It’s interesting to me the size of the projects that are happening in LNP wards. They are massively higher than anything that I see in my area. So I’m very curious about these projects. I’m interested in what schedules they are being funded under the budget. I can see that the Blackwood Street project is funded under Schedule 3.3.3.1. It seems to have a budget of $855,000—oh, no, I’m sorry—yes, Blackwood Street Park, that’s it, Rochedale. The lump sum in here is for $539,000.

So I’d be very interested to know, for example, if the balance of $300,000 has been allocated to this project. Whether there are any other costs associated with this project. If there is a surplus of $300,000, I’ve got dozens of park upgrades waiting in my ward to be done.

So I certainly would like to know where these other three projects are being funded. Because they’re not listed or itemised in the Council budget. I’d certainly like to know with respect to the Blackwood Street project the 300 and—it’s about $320,000 surplus from the budgeted amount, what’s going to happen to that money. It is fascinating to me that the LNP projects are so large and I’m interested in why.

I just think that perhaps the Infrastructure Chairperson needs to be aware that Council is describing the Moggill Road Corridor Upgrade project as a roundabout upgrade. So when Councillor WINES says that people are trying to diminish the project by calling it a roundabout upgrade project. That’s what Council’s actually calling it. So Councillor WINES just needs to be aware that that’s how his own organisation and the officers who work to him are describing the project.

What is a little bit delusional from Councillor WINES, is that somehow this project is going to fix traffic problems in the western suburbs. I note that he keeps talking about the expanded scope of the project. I note that the Coonan Street Corridor, which is dramatically impacted by this project, didn’t include—wasn’t included in any of those upgrades. There was no consultation about any of those upgrades. Indenting bus zones is great, but Coonan Street Corridor was underdone in the scope of this project. These are issues I raised through the consultation project.

So yet again the LNP is prioritising east-west traffic in LNP wards, at the expense of the north-south traffic for those people in the southern end of—south-western end of the Walter Taylor Ward and certainly in my ward of Tennyson. So of concern of course is the failure to properly address the Coonan Street Corridor. That impacts on Chelmer, Graceville, Sherwood, Corinda and beyond. It also impacts directly on Indooroopilly and Fig Tree Pocket residents. I’m sorry to say I’m sure this LNP Administration is about to find out the hard way how bad this project is going to go for them.

What’s fascinating is we’re yet to see any work. I keep getting emails saying there’s work happening, but you know you can drive through the corridor and you would not know. So I don’t know if there is work happening or if there isn’t work happening. I can see the current contract is to pay Telstra, presumably to move Telstra pits and Telstra infrastructure. That doesn’t inspire me with confidence that this Administration is actually going to be able to deliver on this project.

So I just draw to Councillor WINE’s attention that if he doesn’t want the project described as a roundabout upgrade. Perhaps he needs to take that up with the Council officers who are running the project. Because that’s how they’re describing it.

I look forward to the Finance Chair responding to my questions as the LORD MAYOR indicated would happen.

Chair: Further speakers? Any further speakers?

Councillor CUNNINGHAM.

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: Yes, thank you, Mr Chair. I rise to speak on item A and for the benefit of the Councillor for Tennyson, I can inform the Chamber that the Bridgnorth Street Park is actually a SEF project. As is the Oriel Park, another SEF project. Majestic Park is part of SEF and also through the Upgrading Facilities in Parks Schedule. The Blackwood Street Park is the—as she correctly identified—Metropolitan and District Playground’s line item.

 Mr Chair, once again in this report, we have seen that Council continues to support enterprise in Brisbane and South East Queensland.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, thank you, Mr Chairman. Look I—thank you for the response, but it was extremely quick. Could I just clarify the SEF schedule is very clear, but the one that’s funded under the SEF and the budget—which I believe was the Majestic Street Park. Could you just tell us what the schedule number or name is again, please?

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: It’s the Upgrading Facilities in Parks Schedule, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Thank you.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor CUNNINGHAM. Please continue.

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: Thank you, Mr Chair. What we see is at least 86% of contracts are awarded to local businesses and 83% of the spend being local. Our buy local plan is paying dividends for local industry and I know there is much pride taken in the business community in working to improve the suburbs that we live in.

 We hear the Opposition say in one breath that we’re not providing enough business support and in the other wanting to rip tens of millions of dollars out of our local economy. They want to cancel the contracts that businesses have with Council. I can confirm that for significant playground projects, part of the evaluation of local benefits includes consideration of where the equipment is actually manufactured. Now Labor can cherry pick if they wish to, but we back our local suppliers and I will not smear them in this place and I won’t stand for it.

 Relevant to my own ward, there is the supply, delivery and installation of the playground at Majestic Park. The successful tenderer maintains a local office and achieved the highest value for money score. The beloved dragon-themed playground has come to its end of life. A whole generation of children have enjoyed this park. I want to make sure that we can share this theme with the next and I’m really excited about what’s going to be delivered here.

 Another park included is Blackwood Street. This park is currently open space but without any facilities. Investment at this location will include a playground, picnic nodes and shelters. Shade trees, more seeding, a kick about space and a water bubbler. The successful tenderer maintains a local office and uses local subcontractors and suppliers.

Mr Chair, as you know when it comes to play equipment, Council works with a range of design firms based here in the suburbs of Brisbane to deliver these projects for our residents. These suppliers have products from time to time that they supply from—that they source from many places, including Australia. Sometimes, sometimes, yes, from overseas. There’s nothing unusual about that.

From time to time, we do see the Opposition continue to make comments about this, but this just reflects their lack of understanding of the global economy. These projects are entirely—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: —our effort to support local—Mr Chair.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, thank you. I am just concerned at the answer that Councillor has provided. I’m looking at Schedule 3.3.2 Upgrading Facilities in Parks and Majestic Street Park, Coorparoo, is not listed in that schedule. So I want to check that I’m being given accurate information about that project. It was said to be a combination of the SEF program and also Upgrading Facilities in Parks, but it’s not listed in the budget. So I just—

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, I don’t believe this is a valid—point of order.

 But Councillor CUNNINGHAM, if you want to add any further information, you’re entitled to do so.

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: Yes, thank you, Mr Chair. It is a continuing project, Councillor JOHNSTON, and it is Majestic Park at Coorparoo, not Majestic Street Park, thank you.

Chair: Thank you.

 Any further debate?

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Sorry, I asked for further debate.

Point of order, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Thank you so much. There are continuing projects listed under that schedule in the budget, but again that project is not listed in the budget. So I’m—

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, I think you’re—

Councillor JOHNSTON: —genuinely seeking information here about this and given Chairs have a responsibility now to make sure we get the correct information. I’d just like to clarify this please.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON you can ask this question in General Business.

 Councillor ALLAN.

Councillor ALLAN: Thank you, Mr Chair. I did want to join the debate and just touch upon item 4 in the contracts and tendering report. This is the intersection upgrade at Melton Road and Hows Road which Councillor WINES spoke about a little bit earlier. This is certainly a difficult intersection. It’s one that I’ve had on my radar for a number of years and it’s certainly had some challenges in the design and planning process, but I’m very pleased that it’s now up and running.

 Importantly this is an intersection that carries 15,000 vehicles a day. Thirty-five cyclists use it and about 130 pedestrians. It is getting to a point now where in peak hours it’s getting close to its capacity. This particular road, Melton Road, is a key north-south feeder road that accesses Toombul Shopping Centre, it accesses a school, it accesses a couple of train stations. So it is a key transport route. Interestingly enough, Hows Road, which is the minor road, has always had priority here. That’s part of the problem.

 You’ve got sort of opposing stop signs, you’ve got the major road giving way to the minor road. There is a misalignment between the two sections of Melton Road. So it is an intersection that been difficult, not only for vehicles, but also for pedestrians. So the intersection upgrade is going to be a roundabout, each of the approaches to that roundabout will have splitter islands and pedestrian refuges. The sight lines are going to be improved and the misalignment, or the dog leg, on Melton Road will be smoothed out.

 So we’re going to get much better traffic movement and improved safety of that particular intersection. So the key outcomes of this particular project are improved safety for all road users, reduced traffic congestion and improved connectivity.

 So to the points Councillor CASSIDY made earlier and the ones that Councillor WINES refuted. He is absolutely incorrect on this. I’m not aware of any project that has had the level of consultation with a small number of residents to get this design right. We’ve made a number of design modifications to suit a number of users. Those design modifications will improve this particular intersection out of sight.

A couple of those modifications include obviously the refuges at each of the approaches, but more importantly another refuge has been put in south of this intersection, close to Toombul Shopping Centre, there is improved footpaths in this location. So the safety outcomes of this proposed project are just so much better than what’s currently there.

Now, just moving on, I’d like to acknowledge the fact that this project is joint funded with the Australian Government via their Roads to Recovery program. So, obviously, great to have them on board. This project has now started, we’re looking at delivery in the middle of the year.

In the meantime there are going to be detours that will be required and that will impact northbound residents. Well northbound travellers, I should say. Those detours will create some localised inconvenience. I do acknowledge and thank residents impacted by those detours now and obviously we’re very keen that this project is delivered as quickly as possible. So that those detours can be removed and that the community of large can benefit from this particular project. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you Councillor ALLAN.

Any further debate? No further speakers?

 LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thanks, Mr Chair, and thanks also to everyone who has talked in this segment. Look I just—I did want to apologise. I think it was in reference to the item in front of us, but I misspoke earlier. I stated that 68% of the Council budget was spent in the suburbs. I got that wrong. I got the numbers around, it’s actually 86% of the Council budgets that’s spent in the suburbs. So I apologise for that error. I—yes, I want to correct the record. It’s actually 86% of our budget that is spent in the suburbs, not 68%. Thanks, Mr Chair.

Chair: Thank you.

 We now move this report.

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

The report read as follows⎯

#### A CONTRACTS AND TENDERING – REPORT OF CONTRACTS ACCEPTED BY DELEGATES OF COUNCIL FOR NOVEMBER 2021

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

**398/2021-22**

1. The Chief Executive Officer provided the information below.

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

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

4. The *City of Brisbane Regulation 2012* (the Regulation) was made pursuant to the Act. Chapter 6, Part 4, section 227 of the Regulation provides that: (1) Council must, as soon as practicable after entering into a contract under this chapter worth $200,000 or more (exclusive of GST), publish relevant details of the contract on Council’s website; (2) the relevant details must be published under subsection (1) for a period of at least 12 months; and (3) also, if a person asks Council to give relevant details of a contract, Council must allow the person to inspect the relevant details at Council’s public office. ‘Relevant details’ is defined in Chapter 6, Part 4, section 227 as including: (a) the person with whom Council has entered into the contract; (b) the value of the contract; and (c) the purpose of the contract (e.g. the particular goods or services to be supplied under the contract).

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

6. The Chief Executive Officer provided the following recommendation and the Committee agreed at the meeting of 24 January 2022.

7. **RECOMMENDATION:**

**THAT COUNCIL NOTES THE REPORT OF CONTRACTS ACCEPTED BY DELEGATES OF COUNCIL FOR NOVEMBER 2021, AS SET OUT IN ATTACHMENT A,** hereunder.

**Attachment A**

| **Report of Contracts Accepted by Delegates of Council for November 2021** |
| --- |
| **Contract number/contract purpose/successful tenderer/comparative tender/price value for money (VFM) index achieved** | **Nature of arrangement/ estimate maximum expenditure** | **Unsuccessful tenderers/VFM achieved** | **Comparative tender price/s** | **Delegate/****approval date/start date/term** |
| **BRISBANE INFRASTRUCTURE** |  |  |  |  |
| **1. Contract No. 510812****INSURANCE FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE KANGAROO POINT GREEN BRIDGE PROGRAM*****Contract Works Insurance*****Liberty Mutual Insurance Company trading as Liberty Specialty Markets** (lead insurer)\***Allied World Assurance Company, Ltd** (co insurer)\***AIG Asia Pacific Insurance Pte. Ltd.**(co insurer)\***HDI Global Specialty SE** (co insurer)\***QBE Insurance (Australia) Limited** (co insurer)\***Helvetia Swiss Insurance Company in Liechtenstein Ltd** (co insurer)\****Construction Liability Insurance*****Liberty Mutual Insurance Company trading as Liberty Specialty Markets\****\*Comparative tender price and VFM not applicable as insurance contracts are negotiated on Council’s behalf by its insurance broker, Marsh Pty Ltd.* | Corporate Procurement Arrangement (CPA) (Preferred Supplier Arrangement)Adjustable rates**$1,730,615** | Not applicable (N/A)\* | N/A | **Delegate**CEO**Approved**24.11.2021**Start**06.12.2021**Term**35 months |
| **2. Contract No. 533022****BRIDGNORTH STREET PARK UPGRADE 2021-22****Naturform Pty. Ltd. – $465,009** Achieved the highest VFM of 19.35 | Lump sum**$465,009** | Landscape Solutions (QLD) Pty. Limited Achieved VFM of 19.26Glascott Landscape and Civil Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 15.36The Landscape Construction Company Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 15.36 | $467,370 $517,519 $527,510 | **Delegate**CPO**Approved**03.11.2021**Start**10.11.2021**Term**16 weeks |
| **3. Contract No. 520725****COLLECTION OF TRACKABLE WASTE****REMONDIS Australia Pty Ltd – $26,862**Achieved the highest VFM of 34.06 | CPA (Preferred Supplier Arrangement)Schedule of rates**$750,000** | *Shortlisted offer not recommended*Cleanaway Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 23.11*Non-conforming offer*Total Drain Cleaning Services Pty Ltd | $28,200 | **Delegate**CPO**Approved**25.11.2021**Start**29.11.2021**Term**Initial term of three years with a maximum term of five years. |
| **4. Contract No. 532661****MELTON ROAD AND HOWS ROAD INTERSECTION UPGRADE****Doval Constructions (QLD.) Ltd – $2,144,396\***Achieved the highest VFM of 39.6\**Comparative tender price normalised for possible delay costs claimable by the contractor, applying overhead margins to potential variations and day works rates claimable by the contractor.* | Schedule of rates**$1,905,626** | Allroads Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 33.0Abergeldie Contractors Pty Ltd Achieved VFM of 28.6 | $2,089,732\*$2,696,085\* | **Delegate**CEO**Approved**08.11.2021**Start**12.11.2021**Term**32 weeks |
| **5. Contract No. 532951** **PLAYGROUND UPGRADE AT ORIEL PARK, ASCOT****a\_space Australia Pty Ltd – $299,995** Achieved the highest VFM of 27.81 | Lump sum **$299,995** | *Shortlisted offers not recommended*Hansen Pty Ltd as trustee for the Hansen Family Trust trading as Forpark Australia Achieved VFM of 25.23Austek Constructions Pty Ltd trading as Austek PlayAchieved VFM of 24.75*Non-conforming offer*Willplay Pty. Ltd. | $295,000$300,000 | **Delegate**CPO**Approved**18.11.2021**Start**19.11.2021**Term**16 weeks |
| **6. Contract No. 532992****MONIER ROAD AND BELLWOOD STREET INTERSECTION UPGRADE****Doval Constructions (QLD.) Ltd – $2,824,777\***Achieved the highest VFM of 30.4\**Comparative tender price normalised for possible delay costs, additional variations and margin claimable by the contractor.* | Schedule of rates**$2,571,697** | Allroads Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 29.8HEH Civil Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 25.9Abergeldie Contractors Pty Limited Achieved VFM of 25.1 | $2,917,734\*$2,957,450\*$3,110,556\* | **Delegate**CEO**Approved**15.11.2021**Start**17.11.2021**Term**24 weeks |
| **7. Contract No. 533014****DEMOLITION AND REMEDIATION OF PROPERTIES ACQUIRED FOR PARKLAND PROGRAM PACKAGE 13****WJ & M Allendorf trading as WMA Demolition – $323,459**Achieved the highest VFM of 29.37 | Lump sum$323,459 | *Shortlisted offers not recommended*Roelandts Group Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 20.85Rosenlund Contractors Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 14.36Paterson Demolition & Recycling Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 11.06*Non-conforming offers*Demex Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 21.84Logan City Demolitions Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 15.06 | $398,023$626,898$687,140$412,174 $597,615  | **Delegate**CPO**Approved**17.11.2021**Start**24.11.2021**Term**10 weeks |
| **8. Contract No. 533027****ROAD NETWORK FEASIBILITY STUDIES 2021-22 – PACKAGE 1*****O’Connell Terrace, Bowen Bridge Road, Butterfield Street Feasibility Study*****Jacobs Group (Australia) Pty Ltd – $399,168**Achieved the highest VFM of 23.0***Meadowlands Road – Dairy Swamp Road Corridor Feasibility Study*** **Cardno (Qld) Pty Ltd – $222,697**Achieved the highest VFM of 38.7***Tilley Road – Kianawah Road Corridor Feasibility Study*****Cardno (Qld) Pty Ltd – $301,036**Achieved the highest VFM of 28.7 | Schedule of rates**$922,901** | ***O’Connell Terrace, Bowen Bridge Road, Butterfield Street Feasibility Study***GHD Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 21.8Cardno (Qld) Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 20.8Arup Pty LimitedAchieved VFM of 20.7HDR Pty LimitedAchieved VFM of 20.4Bligh Tanner Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 14.9***Meadowlands Road – Dairy Swamp Road Corridor Feasibility Study*** HDR Pty LimitedAchieved VFM of 36.3Aurecon Australasia Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 34.1Arup Pty Limited Achieved VFM of 33.5Bligh Tanner Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 33.4Calibre Professional Services Pty Ltd Achieved VFM of 29.3***Tilley Road – Kianawah Road Corridor Feasibility Study***HDR Pty LimitedAchieved VFM of 26.5Arup Pty Limited Achieved VFM of 25.2Bligh Tanner Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 24.4 | $385,735$396,242$374,108$305,418$423,420$228,837$231,937$222,376$226,400$254,806$312,778$309,162$309,280 | **Delegate**CPO**Approved**24.11.2021**Start**03.12.2021**Term**29 weeks |
| **9. Contract No. 533028****ROAD NETWORK FEASIBILITY STUDIES 2021-22 – PACKAGE 2*****Hamilton Road (Gympie Road to Spence Street) Feasibility Study*** **GHD Pty Ltd – $205,701**Achieved the highest VFM of 42.3***Learoyd Road (Gooderham Road to Watson Road) Concept Design*** **Jacobs Group (Australia) Pty Ltd – $259,381**Achieved the highest VFM of 34.1***Rode Road (Parton Street to Webster Road) Feasibility Study*****Jacobs Group (Australia) Pty Ltd – $219,868**Achieved the highest VFM of 39.6 | Schedule of rates**$684,950** | ***Hamilton Road (Gympie Road to Spence Street) Feasibility Study*** Jacobs Group (Australia) Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 39.6Cardno (Qld) Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 33.5***Learoyd Road (Gooderham Road to Watson Road) Concept Design*** Cardno (Qld) Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 31.3***Rode Road (Parton Street to Webster Road) Feasibility Study***Cardno (Qld) Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 33.6 | $219,858$219,604$269,890$219,002 | **Delegate**CPO**Approved**10.11.2021**Start**03.12.2021**Term**29 weeks |
| **10. Contract No. 533032****SIGNATURE PLAYGROUND BLACKWOOD STREET PARK, ROCHEDALE****Naturform Pty. Ltd. – $539,145**Achieved the highest VFM of 161.37 | Lump sum**$539,145** | The Landscape Construction Company Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 156.15Penfold Projects Pty. Ltd.Achieved VFM of 150.93Glascott Landscape and Civil Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 110.42 | $557,160$516,807$624,862 | **Delegate**CPO**Approved**03.11.2021**Start**10.11.2021**Term**24 weeks |
| **11. Contract No. 533058****SUPPLY, DELIVERY AND INSTALL OF PLAYGROUND AT MAJESTIC PARK, COORPAROO****Bespoke Playgrounds Pty Ltd – $214,047**Achieved the highest VFM of 34.07 | Lump sum**$214,047** | *Shortlisted offers not recommended*Adventure Playgrounds Pty Ltd trading as Adventure Plus PlaygroundsAchieved VFM of 32.71M&N Enterprises Pty Ltd trading as Playscape CreationsAchieved VFM of 32.08Moduplay Group Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 31.29Austek Constructions Pty Ltd trading as Austek PlayAchieved VFM of 29.69*Offers not recommended*Proludic Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 29.87Hansen Pty Ltd as trustee for the Hansen Family Trust trading as Forpark Australia Achieved VFM of 29.54Willplay Pty. Ltd.Achieved VFM of 23.74Keith Heffernan Pty. Ltd. trading as QPlayAchieved VFM of 16.20 | $210,960$219,732$219,999$218,391$213,684$218,600$237,324$240,675 | **Delegate**CPO**Approved**11.11.2021**Start**15.11.2021**Term**20 weeks |
| **12. Contract No. NBN-00382270****NBN RELOCATION WORKS – ROCHEDALE ROAD PRIESTDALE ROAD INTERSECTION UPGRADE** **NBN Co Limited – $257,861** | Lump sum**$257,861** | Contract entered into under Exemption 3 of Council’s *SP103 Procurement Policy and Plan 2021-22*, which allows for exemption for tendering where the marketplace is restricted by third-party ownership of a public utility plant asset. | N/A | **Delegate**CPO**Approved**27.10.2021**Start**24.11.2021**Term**10 weeks |
| **13. Contract No. QW291395-3****MOGGILL ROAD CORRIDOR UPGRADE PROJECT – STAGE 1 INDOOROOPILLY ROUNDABOUT UPGRADE – TELSTRA ASSET RELOCATIONS****Telstra Corporation Limited – $5,265,630** | Lump sum**$5,265,630** | Contract entered into under Exemption 3 of Council’s *SP103 Procurement Policy and Plan 2021-22*, which allows for exemption for tendering where the marketplace is restricted by third-party ownership of a public utility plant asset. | N/A | **Delegate**CEO**Approved**01.11.2021**Start**17.11.2021**Term**52 weeks |
| **CITY ADMINISTRATION AND GOVERNANCE** |
| Nil |  |  |  |  |
| **CITY PLANNING AND SUSTAINABILITY** |
| **14. Contract No. 511602****BOTANICA – PRODUCTION AND EVENT MANAGEMENT SERVICES****Museum of Brisbane Pty Ltd – $369,000\***Achieved the highest VFM of 24.39\**\*Budget of $369,000 per annum was provided to the market.* | Lump sum**$1,107,000** | *Shortlisted offer not recommended*Metro Arts LtdAchieved VFM of 20.87*Offers not recommended*Iscariot Media Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 14.63 Irma Eugenia PachecoAchieved VFM of 6.78 | $369,000\*$369,000\*$369,000\* | **Delegate**CPO**Approved**10.11.2021**Start**17.11.2021**Term**Initial term of one year with a maximum term of three years. |
| **LIFESTYLE AND COMMUNITY SERVICES** |
| Nil |  |  |  |  |
| **ORGANISATIONAL SERVICES** |
| **15. Contract No. 510199****VIRTUAL DESKTOP INFRASTRUCTURE FOR WARD OFFICES****NewBase Computer Services Pty. Ltd. – $220,000** | CPA (Preferred Supplier Arrangement)Schedule of rates**$220,000** | Contract entered into without seeking competitive tenders from industry in accordance with Council’s *SP103 Procurement Policy and Plan 2021-22.* | N/A | **Delegate**CPO**Approved**17.11.2021**Start**25.11.2021**Term**Nine months |
| **16. Contract No. 510480****LOCAL GOVERNMENT KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM TOOLBOX****PreviousNext Pty Ltd – $246,000** | CPA (Preferred Supplier Arrangement)Schedule of rates**$246,000** | Contract entered into without seeking competitive tenders from industry in accordance with Council’s *SP103 Procurement Policy and Plan 2021-22.* | N/A | **Delegate**CPO**Approved**03.11.2021**Start**13.02.2022**Term**Initial term of 17 months with a maximum term of 29 months. |
| **17. Contract No. 510856****PROVISION OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND MACHINE LEARNING SERVICES****CognitiveCX Pty Ltd trading as Otso.ai\*****Madrah Pty. Ltd. trading as Blackbook Professional Services\*****Tata Consulting Services Limited\****\*Comparative tender price and VFM not applicable, extension of existing CPA.* | CPA (Panel Arrangement)Schedule of rates **$1,000,000** | Contract is exempt from tendering under Exemption 6 of *Council’s SP103 Procurement Policy and Plan 2021-22*, which allows for exemption from tendering for low value procurements.  | N/A | **Delegate**CPO**Approved**04.08.2021**Start**16.08.2021**Term**Initial term of one year with a maximum term of two years. |
| **18. Contract No. 511427****TRADE AND BUILDING SERVICES CATEGORY 3 – PAINTING AND DECORATING****Russell Hewson trading as Russell Hewson Painting and Decorating – $640,325**Achieved the highest VFM of 121.3**South East Coast Painting Pty Ltd as trustee for Miller Family Trust trading as Brush Techniques – $668,180**Achieved VFM of 113.5**Waller Painting Pty Ltd – $854,800**Achieved VFM of 104.1**Probuild Industries Australia Pty Ltd trading as PBI Australia – $957,860**Achieved VFM of 94.0**MMS Group Pty Ltd – $882,674**Achieved VFM of 89.1**Amalgamated Property Maintenance (Brisbane) Pty Ltd – $880,204**Achieved VFM of 79.3 | CPA (Panel Arrangement)Schedule of rates**$4,673,165** | Maintain Australia Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 78.2Programmed Property Services Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 77.0Aizer Property Services Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 76.3Kerry Nolan trading as Kerry Nolan Painting & Flooring CoveringsAchieved VFM of 75.9Higgins Coatings Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 72.9CVSG Asset Services Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 67.5Dart Holdings Pty Ltd trading as A Dart & CoAchieved VFM of 66.9E A & J Campbell (Partnership)Achieved VFM of 62.2Denberth Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 54.4AE Smith Service (SEQ) Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 41.5 | $1,044,836$1,173,526$1,063,480$849,800$1,064,670$1,232,984$1,157,850$1,195,840$1,121,720$1,357,160 | **Delegate**CEO**Approved**08.11.2021**Start**01.12.2021**Term**Initial term of three years with a maximum term of seven years. |
| **19. Contract No. 511430****TRADE AND BUILDING SERVICES CATEGORY 6 – WATER APPLIANCE SERVICING****Aquaspec Pty Ltd trading as Boiling Point Services – $327,195**Achieved the highest VFM of 25.7 | CPA (Preferred Supplier Arrangement)Schedule of rates**$2,183,321** | *Shortlisted offers not recommended*Waterlogic Australia Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 21.8Baronial Pty Ltd as trustee for the Byron Brown Family Trust trading as Aqua Tech Drinking Water SolutionsAchieved VFM of 19.9*Offers not recommended*Galaxy Plumbing (QLD) Pty Ltd Trading as O’Brien Electrical and Plumbing Coopers PlainsAchieved VFM of 11.6ZIP Heaters (Aus) Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 10.8 | $310,338$366,776$521,270$518,340 | **Delegate**CEO**Approved**15.11.2021**Start**01.01.2022**Term**Initial term of three years with a maximum term of seven years. |
| **20. Contract No. 511493****CREATIVE AND DIGITAL SERVICES*****Category 1 – Creative Design Services*****JMJB Pty Ltd trading as JSA Creative – $12,650**Achieved the highest VFM of 74.44**Portfolio Creative Services Group Pty Ltd – $13,100**Achieved VFM of 64.37**Publicis Communications Australia Pty Ltd – $14,475**Achieved VFM of 63.09**Growthops Khemistry Pty Ltd – $14,800**Achieved VFM of 61.70**VMLY&R Pty Limited – $14,994**Achieved VFM of 60.91**The Comms Team Pty Ltd – $13,500**Achieved VFM of 60.74**Rumble Strategic Creative Pty Ltd trading as Edison – $14,600**Achieved VFM of 60.05***Category 2 – Digital Design Services*****Ogilvy Australia Pty Ltd trading as Ogilvy Brisbane – $90,660**Achieved the highest VFM of 84.01**Growthops Khemistry Pty Ltd – $94,700**Achieved VFM of 80.96**JMJB Pty Ltd trading as JSA Creative – $106,280**Achieved VFM of 80.13**Ice Media Pty Ltd – $108,300**Achieved VFM of 71.10**Publicis Communications Australia Pty** **Ltd – $116,320**Achieved VFM of 64.19**PreviousNext Pty Ltd – $137,160**Achieved VFM of 60.39***Category 3 – Search Engine Marketing and Search Engine Optimisation*****JMJB Pty Ltd trading as JSA Creative – $26,360**Achieved the highest VFM of 29.53**Ogilvy Australia Pty Ltd trading as Ogilvy Brisbane – $27,900**Achieved VFM of 27.72**Alpha Digital Design Consultants (Aust) Pty Ltd – $36,000**Achieved VFM of 24.63**Resolution Media Network Pty Ltd trading as Resolution Digital – $38,130**Achieved VFM of 23.35 | CPA (Panel Arrangement)Schedule of rates**$9,100,000** | ***Category 1 – Creative Design Services****Shortlisted offer not recommended*Ogilvy Australia Pty Ltd trading as Ogilvy BrisbaneAchieved VFM of 58.59Engine Interactive Pty. Ltd. Achieved VFM of 57.27Centreforce Technology Group Pty Ltd trading as R6 DigitalAchieved VFM of 39.11Rowland. Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 32.90*Offers not recommended*Bravo Productions Qld Pty Ltd\*Enigma Communication Pty Limited\*Creative Design Industries Pty Ltd\* Gilimbaa Pty Ltd\*Corplite Pty. Ltd.\****Category 2 – Digital Design Services****Shortlisted offer not recommended*iLiquid Pty Ltd trading as Liquid InteractiveAchieved VFM of 55.36Ernst & YoungAchieved VFM of 40.84*Offers not recommended*Symplicit Pty Ltd\*Corplite Pty. Ltd.\****Category 3 – Search Engine Marketing and Search Engine Optimisation****Shortlisted offer not recommended*Reload Media Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 17.97*Offers not recommended*Portfolio Creative Services Group Pty Ltd\*Growthops Khemistry Pty Ltd\*Corplite Pty. Ltd.\**\*Comparative price and VFM not applicable as tenderers did not meet minimum quality requirements.* | $14,650$15,250$20,625$24,420$148,713$174,328$48,960 | **Delegate**CEO**Approved**24.11.2021**Start**01.12.2021**Term**Initial term of two years with a maximum term of five years. |
| **21. Contract No. 511522****DIESEL AND ADBLUE INFRASTRUCTURE MAINTENANCE****Enviropacific Services Limited – $195,534**Achieved the highest VFM of 40.9**Lennon Engineering and Construction Pty Ltd – $201,570**Achieved VFM of 38.9 | CPA (Panel Arrangement)Schedule of rates**$1,100,000** | *Shortlisted offer not recommended*Rosenblatt Enterprises Pty Ltd as trustee for Rosenblatt Family Trust trading as L.R. Fuel ServicesAchieved VFM of 35.3 *Offers not recommended*PETRO Industrial (BNE) Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 31.3Go Industrial Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 24.0Fuelfix Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 22.9 | $181,100$233,150$236,900$198,750 | **Delegate**CPO**Approved**17.11.2021**Start**1.12.2021**Term**Initial term of three years with a maximum term of five years. |
| **22. Contract No. 520697****TRAFFIC SIGNAL WORKS****MI Electric Pty Ltd as trustee for the Morris Family Trust – $2,712,837**Achieved the highest VFM of 30**Pensar Utilities Pty Limited – $3,103,088**Achieved VFM of 28**Downer EDI Works Pty Ltd – $2,815,470**Achieved VFM of 27**GNB Energy Pty Ltd – $2,762,975**Achieved VFM of 25 | CPA (Panel Arrangement)Lump sum and schedule of rates**$23,000,000** | *Offer not recommended*Civex Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 20*Non-conforming offers*CB Energy Pty LtdJ & P Richardson Industries Pty Ltd | $2,877,759 | **Delegate**CEO**Approved**12.10.2021**Start**22.11.2021**Term**Initial term of three years with a maximum term of seven years. |
| **TRANSPORT FOR BRISBANE** |
| Nil |  |  |  |  |

**ADOPTED**

Chair: LORD MAYOR, Establishment and Coordination Committee decisions.

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

### ESTABLISHMENT AND COORDINATION COMMITTEE (Information report)

The Right Honourable, the LORD MAYOR (Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER), Chair of the Establishment and Coordination Committee, moved, seconded by the DEPUTY MAYOR (Councillor Krista ADAMS), that the report setting out the *decisions* of the Establishment and Coordination Committee as delegate of the Council during the Summer Recess 2021-22, on matters usually considered by that Committee, be noted.

Chair: Is there any debate?

LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Yes, Mr Chair, we have three items in front of us. Item A relates to the Newmarket Olympic Swimming Pool Funding Agreement. Council is proposing to enter into a funding agreement with the operators of the Newmarket Pool to deliver an upgrade of the facilities which are nearing the end of their life. The 50-metre swimming pool, including the associated plant, pipework and filtration system remain in their original 1972 condition in the main. They will be completely replaced and upgraded. Additionally the plant room and filtration systems that support the wading pool and 25-metre pool will also be upgraded.

 The Newmarket Pool sees more than 250,000 visitors each year, making it one of the most popular pools in the city. The Miller family have held the lease on the site since 2004 and they are considered a strong and reliable tenant. They also have experience designing, procuring and completing a number of other swimming pool projects in Brisbane. The works on this particular project are expected to start in April. Obviously I recommend this submission to the Chamber.

 Item B relates to the Story Bridge Adventure Climb. Item B is an amendment of Council’s operating agreement with Story Bridge Adventure Climb. The climb is one of Brisbane’s must do tourism experiences. I’ve done the climb several times myself and it is a fantastic way to see Brisbane. But also to get to know an iconic asset a bit better and learn a bit about the history of the bridge and experience something that’s quite unique.

 There are not too many bridge climbs of this kind in the world. So we are fortunate to have this great facility and asset and be able to take advantage of it for local residents and tourists. The amendment before us is required to allow the installation of additional bridge climbing activities on the northern half of Story Bridge. This additional climb activity includes a viewing platform with a swing out activity.

 These works will also ensure the continued operation of the climb throughout the major Story Bridge restoration project which is ongoing. Now if you’ve been across or near the Story Bridge in recent times, you will see significant work has been underway for quite some time on the restoration of the bridge. In order to do that, the section of the bridge that’s being treated needs to be fully enclosed. When I say fully enclosed, the purpose of that is to prevent any of the old lead-based paint from falling down into the surrounding area or indeed into the river.

 Now obviously the paint that was used on the Story Bridge in the past is not the same type of paint that we would use now, but we’re dealing with that lead-based paint. Lead being an obvious I guess control substance and a pollutant, we need to make sure that we do everything possible to capture anything that comes off the bridge as we’re restoring it.

 So there’s a process underway to remove the paint from the bridge, the old lead‑based paint. To treat and repair any areas of corrosion. Then also to put a new sealant on the bridge and new coat of paint, or multiple coats of paint in fact. This is all part of the work that we’re doing to protect and restore this iconic asset. It is a relatively old asset in the scheme of things. It can have a long life ahead of this if we continue to do this work.

 One of the, I guess, challenges presented by the project to restore the bridge, is that it will have impacts on the Story Bridge Climb. There will be sections of the bridge that will no longer be available for climbing activities during certain periods. So this additional use on the northern end of the bridge helps to provide that ongoing opportunity, even while other works are happening on the bridge.

 I acknowledge the operators have received support from the State Government for these works. This has gone through a development approval process and a change to the operating agreement is required to allow these activities on the northern half of the bridge. Obviously, as I said this will continue to support tourism activities in our city and the ongoing use of a great and iconic asset.

 In relation to item C, the COVID Response Policy, item C is Council’s COVID Response Policy and we have been—consistently we’ve been responding to COVID since early 2020. Following health directions in the first lockdown, to providing our community groups and local businesses with the support they need. We’ve always been focused on making sure we do what we can to help in the COVID recovery and the response process and support the work of other levels of government as well.

But the item that comes before us today is a response policy from the perspective of Council as an employer. As a Council we’ve always followed the health advice and health directives issued by Queensland Health and the Chief Health Officer. It’s not our decision or place to be making public health directives or to provide expert advice. We take that expert advice, we take the health directives and we implement them in relation to our operations.

Under workplace health and safety legislation, the Chief Executive Officer has a duty to eliminate or minimise so far as reasonably practical, the risk of exposure to COVID or other workplace injuries or issues. This policy ensures that we have the settings in place to allow us to manage this new phase where we’re dealing with transmission in the community. Obviously something that hasn’t happened in any large scale until now.

This policy was considered by Cabinet in time for the reopening of Queensland borders. We recognise the need to consider what reasonably available, additional controls are required to ensure our workers are protected and supported during this pandemic. The response policy provides Council with a mechanism to quickly consult on, implement and finalise procedures and control measures, in response to the changing and evolving circumstances that we’re in.

At times, and consistent with what we’ve always done, we will continue to align with Queensland Health and other directives and State Government, I guess policies and procedures, when it comes to workplace health and safety. I acknowledge the work of our Human Resources team and also the CEO and senior managers for help guiding the organisation through these challenging times. Thank you, Mr Chair.

Chair: Thank you, LORD MAYOR.

Further speakers.

Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair. I’ll just speak on Clause B and C—Clause A—sorry, all three. I want to speak on Clause A—supporting this item, the upgrade of the Newmarket Swimming Pool with a financial contribution from the lessee of Council. Which is standard practice for these upgrades.

 Clause B, the Story Bridge Adventure Climb. There were concerns raised by residents that these changes would impact the privacy in their homes. So Councillors will recall that over the last few years—so we certainly hope—didn’t recall the LORD MAYOR talking much about that then. Certainly hope that the LNP Administration took this feedback into account when making a ruling on it. Given how this Administration has treated residents all around Brisbane in terms of consultation and responding to legitimate concerns. We don’t have much faith that they did in fact do that.

 Clause C, the COVID Response Policy. It has now been two years or more than two years since the pandemic began here in Queensland and in Brisbane. Only now has this LNP Mayor put together a COVID-19 Response Policy. Throughout this entire pandemic, there has been no leadership and no direction from this Mayor, Chair, it’s been simply words. Everything is done through the city, throughout the pandemic, has been of benefit to himself only. It’s been tokenism at best.

 We saw the cuts to community grants, they were then rebranded and called a COVID relief package to make it look like he was actually doing something. Cutting basic community services like kerbside collection. Only bringing it back after an intense and prolonged community campaign. Denied casual bus drivers concessional leave days, despite working through numerous peaks and putting their own lives and health at risk. He ignored Labor’s calls for small business fee relief for six months. Only announcing after he knew there was some media interest in it. When he did announce it, it’s only been for one quarter, Chair.

 So everything’s been too little and far too late on this LORD MAYOR’s watch. This COVID Response Policy is no different. The rules around pandemic leave have been nothing short of confusing for our Council workers. Supervisors were just told to deal with it, but not given any clear instructions or guidance on what information they were to give to workers. We’ve seen zero consultation with employees on this policy.

 Briefing meetings with unions were cancelled at the last minute. This is completely irresponsible, heinous and illustrates how tokenistic this LORD MAYOR’s approach to this policy is. The LNP have drafted it up to make sure—to make it look like they were acting but couldn’t be bothered to consult with those workers, train supervisors or implement it on the ground. Council employees deserve clarity and certainly. Brisbane is the largest Council in Australia and we should be leading by example.

 In fact that is the feedback we have received from Council employees. Throughout this whole process it’s been unclear and confusing for them. They have been disappointed that Brisbane City Council, as the largest Council in Australia, hasn’t been leading from the front on this.

 But unfortunately this LNP Mayor in charge of the city doesn’t lead out on the streets or on the front line, Chair. He dictates from that ivory tower while standing in front of the Golden Mirror in City Hall. This type of selfish leadership has cost Brisbane residents and workers big time throughout this pandemic. His priorities are crystal clear. Himself and the LNP first and residents and workers last, every single time, Chair.

Chair: Further speakers? Further speakers?

Councillor WINES.

Councillor WINES: Thank you, Mr Chair. I rise to speak to item A, the Newmarket Pool arrangement to make sure that that facility gets even better. Can I begin by briefly describing Newmarket Pool. Newmarket Pool is at the edge of Newmarket and Alderley on Alderson Street and it is an excellent community facility. It is Council’s most popular summertime pool with—and it regularly takes out the second most popular pool for the city each and every year. That, in many ways is a testament to the lessees—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: —who took on this leasehold almost 20 years ago and have grown the attendance rate from that time. Where the annual attendance rate for Newmarket Pool was roughly the same as what you would expect in a January today under normal conditions. So I want to congratulate them and their efforts. They rightly have been recognised as having experience in interacting with Council and delivering a high-quality product and high-quality upgrades that’s discussed explicitly inside the report. The sort of works that they’ve been able to do with us in a partnership in the past. They really have, once again, brought that facility to a new level.

 Some of the things here that we’re doing are necessary support items around the filtration and heating system. Now the heating opportunity should mean that, rather than closing through the winter months, which it has historically done. Newmarket Pool will now be able to operate—if it chooses—if the market around there, if the people, the residents wish to swim through the winter. They will be able to do so. Therefore we’ll expect to see Newmarket swimming pool, become the most popular pool in all Brisbane very, very soon.

 The filtration system will be both for the principle pool and for the learn to swim and smaller pools around. Which is a necessary support system to make sure that the water stays healthy and clean. When you do have a public pool like that, we have to make sure that it is always healthy and safe and that the principle 50-metre pool will be replaced.

 The report says—and the LORD MAYOR recognised earlier—the pool, was built in 1972. So when my family moved from Dalby to Wilston and they were there as primary school age children to see the pool open. When I attended by Grade 11 and 12 swimming carnivals at Newmarket Pool, it was the same pool that we were all swimming in. Right down to today it is the same Olympic pool. So we have most definitely got our bang for buck out of the original 1972 Olympic pool, our community.

 It has been there for a long time but I look forward to the upgrades—to the replacement. It will be a modern, Olympic standard pool that will reflect the standards we see in other pools around the city, but also allow for better training facilities for swimmers and of the very successful swimming club there. It will allow for better water retention and lost water—and reduce water loss through water being splashed out of the pool. There’ll be improved gallery.

As you can tell, Mr Chair, I am very keen to see this project proceed and I look forward to it. I recommend it to the—to my fellow Councillors and I very much look forward to its completion some time in December, thank you.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor WINES.

Any further speakers?

Councillor JOHNSTON.

**Seriatim - Clause C**

|  |
| --- |
| Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON requested that Clause C, COVID-19 RESPONSE POLICY, be taken seriatim for voting purposes. |

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, please, thank you. With respect to item B. Just briefly—and I hope—well the LORD MAYOR’s no longer in the meeting I don’t think, but hopefully he will come back to wrap up this session. I am very interested by what swing out facilities, as part of the bridge climb project, actually means. Is this a platform that springs out? Is this people that are going to jump off the top of the Story Bridge? Is this some sort of bungy jumping? I would like some more information this.

The history of safety around the bridge and the deaths that have occurred from people who’ve committed suicide from the bridge. Make any potential movement off the bridge I think quite significant one for us. Now, I appreciate the important tourism function provided by the bridge walk and I’m very supportive of that. This may be just the way this is described in the E&C report before us today. But I have concerns about the way the descriptor has been used. That relates to what the swing out facilities are.

If this is people swinging off the bridge then I would absolutely not support what is being proposed here and I think this needs to be clarified. If this is some sort of extension of a platform then certainly I think that would need some careful scrutiny. Again if people are seen to be hanging off the side of the Story Bridge, that may present concerns for drivers passing underneath. It may present concerns from others who can see this from the ground but not see what’s happening. It may cause some distress to residents who are concerned.

I mean at the moment the bridge climb largely uses the structure of the bridge and people’s movement are somewhat sequestered within the structure of the bridge. So I’m seeking some further information about what this swing out function actually means. How it will be used and what impact that’s going to have on people’s safety and the perceived safety of people participating.

My main concern with the E&C paper today is the COVID-19 Response Policy. I note that the Chief Executive Officer and the Executive Management Team have a duty under the work health and safety legislation to quote, eliminate, or if that is not possible, minimise so far as reasonably practical, the risk of exposure to infection from COVID-19 in the workplace.

I have read the attachments, the policies. They are woefully underdone and there are a number of areas where I feel Council has been lax in this policy. That’s something that I think needs to be corrected and I don’t support what’s being put forward here today.

So let me say this. Firstly, this policy does not address customer service staff. Now customer service staff I’m particularly concerned about and there are plenty across Council. But this policy does not address customer service staff in our ward offices. Libraries are mentioned, those are examples of staff who are engaged in face to face activities and have been through the process. Events are mentioned, certainly hospitality is mentioned. But there is absolutely no reference in either of the two documents before us that is the public health and social measures linked to vaccination status, or the HRP162 COVID-19 Response Policy.

Now the only thing that I can find is that the CEO is planning to look at the significant effect to workers as defined in Council’s Certified Agreement. Now our ward staff are on individual contracts, they’re not under a certified agreement. So they’re excluded from the process that’s outlined in the policy before us today.

The policy also goes on to refer to it applying to all Council employees who have to adhere to the controls outlined. Now the controls outlined are incredibly unclear. The policy document absolutely lacks detail. So, for example, it says that Council will undertake a risk assessment. Two years into the global pandemic, they haven’t done one. Certainly I know our Council support officers talk to us about what we need, but let me be clear, the things I’ve asked for have not been delivered.

So this year I have asked whether or not Council could source rapid antigen tests for our frontline staff. These are people who are engaged in working with the community. The response I got to that was no, Council was not going to do that, but ward officers could. So I have gone and done that and I’m using my ward budget to provide tests for my staff if they require.

What concerns me now with the policy is, the policy goes on to state that there may be a requirement for staff to undertake COVID testing as a requirement—and I quote, ‘as a requirement for a person carrying out certain roles or entering certain workplaces.’ Now, presuming the requirement for rapid antigen tests for those customers who are—for those Council employees who are most exposed to the public. Presumably that’s ward office staff, that would be bus drivers, that would be library staff.

So I guess my first question is what is the Administration doing? When there is zero information in a COVID policy about how frontline Council staff are going to be supported to meet the requirement—the requirement that the CEO is now putting on them. That testing must be undertaken before entering a workplace. That is unreasonable.

Now I am fully aware that many workplaces around Queensland and Australia are requiring staff to undertake rapid antigen tests in some circumstances. Some in sensitive positions are asked to do them every day before them come to work. Others are being asked to do them at certain times. Now the CEO has put down this really broad statement that it is a requirement for a person carrying out a certain role or entering a workplace to undergo testing, but there’s no support mentioned for that.

Worse than that, it’s only certified agreement staff that are being specifically addressed. So the risk assessment, I’m concerned is inadequate. It doesn’t recognise all staff, but most importantly those in the frontline undertaking customer service in our ward offices. (2) There certainly says there’ll be consultation with affected workers, but presumably the CEO means only Council officers under certified agreements, health and safety representatives and unions.

Well, I’m sorry, but there are 27 of us—the LNP’s had an increase in staff numbers, the ALP’s had an increase in staff numbers. I haven’t—Councillor SRI hasn’t, to my knowledge. I am concerned that our staff are being left out of safety issues related to COVID. Two years into this crisis, that’s not good enough.

So my first issue is around the inadequacy of this policy. The failure of it at a practical level to address customer service staff in our ward office. Thirdly the fact that the measures in here are not practical, they have no timeframes associated with them. They don’t appear to involve consultation with all customer service staff. There are a heap of other problems with this as well but I’m running out of time.

My second issue relates to my other request which so far has been in relation to staffing. So two years ago we were told that there would be a pool of support staff provided for us to draw from when our offices were down on staff. Now we are dealing with that very situation now and my request to Councillor Support—we’ve been told that there are no staff. So I don’t know if that means that the pool’s not been set up, whether there are staff or whether or not they’re all out. But—

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, your time has expired.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Move for an extension of time?

Chair: Further speakers?

Councillor LANDERS.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

|  |
| --- |
| **399/2021-22**At that time, 3.01pm, it was resolved on the motion of Councillor Sandy LANDERS, seconded by Councillor Sarah HUTTON, that the meeting adjourn for a period of 15 minutes, to commence only when all councillors had vacated the chamber and the doors locked.Council stood adjourned at 3.02pm. |

**UPON RESUMPTION:**

Chair: Welcome back, Councillors. We’re in debate in E&C information report.

Are there any further speakers?

Councillor CUNNINGHAM.

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: Yes, thank you, Mr Chair. I am speaking on item C today. Mr Chair, somewhat predictable comments from Councillor CASSIDY. This is an HR policy, and in responding to the pandemic, Council has been managing the risks of COVID and implementing control measures outlined in a workplace health and safety plan. This Council, under the leadership of the LORD MAYOR, has in fact been very proactive in supporting our staff. We were one of the first employers to provide leave to staff to go and have vaccinations.

 I also want to acknowledge anyone in this room and in the community who may have been personally impacted by COVID in recent months. It’s been a particularly challenging time. Many of my friends have tested positive and I’m hoping for a full and speedy recovery for our residents. I also want to take the chance while I have it, Mr Chair, to thank health workers, including pathology workers who have endured some really trying circumstances. As the LORD MAYOR has said, we will continue to follow the advice and directives issued by Queensland Health and the Federal Government.

 Now, this policy has been designed using a tiered approach and allows for the introduction of additional COVID Safe controls to mitigate and manage the risks as they emerge. It allows the controls to be escalated or de-escalated as the situation changes. In summary, Mr Chair, and as the LORD MAYOR has said, it was introduced in line with borders opening and increased levels of transmission in our community, and I really want to thank the officers, particularly our HR team, who have done a lot of work behind the scenes to minimise the risk to our Council employees. That’s it, Mr Chair.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor CUNNINGHAM.

 Any further speakers? No further speakers.

 LORD MAYOR?

LORD MAYOR: No, nothing further from me.

Chair: Thank you, LORD MAYOR.

 We now move to the vote on item A and B, items A and B.

**Clauses A and B put**

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

Chair: All in favour of item C, please say aye and raise your hands.

*Councillors say aye.*

Chair: Any opposed, please say no and raise your hands.

 Are there any abstentions?

 Thank you. I declare that motion carried.

Chair: Councillors, we move on to Councillor ALLAN, City Planning and Suburban Renewal Committee decisions, please.

Councillor ALLAN: Thank you, Mr Chair. I move that the report setting out the decision—

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

Chair: Oh, there’s a point of order.

 Councillor JOHNSTON?

Councillor JOHNSTON: I was literally just let in. Did you conduct a vote on the E&C report?

Chair: Yes, with those who were in the room.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Well, I can’t get into the room, unfortunately, unless we are admitted, and it’s not reasonable for you to conduct voting if all Councillors have not been admitted back into the meeting after the afternoon tea break. So I would appreciate it if you could ensure that that vote is taken when all Councillors are admitted and in the room, because I wanted to vote on that issue.

Councillor SRI: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor SRI.

Councillor SRI: I’d like to just call a Division on that last vote so that we—

Chair: Look, I’m happy to—Councillor JOHNSTON, the—who is admitted into the room is not in my remit, outside my sphere of influence, but I’m happy, if that was the case, to conduct that vote again on item C if that is okay with all other Councillors.

Councillors, we are revoting on item C in the E&C decisions report.

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

NOES: 1 Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON.

ABSTENTIONS: 1 - Councillor Jonathan SRI.

The report read as follows⎯

#### A NEWMARKET OLYMPIC SWIMMING POOL FUNDING AGREEMENT

 **112/45/541/8**

**400/2021-22**

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

2. Newmarket Olympic Swimming Pool opened in 1972 with a 50 m pool, a children’s wading pool, a caretaker’s residence, a kiosk, and an amenities block. Robert James Miller and Vicki Lyn Miller as The Trustee for The Miller Unit Trust (The Millers) secured a lease at the venue in 2004 and have operated the facility since on several short and long-term lease agreements.

3. In 2015, The Millers approached Council with an expansion proposal. As part of the new 20‑year lease agreement, The Millers funded and built a new indoor heated program pool, an indoor hydrotherapy pool, an indoor multi-purpose fitness room, a zero-depth aquatic playground, a new playground, and part‑funded a water slide. The cost of these works was more than $2 million in total. Since the works were completed in 2015, attendance numbers have grown by 12% with more than 254,000 people visiting the venue per annum.

4. The 50 m pool and associated plant, pipework and filtration remain in original 1972 condition. This pool has been on the upgrade list for several years and has reached end of life, requiring replacement. The plant room, chemical storage and filtration systems that support the two wading pools and the 25 m pool also need upgrading to improve efficiency and workplace health and safety.

5. The scope of the works for the 50 m pool is similar to recent Council upgrade projects completed at Bellbowrie Pool, Bellbowrie; Centenary Pool, Spring Hill; Langlands Park Memorial Pool, Stones Corner; Musgrave Park Swimming Centre, South Brisbane; and Sandgate Aquatic Centre, Sandgate. The scope has been collaboratively refined between The Millers and officers from Community Facilities, Lifestyle and Community Services. The works are designed to meet Queensland Health’s *Water quality guidelines for public aquatic facilities*.

6. The scope of works for the plant room, chemical storage and filtration systems that support the two wading pools and the 25 m pool have been developed by a qualified aquatic engineer.

7. Based on these scopes of work, The Millers have obtained itemised quotes from four swimming pool builders, all located in South East Queensland, with sound experience with Council aquatic centres. These quotes range from $3.1 million to $3.7 million. This range is consistent with the costs to deliver recent upgrade works at Bellbowrie Pool, Musgrave Park Swimming Centre and Sandgate Aquatic Centre.

8. It is recommended that a maximum budget of $3.4 million is allocated to the refurbishment of the 50 m pool including all plant, filtration and heating at Newmarket Olympic Swimming Pool. If any unforeseen conditions underneath the existing 50 m pool present themselves throughout the refurbishment process, requiring additional funding, the pop-up swim wall can be removed from the scope of works to provide some contingency for the project. The cost of the swim wall is $220,000 and Council will work with the lessee on options to fund this in the short to medium term.

9. The Millers have substantial experience in designing, procuring, and completing swimming pool projects. The Millers completed the $2 million upgrade at Newmarket Olympic Swimming Pool in 2015, have worked with Brisbane Racing Club to deliver and operate the new Ascot Aquatics Centre, and have been involved in the delivery of private learn to swim facilities. Council is confident in the ability of The Millers to partner with Council to deliver these works for community benefit.

10. It is proposed to support The Millers in the delivery and management of these works, with expertise and project reporting to be coordinated by City Projects Office, Brisbane Infrastructure, in consultation with City Venues, Community Facilities, to ensure Council has oversight in the delivery of this project. These Council areas have significant experience in the delivery of a number of aquatic centre upgrades and will ensure the project is delivered to the required specifications.

11. It is planned that the works to demolish and upgrade the existing 50 m pool will commence in April 2022 and conclude in early December 2022. The required works on the 25 m pool and wading pools will be timed to minimise disruption to pool patrons.

12. Over the last four years, upgrade and improvement projects have been successfully completed at Langlands Park Memorial Pool, Runcorn Pool, Runcorn, and Sandgate Aquatic Centre by partnering with competent swimming pool lessees to deliver these works on Council’s behalf.

13. The Divisional Manager provided the following recommendation and the Committee agreed at the meeting of 13 December 2021.

14. **DECISION:**

**THAT E&C, AS DELEGATE OF COUNCIL DURING RECESS:**

1. **APPROVES ENTERING INTO A FUNDING AGREEMENT** (refer Attachment A, submitted on file) **WITH THE TRUSTEE FOR THE MILLER UNIT TRUST TO COMPLETE A REFURBISHMENT OF THE 50 M SWIMMING POOL AND UPGRADE THE FILTRATION SYSTEM ON THE EXISTING 25 M SWIMMING POOL AND WADING POOLS AT NEWMARKET OLYMPIC SWIMMING POOL TO A MAXIMUM VALUE OF $3.4 MILLION**
2. **AUTHORISES THE DIVISIONAL MANAGER, LIFESTYLE AND COMMUNITY SERVICES, TO MANAGE THE FUNDING AGREEMENT ON COUNCIL’S BEHALF.**

**NOTED**

#### B STORY BRIDGE ADVENTURE CLIMB

 **112/445/444/1349**

**401/2021-22**

15. The Divisional Manager, Brisbane Infrastructure, provided the information below.

16. Council is the owner of the Story Bridge in Brisbane. On 30 July 2003, Council and the operator of the Story Bridge Adventure Climb entered into an agreement for the design, construction and operation of a bridge walk program. The bridge walk program includes a climbing route and ancillary activities contained on the southern half of the Story Bridge (refer Attachment B, submitted on file).

17. XBrisbane Pty Ltd is the current operator of the Story Bridge Adventure Climb under an operating agreement that expires on 29 November 2035.

18. On 1 April 2021, development approval was granted to the operator for a material change of use associated with the proposed installation of additional bridge climb activities on the northern half of the Story Bridge. The additional climb activities include a viewing platform with swing-out activity to be accessed by the existing bridge maintenance walkway on the northern half of the bridge.

19. The current operating agreement only permits access via the bridge walkway on the southern half of the bridge. The terms of the operating agreement will need to be amended to allow the additional bridge climb activities to be undertaken on the northern half of the bridge.

20. The current operating agreement can be amended to incorporate the additional bridge climb activities by deed of variation.

21. The Divisional Manager provided the following recommendation and the Committee agreed at the meeting of 13 December 2021.

22. **DECISION:**

 **THAT E&C, AS DELEGATE OF COUNCIL DURING RECESS, APPROVES THE RECOMMENDATION SET OUT IN ATTACHMENT A,** hereunder.

**Attachment A
Recommendation**

 **RECOMMENDATION TO AMEND THE STORY BRIDGE ADVENTURE CLIMB OPERATING AGREEMENT BY DEED OF VARIATION**

 As:

(i) the Story Bridge Adventure Climb operates under an agreement between Council, as owner, and XBrisbane Pty Ltd, the operator, that expires on 29 November 2035

(ii) the operator of the Story Bridge Adventure Climb is seeking to install and operate additional bridge climb activities on the Story Bridge

(iii) the operator has obtained development approval on 1 April 2021 for the installation of additional bridge climb activities on the Story Bridge

(iv) the additional bridge climb activities can be incorporated into the existing operating agreement by deed of variation,

then E&C, as delegate of Council during recess, approves:

(i) amending the Story Bridge Adventure Climb operating agreement by deed of variation to include additional bridge climb activities on the northern half of the bridge, and otherwise on terms and conditions that are satisfactory to the Asset Portfolio Management Manager, Asset Management, Brisbane Infrastructure, and the Chief Legal Counsel, City Legal, City Administration and Governance.

**NOTED**

#### C COVID-19 RESPONSE POLICY

 **109/268/608/93**

**402/2021-22**

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

24. Council acknowledges that:

(a) the Queensland Government is responsible for determining public health policy and regulations related to the management and response to the COVID-19 pandemic;

(b) the Chief Health Officer (CHO) is lawfully authorised to make Public Health Directions under the *Public Health Act 2005* throughout the course of the COVID-19 pandemic;

(c) relevantly to Council, the CHO implemented the following health directives:

(i) *Public Health and Social Measures linked to vaccination status Direction*;

(ii) *Workers in a healthcare setting (COVID-19 Vaccination Requirements) Direction*;

(iii) *COVID-19 Vaccination Requirements for Workers in a high-risk setting Direction*;

(d) the Queensland Government has provided answers to questions posed by the Local Government Association of Queensland on behalf of councils to the *Public Health and Social Measures linked to vaccination status Direction* dated 7 December 2021 (as set out in Attachment B, submitted on file); and

(e) Council has no role or authority in making Public Health Directions or regulations.

25. However, the Chief Executive Officer and Executive Management Team have a duty under work health and safety (WHS) legislation to eliminate, or if that is not possible, minimise, so far as is reasonably practicable, the risk of exposure to infection from COVID-19 in the workplace.

26. Council currently has a COVID-19 Work Health and Safety Plan outlining control measures for managing the risks of COVID-19 within its operations and workforce. With the opening of Queensland’s borders, Council is considering what reasonably available additional controls will be needed to address the increased risk of COVID-19 to its workers and operations, based on what Council knows or ought to reasonably know.

27. Council is not required to mandate employee vaccination in the absence of a health directive. However, Council recognises that vaccinations are an effective way of minimising the risk of COVID-19 and must consider the potential for a vaccination policy as part of a suite of control measures.

28. The proposed COVID-19 Response Policy (as set out in Attachment A, submitted on file) has been developed in response to the factors outlined above, and the likelihood that the COVID‑19 situation and associated level of risk for Council will rapidly increase over the coming weeks or months. It is intended that the COVID-19 Response Policy will provide Council’s Chief Executive Officer with a mechanism to quickly consult on, implement and finalise procedures and control measures in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, where those controls have a significant effect on workers as defined in Council’s Certified Agreement.

*Human Rights Impact Assessment*

29. It is unlawful for Council to fail to give proper consideration to a human right relevant to a decision. In accordance with section 58(5) of the *Human Rights Act 2019*, proper consideration of human rights includes identifying any human rights that may be affected by the decision and considering whether the decision would be compatible with human rights. The human rights of some of our employees and workers may be limited by decisions made in accordance with the proposed COVID-19 Response Policy, for example, if a control measure was introduced requiring the wearing of masks or mandatory vaccination for COVID-19. The human rights that may be limited could include the right to freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief, the right not to be subjected to medical treatment without consent, the right to privacy and the right to equality. Council may only limit rights as far as is necessary to achieve an important purpose. The purpose of limiting some employee and contractor’s human rights is to help ensure the safety of Council’s workforce, customers and the wider community as required under the WorkSafe Qld Codes of Practice and the *Work Health and Safety Act 2011*. Consideration of human rights will be a part of the process provided in the proposed COVID-19 Response Policy.

30. The Divisional Manager provided the following recommendation and the Committee agreed at the meeting of 17 December 2021.

31. **DECISION:**

**THAT E&C, AS DELEGATE OF COUNCIL DURING RECESS, APPROVES TO ADOPT THE COVID-19 RESPONSE POLICY AS SET OUT IN** **ATTACHMENT A** (submitted on file).

**NOTED**

Chair: Now, we move—

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order, Mr Chair.

Chair: Pardon, Councillor JOHNSTON?

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order on a procedural—

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Just to clarify a procedural matter, you’ve just stated prior to that Division that you’re not responsible for making sure we’ve been admitted into the meeting, but you are responsible for the running of the meeting. Can you give us an undertaking now that you will ensure that all Councillors waiting to be admitted are admitted prior to you conducting any further votes?

Chair: Yes.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Thank you.

Chair: Councillor ALLAN.

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

### CITY PLANNING AND SUBURBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE

Councillor Adam ALLAN, Civic Cabinet Chair of the City Planning and Suburban Renewal Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Fiona HAMMOND, that the report setting out the *decisions* of the Establishment and Coordination Committee as delegate of the Council during the Summer Recess 2021-22, on matters usually considered by the City Planning and Suburban Renewal Committee, be noted.

Chair: Is there any debate?

Councillor ALLAN.

Councillor ALLAN: Thank you, Mr Chair. During Recess, two petitions were addressed. The first one was a petition requesting that Council implement a requirement for larger sized parking spaces for pregnant mothers to be provided in all publicly accessible car parks. The petition contained eight signatures. The petitioners suggested that the car parking spaces be of a similar dimension to those provided in car parks for carers with prams. It is proposed that this be accessed via a permit scheme, similar to the disability parking permits.

 Operators of private parking facilities may choose, at their discretion, to allocate parking spaces for particular user groups, such as pram parking. Whilst Council has responsibility for ensuring that new developments provide the requisite number in configuration of car parking spaces, it is the State Government’s Department of Transport and Main Roads (DTMR) which administers the scheme for the issuing and maintenance of disability parking permits. The introduction of a similar scheme for pregnant mothers would be a matter for DTMR to consider.

 The second petition was a request that Council immediately stop the micro‑subdivision of existing properties at Parkland Village Forest Lake. This particular petition contained 657 signatures. Petitioners requested that Council deny all development applications for subdivisions, both existing and future, and re-examines those development applications that have been approved but not yet built upon, with a view to either withdrawing approval to build or enforcing the same building conditions used by the original developers, Delfin Land Lease.

 City Plan 2014 is Council’s current plan for the future development of Brisbane and guides how land in Brisbane is used and developed. The original development control plan for Forest Lake ceased to have effect when the previous *Brisbane City Plan 2000* commenced and Council introduced the Forest Lake Local Plan. Such plans have subsequently become redundant with newer iterations. The Forest Lake neighbourhood plan provides for a range of lot sizes to be established in the residential precinct, with minimum areas ranging from less than 450 square metres to 1,000 square metres, with corresponding performance outcomes regarding the total number of dwelling houses and the spread of density across the precinct.

 Officers from Development Services continue to track these applications to ensure that the number of lots for residential purposes in the residential precinct remain within the requirements of the Forest Lake neighbourhood plan. Council have been in contact with these petitioners on a number of occasions, and I’ll leave further debate to the Chamber.

Chair: Councillor ALLAN.

 Is there any further debate?

 Councillor STRUNK.

Councillor STRUNK: Yes, thank you, Chair. As Councillor of Forest Lake Ward, I do not support the Council’s petition response which allows further micro-subdivisions of lots within the Forest Lake masterplan community, specifically the Parkland Village community’s action group prime petition that we’re debating here today. The Forest Lake masterplan was established by an Act of Parliament, and this is the only masterplan community in all of Brisbane and should be respected. The plan was designed to accommodate 8,000 dwellings in total, being made up of dwelling houses on various sized blocks, also of course including dual occupancy and also multiple dwellings, as well.

 Of the original plan of 8,000 dwellings in Forest Lake, the only—there still is a few remaining blocks that haven’t been developed, but they are really few in number. The design of the masterplan sought to make available various sized lots for large families, with the goal that parents of large families would be available to downsize to a smaller block and still be able to remain in the Forest Lake community. The reduction of these large family blocks—which, by the way, is between 1,000 and 1,200 square metres—are rapidly disappearing, which means those large families, right, won’t have that available to them once all this micro development filters right through this particular village and potentially other villages, as well.

 The current City Plan is 2014, however, many of the petitioners purchased their properties under the City Plan 2000, with the understanding that these blocks would not be subdivided in the future. A masterplan community like Forest Lake should have been, I believe, better consulted directly with any proposed City Plan changes that would have a deleterious effect on the masterplan community, bearing in mind this is the only masterplan community, so it wasn’t like we were going to have to do work right across Brisbane. We’d only really have to do it in this particular one community.

 The type of consultation should have been done in the lead-up to the new City Plan 2014, especially when you consider that both levels of government, whether it be Council and/or State Government, was controlled by the LNP. So there was not going to be any political argy and bargy here, all right? It could have been done. The recommendation to Council to the petitioners did not address the problems that the Parkland Village has with the micro-subdivisions. The petitioners are not happy with the process that Council undertook in considering the petition, specifically that the petitioners never—that the petition never came before the City Planning and Suburban Renewal Committee at any time in the past months.

 That was conveniently directed to the E&C for approval during the Committee Recess. All of the more than 650 petitioners believe that this is a very serious issue. The process is—this process is allowed. However, the petitioners, if this process is allowed, believe that their voice is important and the petition should have had the full and proper review. The petitioners are equally concerned at the fact that the correspondence from Brisbane City Council, with the decision from the E&C, was not signed off by a senior member of the E&C, specifically the Chair of City Planning or the LORD MAYOR.

 None of the information that came out of the investigation that informed the recommendation was made available to the petitioners. The petitioners who lodged—the petitioner who actually lodged the petition at the LORD MAYOR’s office initially was denied proof of lodgement, and the petitioner really insisted that they were not going to leave the LORD MAYOR’s office until that lodgement proof was received, which it in due course was. I believe that Brisbane City Council owes the residents a full review of the micro-subdivisions that are going on in the Parkland Village of the masterplan community called Forest Lake.

 Finally, the masterplan community was brought about by an Act of Parliament in a forward-thinking Brisbane City Council under the stewardship of then the Lord Mayor Sallyanne Atkinson and Premier Wayne Goss, who allowed the masterplan development to go forward, and this masterplan development was put into place to cater for the whole community, and this is what they believe is now under threat. Thank you, Chair.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor STRUNK.

 Any further speakers?

 Councillor—oh, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Just briefly on both items. Just with the item A, I note the completely inadequate petition response which basically says Council can’t require private car parking operators to allocate spaces for particular groups like mothers with prams or pregnant people. What Council can do and what Council refuses to do is to look at the TAPS (Transport Access Parking and Services) policy and make sure that there are policy settings in place to cater for the need for wider car parks. The car parking requirements in many shopping centres are incredibly narrow. They can be 2.3 or 2.4 metres wide. That’s difficult in a four-wheel drive. That’s enormously difficult if you have a pram or a mobility device.

 So I appreciate what Council’s saying here, but there is a practical way to address this issue and Council’s just refusing to look at it, and that is to look at whether or not changes to TAPS can be made to make policy changes, at least for future developments. Now, we know that these big shopping centre providers come to Council with extensions all the time, with changes to their building structures all the time. There’s certainly—for example, at Indooroopilly near me, there have been multiple DAs underway since they’ve started and multiple changes to car parking and traffic arrangements.

 So, to me, this issue has not been properly considered by Council, and I think that Council should be looking at policy changes in TAPS to make sure that this issue can be addressed in an appropriate way, and it’s disappointing that the Chair didn’t raise this. I don’t know whether E&C considered it. It just seems to be that the standard LNP response to petitions, i.e. the residents of Brisbane asking Council to look at an issue, is grossly inadequate, and there’s not a lot of innovative thinking going on. To quote John Grisham, ‘it’s deny, deny, deny’. That’s not, in my view, a good way to run an open and accountable administration.

So, to me, this is an inadequate response, and there are certainly other options, practical options that we could be looking at here that would make it better for people in the future, and certainly from a longer-term point of view.

 Just with respect to item B, I had an email about this, as I’m sure most Councillors did, and certainly, I’ve listened carefully to Councillor STRUNK’s concerns. Again, this is Council’s planning process, just doing over residents in a community. It’s very clear to me that City Plan 2014—on day one of the weeklong debate, it was clear to me that it was a grossly inadequate plan. It had terribly adverse impacts for people, and we are just seeing every day since then the damage that City Plan 2014 has caused. I think that, again, this Administration is not respecting community views, and I don’t support item B.

 I’ve listened carefully to Councillor STRUNK, who’s a very measured person, he’s very informed about this issue, and I don’t support Council’s response because it does not meet community expectations. It does not meet the intended planning scheme intent for the masterplan in this area, and again, this is a failure of Council’s planning policy to adequately address community concerns.

Chair: Thank you.

 Further speakers?

 Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Chair, yes.

**Seriatim - Clause B**

|  |
| --- |
| Councillor Jared CASSIDY requested that Clause B, PETITION – REQUESTING COUNCIL IMMEDIATELY STOP THE MICRO-SUBDIVISION OF EXISTING PROPERTIES IN PARKLAND VILLAGE, FOREST LAKE, be taken seriatim for voting purposes. |

Chair: Okay.

 Any further speakers?

 Councillor ALLAN.

Councillor ALLAN: Well, thank you, Mr Chair. Look, I’d just point out that both the City Plan 2000, City Plan 2014, the Forest Lake Local Plan, and then the subsequent neighbourhood plan all entailed public consultation and feedback. So yes, there was a mechanism for this feedback to be addressed or included in the consultation process. Now, I did take the opportunity to check with City Legal in respect of these alleged covenants or lot size control that might have been put in when Delfin did the development in the first instance.

 There seems to be a lot of reference to what was originally provided by the developers and what the community thought would remain as larger lots, but the reality is that City Legal have checked. There are no covenants on these sites. We’ve gone right back to the original acquisition, and so there are no restrictive covenants that would preclude a subdivision of these blocks to smaller blocks. So, I think that ultimately, there have been opportunities for—as the various City Plan iterations have been worked on—feedback into the process.

 So, ultimately, we have done what we believe is accurate. The Development Services team have assessed these particular applications against the requirements of City Plan and the State Planning Act. I’ll leave further debate—or actually, no further debate now. I’ll leave it at that.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor ALLAN.

We now move to the votes. A and B are seriatim.

**Clause A put**

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

Chair: I now move to 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 Planning and Suburban Renewal Committee was declared **carried** on the voices.

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

The voting was as follows:

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

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

The report read as follows⎯

#### A PETITION – REQUESTING THAT COUNCIL IMPLEMENT A REQUIREMENT FOR LARGER-SIZED PARKING SPACES FOR PREGNANT MOTHERS TO BE PROVIDED IN ALL PUBLICLY ACCESSIBLE CAR PARKS

 **CA21/774279**

**403/2021-22**

1. A petition requesting that Council implement a requirement for larger-sized parking spaces for pregnant mothers to be provided in all publicly accessible car parks, was received during the Winter Recess 2021.

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

3. The petition contains eight signatures.

4. The petitioners suggest that the car parking spaces be of a similar dimension to spaces provided in car parks for carers with prams, to allow pregnant mothers plenty of room to comfortably get in and out of their cars. To indicate the eligibility of vehicle occupants to use a ‘pregnancy parking’ space, it is suggested that a doctor or hospital may be able to issue pregnant mothers with a sticker to display on their cars (comparable to the system used for disability parking permits).

5. In Queensland, the issuing and maintenance of disability parking permits is undertaken by the Queensland Government’s Department of Transport and Main Roads (DTMR). The introduction of a similar scheme to issue permits for pregnant mothers would be a matter for DTMR to consider.

6. Council has responsibility for ensuring that new development provides the requisite number and configuration of car parking spaces. *Brisbane City Plan 2014* includes provisions in the Transport, access, parking and servicing code (the code) and associated Transport, access, parking and servicing planning scheme policy (the policy), which set out the requirements for the number and design of car parking spaces required when undertaking new development. There are no specific requirements in the code or the policy in relation to the allocation of car parking spaces for different user groups in new car parks, other than for those with a disability.

7. Council cannot require car park operators to retrospectively adjust car parking spaces to allocate space to other user groups such as pregnant mothers or carers with prams. Operators of publicly accessible private parking facilities may choose, at their discretion, to allocate special parking spaces for particular user groups. The allocation of car parking spaces and the compliance of car park users in parking in the correct spaces is a parking facility management issue and cannot be enforced by Council or the Queensland Police Service.

Consultation

8. As the petition relates to a citywide issue, and makes no reference to a specific ward, Councillor Adam Allan, Civic Cabinet Chair of the City Planning and Suburban Renewal Committee, was consulted and supports the recommendation.

Customer impact

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

10. The Divisional Manager recommended as follows and the Committee agreed at its meeting held on 13 December 2021.

11. **DECISION:**

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

**Attachment A**

**Draft Response**

**Petition Reference:** CA21/774279

Thank you for your petition requesting that Council implement a requirement for larger-sized parking spaces for pregnant mothers to be provided in all publicly accessible car parks, including car parks at shopping centres, hospitals and sporting events.

Council has responsibility for ensuring that new development provides the requisite number and configuration of car parking spaces. *Brisbane City Plan 2014* includes provisions in the Transport, access, parking and servicing code (the code) and associated Transport, access, parking and servicing planning scheme policy (the policy), which set out the requirements for the number and design of car parking spaces required when undertaking new development. There are no specific requirements in the code or the policy in relation to the allocation of car parking spaces for different user groups in new car parks, other than for those with a disability.

Council cannot require car park operators to reallocate parking spaces to other user groups such as pregnant mothers or carers with prams. Operators of private parking facilities including shopping centres and hospitals may choose, at their discretion, to allocate parking spaces for particular user groups such as pram parking. The allocation of those car parking spaces and the compliance of car park users in parking in the correct spaces is a parking facility management issue and cannot be enforced by Council or the Queensland Police Service.

The Queensland Government’s Department of Transport and Main Roads (DTMR) administers a scheme for the issuing and maintenance of disability parking permits. The introduction of a similar scheme to issue temporary permits for pregnant mothers would be a matter for DTMR to consider.

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

Should you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact Glenn McDonald, Senior Urban Planner, City Plan Operation Team, Strategic Planning, City Planning and Economic Development, City Planning and Sustainability, on (07) 3303 6088.

Thank you for raising this matter with Council.

**NOTED**

#### B PETITION – REQUESTING COUNCIL IMMEDIATELY STOP THE MICRO‑SUBDIVISION OF EXISTING PROPERTIES IN PARKLAND VILLAGE, FOREST LAKE

 **137/220/594/31**

**404/2021-22**

12. A petition requesting Council immediately stop the micro-subdivision of existing properties in Parkland Village, Forest Lake, was received during the Spring Recess 2021.

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

14. The petition contains 657 signatures.

15. It is noted that the petitioners request that Council deny all development applications for subdivision, both existing and future, and re-examines those development applications that have been approved, but not yet built upon, with a view to either withdrawing approval to build or enforcing the same building conditions used by the original developers, Delfin Lendlease.

16. The petitioners’ concerns include the following.

- The number of infill lots being approved, some less than 450 square metres.

- The infill lots not being consistent with the design, amenity or space with the much larger lot sizes and larger homes surrounding them.

- The loss of trees and native fauna.

- Lack of consideration by Council before any of these infill developments were assessed or started.

- The conflict between these developments and the intent of the *Delfin Lendlease Forest Lake Development Control Plan*, which was gazetted as a Queensland Statutory Instrument in 1994.

17. It is noted that the original subdivision development approval for the parklands included Condition K of the 439/26-105/90 approval, which stated that development should preserve as many healthy trees as possible in the estate, particularly the scribbly gums (*Eucalyptus Signata*) and tumbledown redgum (*Eucalyptus Seeana*). Furthermore, land located within 15 metres on either side of the gully running through the parklands is to be left in its natural state. Subsequently, park areas damaged during the construction work are to be revegetated to the satisfaction of Council. It is noted that no formal *Brisbane City Plan 2014* (City Plan) overlay or *Natural Assets Local Law 2003* was applied to the development to specifically retain trees on every site.

18. Council received four development applications within the parklands for Reconfiguring a lot (the subject sites). All subject sites are located within the Low density residential zone under City Plan and are within the Residential precinct of the Forest Lake neighbourhood plan. The subject sites include 56 Renoir Crescent (1 into 3 lots) (application reference A005659646), 7 Manet Crescent (1 into 3 lots) (A005771142), 11 Manet Crescent (1 into 3 lots) (A005724708) and 8 Morisot Street (1 into 2 lots) (A005795931). Under City Plan, almost all the lots created, with the exception of two, are standard lots with a site area of at least 450 square metres.

19. The proposed development applications were approved by Council on 7 April (A005659646), 9 April (A005724708), 12 October (A005795931) and 22 October 2021 (A005771142) after being assessed against the requirements of the City Plan and in accordance with the provisions of the *Planning Act 2016* (the Act).

20. The development applications were subject to code assessment and therefore public notification was not required in accordance with the Act. During the assessment of the proposed development applications, at least one submission was received for each application, with up to 33 submissions received on the most recent application. The matters raised by all submitters were carefully considered by Council officers as part of the assessment process.

21. Details of the development applications, including all documents relating to the approvals, can be accessed on Council’s Development.i website at https://developmenti.brisbane.qld.gov.au, by searching on the development application reference number.

22. City Plan is Council’s current plan for the future development of Brisbane and guides how land in Brisbane is used and developed. The original Development Control Plan for Forest Lake ceased to have effect when the previous *Brisbane City Plan 2000* (City Plan 2000) commenced (section 316 of the Act and section 1.2 and section 1.2.2, Chapter 4 of City Plan 2000) and Council introduced the *Forest Lake Local Plan* (the Local Plan). Subsequently, the Local Plan was superseded when Council created the Forest Lake neighbourhood plan and the current City Plan came into effect. Extensive citywide community consultation preceded both the City Plan 2000 and the current City Plan.

23. The Forest Lake neighbourhood plan provides that residential development be undertaken at different densities and also provide a safe, attractive, desirable environment and meet the housing needs of the community. The neighbourhood plan code provides for a range of lot sizes to be established in the Residential precinct, with minimum areas ranging from less than 450 square metres to 1,000 square metres, with corresponding performance outcomes regarding the total number of dwelling houses and the spread of densities across the precinct.

24. Officers from Development Services, City Planning and Sustainability, continue to track these applications to ensure that the number of lots for residential purposes in the Residential precinct remain within the requirements of the Forest Lake neighbourhood plan.

25. It is also important to note that Brisbane is continuing to experience sustained population growth. As the city’s population grows, Council is planning for a range of housing choices to be available for people within their community. This includes smaller houses with gardens that require less maintenance.

Consultation

26. Councillor Charles Strunk, Councillor for Forest Lake Ward, has been consulted and does not support the recommendation.

Customer impact

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

28. The Divisional Manager recommended as follows and the Committee agreed at its meeting held on 13 December 2021.

29. **DECISION:**

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

**Attachment A**

**Draft Response**

**Petition Reference:** 137/220/594/31

Thank you for your petition requesting Council immediately stop the micro-subdivision of existing properties in Parkland Village, Forest Lake. Council notes your request to deny all applications for subdivision, both existing and future, and re-examines those applications that have been approved but not yet built upon, with a view to either withdrawing approval to build or enforcing the same building conditions used by the original developers, Delfin Lendlease.

Your concerns are understood to include the following.

- The number of infill lots being approved, some less than 450 square metres.

- The infill lots not being consistent with the design, amenity or space with the much larger lot sizes and larger homes surrounding them.

- The loss of trees and native fauna.

- Lack of consideration by Council before any of these infill developments were assessed or started.

- The conflict between these developments and the intent of the *Delfin Lendlease Forest Lake Development Control Plan*, which was gazetted as a Queensland Statutory Instrument in 1994.

It is noted that the original subdivision development approval for the parklands included Condition K of the 439/26-105/90 approval, which stated that development should preserve as many healthy trees as possible in the estate, particularly the scribbly gums (*Eucalyptus Signata*) and tumbledown redgum (*Eucalyptus Seeana*). Furthermore, land located within 15 metres on either side of the gully running through the parklands is to be left in its natural state. Subsequently, park areas damaged during the construction work are to be revegetated to the satisfaction of Council. It is noted that no formal *Brisbane City Plan 2014* (City Plan) overlay or *Natural Assets Local Law 2003* was applied to the development to specifically retain trees on every site.

Council has received four development applications within Parkland Village for Reconfiguring a lot. All subject sites are located within the Low density residential zone under City Plan and are within the Residential precinct of the Forest Lake neighbourhood plan. The subject sites are 56 Renoir Crescent (1 into 3 lots) (application reference A005659646), 7 Manet Crescent (1 into 3 lots) (A005771142), 11 Manet Crescent (1 into 3 lots) (A005724708) and 8 Morisot Street (1 into 2 lots) (A005795931). Under City Plan, almost all the lots created, with the exception of two, are standard lots with a site area of at least 450 square metres.

The proposed development applications were approved by Council on 7 April (A005659646), 9 April (A005724708), 12 October (A005795931) and 22 October 2021 (A005771142) after being assessed against the requirements of the City Plan and in accordance with the provisions of the *Planning Act 2016* (the Act).

The development applications were subject to code assessment and therefore public notification was not required in accordance with the Act. During the assessment of the proposed development applications, at least one submission was received for each application, with up to 33 submissions received on the most recent application. The matters raised by all submitters were carefully considered by Council officers as part of the assessment process.

Details of the proposed development applications, including all documents relating to the approvals, can be accessed on Council’s Development.i website at https://developmenti.brisbane.qld.gov.au by searching on the development application reference number.

City Plan is Council’s current plan for the future development of Brisbane and guides how land in Brisbane is used and developed. The original Development Control Plan for Forest Lake ceased to have effect when the previous *Brisbane City Plan 2000* (City Plan 2000) commenced (section 316 of the Act and section 1.2 and section 1.2.2, Chapter 4 of City Plan 2000) and Council introduced the *Forest Lake Local Plan* (the Local Plan). Subsequently, the Local Plan was superseded when Council created the Forest Lake neighbourhood plan and the current City Plan came into effect. Extensive citywide community consultation preceded both the City Plan 2000 and the current City Plan.

The Forest Lake neighbourhood plan provides that residential development be undertaken at different densities and also provide a safe, attractive, desirable environment and meet the housing needs of the community. The neighbourhood plan code provides for a range of lot sizes to be established in the Residential precinct, with minimum areas ranging from less than 450 square metres to 1,000 square metres, with corresponding performance outcomes regarding the total number of dwelling houses and the spread of densities across the precinct.

Officers from Development Services, City Planning and Sustainability, continue to track these applications to ensure that the number of lots for residential purposes in the Residential precinct remain within the requirements of the Forest Lake neighbourhood plan.

Brisbane is continuing to experience sustained population growth. As the city’s population grows, Council is planning for a range of housing choices to be available for people within their community. This includes smaller houses with gardens that require less maintenance.

Please let the other petitioners know of this information.

Should you have any further questions, please contact Mr Brendan Gillham, Team Manager, Planning Services South, Development Services, City Planning and Sustainability, on (07) 3403 5958.

Thank you for contacting me with your concerns.

**NOTED**

## CONSIDERATION OF NOTIFIED MOTION – AFFORDABLE HOUSING

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

**405/2021-22**

The Chair of Council (Councillor David McLACHLAN) then drew the Councillors’ attention to the notified motion listed on the agenda, and called on the LORD MAYOR (Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER), to move the motion. Accordingly, the LORD MAYOR moved, seconded by the DEPUTY MAYOR—

*That this Council:*

1. *Calls on the Queensland Government to increase the percentage of social and affordable housing within the Woolloongabba Station Priority Development Area (PDA) from a minimum 15% to a minimum 30% to help address the chronic shortage of social and affordable housing in Brisbane.*
2. *Calls on the Queensland Government to rule out their initial plan for the PDA which allowed a developer to ‘convert’ the provision of affordable housing to a financial contribution in-lieu.*
3. *Calls on the Queensland Government to amend the Interim Land Use Plan to require significantly reduced car parking for all future residential development within the PDA, noting the close proximity to a future Cross River Rail and existing busway station, and significant traffic congestion on all sides of the site.*

Chair: Is there any debate?

 LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Yes, thank you, Mr Chair. Obviously, Brisbane and Queensland, right across the spectrum, has had, in recent times, a significant boost in property values, and it’s come at an unexpected time in many ways where many people were originally in the start of the pandemic concerned about how the property market would track, but then it went gangbusters, to the point where many parts of Brisbane have seen increases of 30 to 40 to even 50% or more in their valuations and sale prices.

 Now, obviously, that’s something that, if you own a house, you will be pretty excited about, to see the value of your more than likely number one investment increase, but we’re also conscious of the fact that if you’re not currently a property owner, that presents even more challenges to getting into the market. In particular, it provides a challenge when it comes to key workers—so when I talk about key workers, I mean those essential workers that keep our city ticking, whether they are nurses in hospitals in South Brisbane and other areas, whether they are teachers, whether they are police officers, whether they are cleaners, but all of those essential people keep our economy ticking along, and not necessarily in the higher-paid jobs, but having a significant affordability issue to live near where they would ideally like to live, or in fact to live near their workplace.

 So, one of the very special opportunities and important opportunities that we have here with Woolloongabba in the PDA and also the Cross River Rail site is a great opportunity to do something that is incredibly well located. It is literally—and look, we’re used to seeing real estate agents say that every single property they’re selling is well located, but this one is hard to beat. It is hard to find any other large site—and this is a large site, I think this is something like 24 football fields of land that we’re talking about, so it’s a large site.

 It is located literally within a stone’s throw of the city. It is located within a stone’s throw of major transport infrastructure that either exists at the moment or is being built. It exists within a stone’s throw of our new Kangaroo Point Green Bridge that construction is gearing up on right now. It exists with great access to many different parts of the city, and it exists close to those areas of major employment, whether they be hospitals or universities, whether they be office buildings in the CBD, whether they be those inner city employment hubs. So, it is genuinely hard to find a better located site in the whole of Brisbane.

 So, that’s one thing, but the second thing is, this is a government-owned site. This is a site that is already owned by the taxpayers and the ratepayers of Brisbane. It is owned by the State Government, and as we know, it is currently a construction site for the Cross River Rail project, a project that will deliver a new station right on this site which will provide great access for any new development that occurs, for any new parkland that is provided here, and also for the Olympic venue that will be the Gabba Stadium in the future. Nearby, we have a busway station, and that busway station will continue to service this new development.

 Nearby, we have our fantastic Woolloongabba Bikeway, right across the road from this site that links people safely in through to our existing bikeway network. So it ticks all of the boxes when it comes to location. It ticks the box in terms of already being government owned. It ticks the box in terms of public and active transport access, and I’ve mentioned also proximity to the Kangaroo Point Bridge. So, we have a real opportunity to do something here that will make a difference when it comes to the provision of affordable housing and social housing in our community.

 So, what we’re simply asking is that the State Government lifts their sights when it comes to what they can do with this particular site when it comes to affordable and social housing. They proposed early on that they would have 15% affordable housing in any new redevelopment of the site, and we are saying that target is nowhere near bold enough. It should be at least double that. To have a provision of 30% or a minimum of 30% affordable or social housing on this site makes so much sense. It provides for those key workers at a location that is ideal. That would potentially total up to 600 apartments on this site if we look at the size of the site.

 Now, you know, you might say, well, will this actually even make a dint when it comes to affordability? Absolutely, it will. Absolutely, it will. If you actually look at the provision of social housing by the State Government in recent years, we’ve seen the number of tenancies—I’m advised—the number of tenancies managed by the State Government in terms of social housing has only increased by 287, whereas over the same period, the waitlist for that social housing has increased by 1,800.

 So, this would represent significantly more housing than the State Government has built in years. You have to go back, I think, something like 2017, and this one project would provide more housing than something like four or five years of State Government provision. So this would make a difference, it would make a real difference, and it is a good place to start, given it is already State Government owned and that the plans for the site do not appear to have been confirmed or locked in at this stage.

 So, the current approach that the State Government is using is not working. We’d like to work with them to deliver a good outcome on a site that they own. Now, there’s been various challenges that they have had over the years when it comes to increasing the supply of public housing and it seemed to me that, instead of just building new public housing, what the State Government has been doing has been selling off existing public housing in a lot of areas. So, rather than just increasing the stock, they’re selling some and they’re trying to use some of that money to build new stock, but we’re not getting the outcomes I think that the community would expect, and certainly not meeting the demands of those waiting lists that we can see.

 So, this would provide a major boost to the State Government’s provision of affordable and social housing, it is well located, but the other thing that I wanted to say is that the zoning of this site is appropriate. Some of the other areas where the State Government has proposed to do large-scale projects have been in low density areas, low density communities, and many people across—and we’ve heard the debate that Councillor STRUNK just talked about in a low-density area. Many people would not like to see the nature or character of their low-density areas changed in a substantial way.

 So, this provides an opportunity that is in an appropriate area for a significant higher density proposal, and as I said, is really well located. The other thing that I wanted to point out is that our proposal talks about reducing the amount of car parking that is provided at this site. Now, it makes obvious sense that, when you’ve got such great public transport links, when you have such great active transport links, not only a train station that will see trains, according to the State Government, turning up every six minutes, you’ve got a busway station near that sees buses turn up literally every minute or so.

 You have a world class bikeway leading to this precinct and we’re building a bridge just down the road to get you into the city. These are all good reasons why you would look at lower provision of car parking, but there is another one, as well. If you had thousands of new residents living in this site and all of those residents had a car, or even if there was a couple of cars per household, the burden and the additional traffic congestion that that would place on the surrounding traffic network there would bring it to a grinding halt. I have no doubt about that.

 You would not get a good traffic congestion outcome. You would literally add to what is already a congested part of the city thousands and thousands of extra motor vehicle trips per day. So this is a great example to put that transit-orientated development to test right here in this ideal location. So, we’re taking a very reasonable approach here. We want to work with State Government to get a good outcome for housing affordability in our city and in our community. I think I’ve touched on some of the reasons why this site is really, genuinely a great opportunity and it’s unique. One final thing—

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

LORD MAYOR: Thank you.

Chair: Further speakers?

 Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair. I rise to speak in support of this motion. As I see it, the conversation around housing affordability needs to become much more prominent and action certainly does need to be taken now. House prices are skyrocketing across Brisbane and locals are being priced out of their communities. Rental prices in the last year have increased by 12.9% while wages grew by 0.2% across Queensland, obviously very concentrated in the south-east corner and in Brisbane.

 So this, by definition now, is a crisis. Housing is one of the most basic human rights, but in Brisbane, that very much is under threat for ordinary people. Some pundits are predicting Brisbane as an Olympic City will have a $1 million median house price. That is not a good Olympic legacy for more than 50,000 people on the public housing waitlist or the tens of thousands or probably hundreds of thousands soon living in precarious private rentals, as well. Everywhere I go, everything I see points to the fact that one of the biggest issues facing Brisbane is housing security, which is the biggest part of people’s economic security.

 It’s interesting to see this current LORD MAYOR all of a sudden become an advocate for affordable housing without really doing anything himself to address the issue, Chair. Advocacy is of course important. We do need champions at a Council level for public and social housing. Councillor SCHRINNER is an advocate, of course, for himself. When you’ve been around as long as Councillor SCHRINNER has, you get yourself a bit of a track record.

 You only have to look at his time as Councillor for Chandler Ward to see what he really thinks of public housing. In front page news, he said—and I quote, Chair, ‘the largest stock of public housing is in Inala and we all know what reputation that suburb has’, Councillor SCHRINNER said. He went on to say, ‘if the government thinks local residents will stand by and watch Carina Heights turn into a slum, they are gravely mistaken’. They are the words of this current LNP LORD MAYOR, Adrian SCHRINNER.

 So I don’t think a leopard ever really changes its spots. It’s quite evident, Chair, the current LORD MAYOR doesn’t have much conviction or understanding, I think, when it comes to this issue. In the space of minutes, just the other day when the current LORD MAYOR put this idea out there, he both claimed that what he was wanting at the Woolloongabba site would be public housing and then not public housing, but social or affordable housing. He said that again. He’s been conflating both of those again today in this debate. He doesn’t seem to have much of an understanding about the difference between government-owned, State-run Department of Housing or social and community run housing, or the definition of affordable housing, as well.

 I think he is probably confused for a pretty good reason. He’s not really committed to the issue. He got what he wanted out of it at the time, Chair, and that was some media. So it’s all well and good for this LNP Mayor to come in here today, to put pressure on other levels of government, to act on housing affordability, but as the largest Council in Australia, we should be leading by example. As a Council, we should be acting on this issue in every manner possible and investing in affordable housing. The last time Council did anything meaningful on affordable and social housing was when Jim Soorley helped set up the Brisbane Housing Company.

 The LNP have done absolutely nothing on that front since. Instead of helping community housing providers provide social and affordable housing, this LNP Administration have, instead of doing that, decided to give millions of dollars in developer discounts to billionaires building five-star hotels in the CBD of Brisbane. That’s the real priority. That’s the track record of this LNP Administration in Council. The Labor team in Council has been listening to housing providers. We have been meeting with community housing providers. We won’t just be an advocate for them and will be putting forward practical actions that really address the housing affordability crisis here in Brisbane.

 The affordability crisis in people being able to afford to purchase a home and the affordability crisis of people being able to rent a home in this city, as well. Now, we had the LORD MAYOR casting aspersions on the State Government’s track record when it comes to investing in social housing. At the moment, while he’s trying to distract from his own inadequacies when it comes to housing affordability on his watch and his city, the State Government is investing $2.9 billion into social and affordable housing.

 That’s the largest concentrated investment in Queensland’s history, which will deliver $7,400 new social and affordable housing commencements across Queensland by 30 June 2025. So, while we’re seeing action on that front, we’re seeing some form of advocacy by the LORD MAYOR, even though it’s mostly self-serving. We will support this motion today, but we want to—in wanting to help address the housing affordability crisis in this city, but we certainly don’t trust this LNP Administration to take an actual lead on anything to do with Brisbane’s housing affordability crisis, which is a great shame for our city.

Chair: Thank you.

Any further speakers?

Councillor OWEN.

Councillor OWEN: Thank you, Mr Chairman. Mr Chairman, I rise in support of this motion today and I think it is very important that, in this debate, all speakers must be very careful not to disparage or marginalise people who need public or affordable housing, because it is a matter of dignity and allowing them to be treated with respect as we look at options available to them. Mr Chair, it’s interesting to hear the Leader of the Opposition, because the Labor Party likes to talk the talk when it comes to affordable housing and transit-oriented developments, but never really walks the walk.

 What the LORD MAYOR has outlined today is a very sensible plan to ensure the Labor State Government can actually deliver on affordable housing in Brisbane. Now, this is putting forward a very sensible option. We have a very, very unique opportunity with the Woolloongabba priority development area, referred to generally as the PDA, to use 30% of that site for social and affordable housing. It is also an opportunity to take advantage of the very significant public transport connections in this area, to limit car usage, and to deal with the increased congestion that we are seeing and that will be expected in and around the Gabba in years to come.

 Now, I do certainly hope that the Premier and her Cabinet colleagues do pay attention to what the LORD MAYOR has outlined today. If they do down in George Street, if they listen to what the LORD MAYOR has said today, then approximately 600 social and affordable housing apartments will be extremely well serviced by the initiatives, particularly the public and active transport ones, that the Schrinner Council is leading. Of course, our game-changing Brisbane Metro will deliver in spades for the new residents around the Gabba, through the Mater Hill Metro station, as well as enhanced bus services through the Woolloongabba busway station.

 With 60 turn-up-and-go Metros, Mater Hill will service both Metro lines and be able to access stations all the way from the Royal Brisbane and Women’s Hospital to Eight Mile Plains or to the University of Queensland.

Councillor SRI: Point of order.

Councillor OWEN: Woolloongabba busway station is a key hub for our bus—

Chair: You raised a point of order, Councillor SRI?

Councillor SRI: Yes.

Councillor OWEN: —and that’s how it links in with this PDA site.

Chair: Excuse me, Councillor OWEN.

 Councillor SRI is raising a point of order.

Councillor SRI: Sorry, Chair. I’m—yes, just on relevance, I understand Councillor OWEN is going on a bit of a digression around the Metro, which I’m fine with, but I just want to understand because I might also like to go on a digression about public transport, whether that is relevant to the motion.

Chair: I believe it’s relevant, given the location of the site in question.

Councillor SRI: Okay, cool.

Chair: Thank you. Councillor OWEN.

Councillor OWEN: I’ll just repeat my last statement again. The Woolloongabba busway station is a key hub for our bus network, particularly at this PDA site. This site will be serviced by high-frequency routes. The buses that travel through that stop at the Gabba service many outer suburbs, as well, and this will provide connectivity for people living in this PDA site to travel easily to visit family and friends across the city. The Schrinner Council has also funded a business case for a new CityGlider, the gold CityGlider, that will add another high frequency bus service to connect Woolloongabba and this PDA site with the city, and also through to Hamilton.

 What I can only hope is the State Government gets onboard and puts their money where their mouth is when it comes to public transport and agrees to contribute funding for this service. Alongside Cross River Rail, this former Goprint site is well positioned to be connected by bus, train, Metro, and also the Kangaroo Point Green Bridge. I know that this site at the Gabba PDA will see many people utilising the Schrinner Council’s green bridges. So, we also know that the Kangaroo Point Green Bridge is currently under construction, and it will also be a very important connection from the city to the inner south, whether the people living in this site want to walk or ride or use an e-bike or an e-scooter.

 It is critical for the future development of the area and reducing congestion that we have a high-quality active transport connection for these people that potentially will move in at this location. I can already see that some of the thousands of people who are likely to move into this development will be, in the future, walking or riding into the CBD and utilising the other means of public transport to get around the city. Now, when we look at it, it would take about 10 minutes to ride a bike from that Goprint site to C.T. White Park, which is the landing spot for the Kangaroo Point Green Bridge.

 Mr Chair, as you can see, whether it is bus, train, Metro, walking, cycling, or e‑scooter, our city now has a once-in-a-generation opportunity for a truly transport-focused development that will also help to tackle our affordable housing crisis. So, this is a very critical moment for the State Government to act, and I just reflect that the Leader of the Opposition said in his speech that action needs to be taken now. So, I do say, please convey that also to your colleagues up in George Street. The LORD MAYOR’s call for a social and affordable housing guarantee at this Gabba site is required, and you only have to look at the latest REIQ (Real Estate Industry of Queensland) Residential Vacancy report, which showed the Greater Brisbane vacancy rate had plummeted to just one per cent.

 This is also supported by the latest Productivity Commission report which has just been released, as well. We all know that property prices have grown and keep growing, and rental properties have become harder to find. The average house price in Gabba is now more than $1 million, locking out so many young people and essential workers, and many of these people rely on public transport, which is why it is important that we do have these sorts of housing options available where there are these major public transport connections and opportunities for them.

 This site will be one of the most connected parts of our city. With the proper planning and vision that the LORD MAYOR has outlined, it is now up to the Palaszczuk Labor Government to not let that go to waste. Labor will be missing an opportunity if they don’t put their hands up with support to this, to really show their support to the most vulnerable in our community. This is an opportunity for our city to be a connected city, which will be less reliant on cars and hence will be a better environmental outcome. The LORD MAYOR’s proposal is more than double the number of new public housing properties the State has managed to deliver across all of Queensland since 2017.

 So, I say to everybody, get on board with this opportunity for Brisbane. The Schrinner Council is setting a clear vision for our city where we can provide affordable housing and deliver access to world-class public and active transport connections, as well. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor OWEN.

Further speakers?

Councillor SRI.

Councillor SRI: Thanks, Chair. It’s a pleasure to speak on this motion, and I must say, it’s a pleasure to see the other Councillors in the Administration are finally jumping onboard with this discussion in a bigger way. It’s certainly not the first time other Councillors have talked about the need for social housing, but this does feel like a positive step. I’ve felt frustrated for some years that the Council didn’t seem to be actively engaging sufficiently with the opportunities presented around the Gabba Cross River Rail site, and so I do want to acknowledge that I think this is a positive step from the LNP Administration to at least be bringing this motion and putting a bit of pressure on the State Government.

 I’ll start by saying that I agree wholeheartedly with the Mayor’s contributions in terms of paragraphs two and three of the motion. The argument is well made and it clearly makes sense that this should be a car-free development and it would be ridiculous for the developers to be allowed to provide financial contributions in lieu of affordable housing. I would just stress that I think it really ought to be car free, not just car light. That means that, with the exception of a few loading zones and disability parking bays, there doesn’t need to be any off-street parking at all because it is so well served by public transport, as Councillor OWEN just outlined.

 I would also add that, by not having to provide car parking onsite, whoever develops this site, whether it’s the State Government or non-profit housing orgs, will save a lot of money because they won’t have to spend millions of dollars on big basement car parks, et cetera. The concerns I did have, though, and would like to unpack over the next few minutes, really come down to the lack of ambition and the slippage in definitions, which Councillor CASSIDY already touched on briefly, but I do hope the Mayor will engage with this and reflect on this, and hopefully it will go on to influence his public messaging in other contexts.

 The term affordable housing is so unhelpfully vague and ambiguous that it is capable to being applied to a really broad range of development styles, some of which don’t actually help address the housing affordability crisis. In this case, to be fair to the Mayor, he’s simply using the State Government’s own language, and I’m pointing the finger squarely at the State Government here for being quite, I think, slippery in terms of how they deploy language when they use the term affordable housing.

 To be clear, when I say public housing, I’m talking about traditional, government‑owned, government-managed housing where rent is capped at 30% of a tenant’s income. That’s public housing and that’s genuinely affordable for people on low incomes, 30% of their income, and the reason it’s capped in that way is that there’s ample research available talking about housing stress, and that once you’re paying more than 30% of your income towards housing, you’re really under a lot of housing stress, you start skipping meals, medical expenses become an issue, et cetera. So, that 30% is really important.

 The problem we have is that the State Government—and, in this case, the Mayor—use the term affordable housing, usually to mean rental accommodation which is rented out at 75% of market rents. That term affordable housing has been used by the State Government to apply both to privately owned housing that’s rented out at 75% of market rent and also to housing that’s rented out by non-profit housing orgs, and in some cases managed—owned by the State Government and managed by those orgs. Let’s just think a bit about what would that mean for a suburb like Woolloongabba? Because currently, the latest real estate guidance suggests that the average rent on an apartment in Woolloongabba is $540 per week.

 That’s average rent on an apartment, and believe me, there are a lot of pretty low‑quality apartments included in that average. So, if we think about 75% of that market rent, we’re talking about $400. That’s what an apartment would be rented out under the State Government definition of affordable housing. It’s $400 per week. So, for a tenant to not be under housing stress, for a tenant in one of these affordable housing apartments—and, LORD MAYOR, I hope you’re following me, please interrupt—anyone, feel free to interrupt me with questions if this isn’t making sense, but for a tenant of one of these properties to not be under housing stress, their take-home pay after tax would have to be over $1,200 a week.

 Otherwise, they’re under housing stress and, by definition, these affordable housing apartments are not actually that affordable. So when we talk about affordable housing for key workers, we have to ask ourselves, is the average nurse or the average teacher taking home $1,200 per week after tax? I don’t think they are. If they’re not, then this definition of affordable housing of 75% market rent actually doesn’t serve us very well. It’s important for all of us as elected representatives, and particularly for the major parties, to grapple with that challenge and recognise that their current definitions of affordable housing aren’t actually that affordable.

 More broadly, I wanted to make the point that, as the LORD MAYOR said, this is public land and it should not be sold off, and to use the Mayor’s own words, that target is nowhere near bold enough. So the Mayor’s 100% right that the State Government’s projections of 15% social and affordable, that’s woefully inadequate, but the Mayor’s own proposed figure of 30% is, in my view, also woefully inadequate. This is a publicly owned site. My view is that 100% of the site should remain in public ownership and that 100% of any dwellings or buildings on there should remain publicly owned.

 I think that’s what we should be talking about when we’re talking about public land. In other cities, they have forms of inclusionary zoning where private developers are required to hand back apartments to the public. Here, we’re talking about the opposite. I know there are some, I think, reasonable discussions to be had around creating good social mixes, and legitimate concerns that if 100% of the housing stock on a site like this were made available to people in very high needs that that would reinforce forms of locational disadvantage and concentrated disadvantage.

 I think some of those arguments are a little bit classist and have been well critiqued in other forums, but it’s important to remember that, even if 100% of the apartments on a site like this remain in public ownership, the State Government still has a range of levers to ensure a diverse mix of demographics and income levels and communities are housed on this site. So it’s possible, for example, that 100% of the apartments on the site could remain publicly owned. Some of them would be rented out to people on very low incomes with very high needs.

 Some might be forms of supported accommodation, but some could indeed be rented out to so-called key workers, to middle class people, at slightly higher rents, though I would argue not 75% of market rent. In doing so, the State Government is able to cross-subsidise the revenue from those higher paying tenants to actually make the project viable long term. This is one of the great tragedies of housing policy in Queensland, is that we’ve basically outsourced and privatised all the most profitable parts of the housing sector.

 The government is left with the costs of providing housing to people only on the lowest incomes and the highest needs, whereas if reconceptualise public housing as being something that is also available to the middle class and is also available to people on higher incomes, that becomes a revenue stream that can make the whole project more sustainable long term. So I would argue very strongly that this site should be retained 100% for public housing. However, I’m going to move an amendment which proposes to amend the first paragraph of the motion and replace the figure 30% with the figure 90%.

 This would mean that the motion reads—paragraph one will read, calls on the Queensland Government to increase the percentage of social and affordable housing within the Woolloongabba Station priority development area from a minimum 15% to a minimum 90% to help address the chronic shortage of social and affordable housing in Brisbane.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Seconded.

Councillor SRI: Thanks, Councillor JOHNSTON, for that seconding. As I’ve pointed out, the substance of a motion like this doesn’t actually require that all 90% of that housing stock would be rented out to people on very high needs or on very low incomes. It could still be used to deliver a mix of housing tenures to a mix of demographics and income levels. Certainly, I think, considering how expensive all the housing is getting on surrounding sites, there’s a very strong case that the entire—that because all the other apartments on surrounding sites are very expensive, that the entirety of the site should be public housing for people on low incomes, and that would still deliver a good mix of residential accommodation types within that part of Woolloongabba.

 The amended motion I’m putting forward doesn’t go into that level of detail. It uses the LORD MAYOR’s own level of ambiguity and the State Government’s own level of ambiguity, and leaves open the possibility that different tenures and different income levels could be housed, but simply reinforces the principle that, because this is public land, that housing should remain publicly owned. I think that’s a crucial point that we as Councillors should not relent on, that anything else would be an asset sale, and that’s effectively what the MAYOR’s initial motion was supporting, is that the MAYOR is supporting an asset sale of at least 70% of developed—

Chair: Councillor SRI, your time has expired.

 Are there further speakers?

Councillor SRI: Sorry, I’ve moved—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: He didn’t move it, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor SRI: I did.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor SRI: I did and Councillor JOHNSTON seconded it.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: He didn’t physically move the motion to commend—

Councillor SRI: No, I did, Chair, and I’ve sent it through.

Chair: You flagged it without moving it.

Councillor SRI: No.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor SRI: I moved it and I sent it through.

Chair: Okay, I’ll take it as moved.

**MOTION FOR AMENDMENT TO NOTIFIED MOTION:**

|  |
| --- |
| **406/2021-22**It was moved by Councillor Jonathan SRI, seconded by Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON that the notified motion be amended by the removal and insertion of such words so that the motion would read as follows:*(i) in paragraph 1 of the Affordable Housing notified motion be amended so that the figure “30%” is replaced with “90%” and the paragraph reads:* *“Calls on the Queensland Government to increase the percentage of social and affordable housing within the Woolloongabba Station Priority Development Area (PDA) from a minimum 15% to a minimum 90% to help address the chronic shortage of social and affordable housing in Brisbane.”* |

Chair: Councillor SRI, you have five minutes to speak to your amendment.

Councillor SRI: Thanks, Chair. I think I’ve broadly made the point I wanted to make. I would just use this opportunity to remind the Mayor and remind the Council Administration of Councillor OWEN’s very apt words, which I thought were right on point. I think she said—and I’m quoting here—please convey that to your colleagues up in George Street. The Council Administration is right to put pressure on the Queensland Labor Government, but the LORD MAYOR is also a senior powerbroker within the Queensland LNP.

 I haven’t yet seen any commentary from LNP State Members about this proposal, and I would respectfully and sincerely encourage the Mayor to talk to his State colleagues, because we can move motions here in the Council Chamber, by all means, but it would be very helpful if the LNP came out at the State level and joined the Greens MPs in calling for a larger proportion of this site to be preserved for a public and affordable housing. So I will just leave that thought with the Mayor and remind him that symbolic motions here at this level of Chamber are a good start, but you’re a significant powerholder in this State and you should be going back to your own Party and encouraging State LNP Members to elevate and amplify this call, as well, in order to put pressure on the State Government.

 In terms of this amended motion, I actually think it’s something that all members of this Chamber would be able to support because it is not specifying exactly what social mix would be involved in the site. It’s not saying that 90% of the housing stock would have to be public housing as that is currently understood. There’s a range of tenure options available. Certainly, as someone who would like to be able to afford to live in this area long-term, there’s a lot of people who might be described as middle-income earners who—they don’t—they’ve already given up on the idea of buying a house of their own, but the idea of having long-term security of tenure, where they can rent a government-owned apartment is really attractive.

 We are not talking about people who are down-and-out or who are really struggling financially. We’re talking about middle class young professionals, for whom ownership may be—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor SRI: Pardon?

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor SRI: Oh yes. I mean, I’d love to be able to afford to rent in Woolloongabba, yes. Right now, though, the situation is pretty dire for a lot of young people, and it’s opportunities like this where we can aim a little higher, we can be a little bolder, and 90% of housing stock being made available for people who really need to live in that area, I think, would be a really good aspiration and a target to set. I think it should be 100%. I’ve moved 90% because I think that’s something that the LNP ought to be comfortable supporting, and emphasising once again that that doesn’t necessarily mean it has to all be public housing.

 It could be a mix of different forms of affordable and subsidised accommodation. I will just add, as well, that the Greens are on the public record as calling for 80% of the site to be preserved for public greenspace and public facilities, such as sports fields. The site is 10 hectares in total, so there’s plenty of room for more greenspace, and I do want to emphasise that the State Government has been a little bit ambiguous and slippery with its comments on that front, as well. It was good to hear the Mayor reinforcing the importance of public greenspace on this site, but the State Government so far has said 50% public open space.

 Public open space is not the same as public greenspace, and we need to be really clear that what we need is 80% public greenspace and public sports fields. Public open space is just concrete, like King George Square. You could deliver 50% public open space on a site like this just with the concrete pathways between buildings, but that’s not what I’m calling for. In addition to a significant proportion of public housing on this site, we need a significant proportion of the site set aside for public parkland and public greenspace and community facilities that can meet the needs of this growing area.

 So I hope Councillors will seriously consider supporting this amended motion. Once again, though, I really want to reiterate that it would be helpful for the LNP to be clearer and more specific about distinguishing between public housing and affordable housing, because I think that’s a crucial question in this debate. I’ve seen lots of developers describe their projects as delivering affordable housing, when actually, they’re not genuinely affordable.

 As I explained earlier with the rough maths on the back of the envelope, you have to be taking home over $1,200 a week after tax in order for an apartment that’s rented out at 75% of market rate rent to be genuinely affordable and not cause you housing stress. So, I’ll leave it at that and welcome any other debate on the amended motion.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor SRI.

 Further speakers on the amendment?

 Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, just briefly on the amendment, but I flag, I do want to speak on the substantive motion. I’m happy to support Councillor SRI’s proposal so that he can get his agenda up today for discussion. I don’t agree with the proposal, though, to 90%. I have some concerns with that, and certainly, I think there needs to be a diversity of housing in any major Masterplan redevelopment in the city, otherwise there are very significant problems that flow. I have some further significant comments on the substantive motion, and I’ll speak on that in a moment.

Chair: Thank you.

 Any further speakers on the amendment?

 Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Yes, thanks, Chair. I think it’s pretty clear that the LORD MAYOR needs to articulate a bit better exactly what he’s talking about when it comes to his support for public housing or affordable housing that’s provided at 75% caps, like Councillor SRI says, or community-provided social housing, as well. The broadness of Councillor SRI’s amendment is acceptable to Labor Councillors.

 The—having 90% affordable housing does give a project like this great scope to invite community housing proprietors to be part of this, as well as publicly delivered housing in the traditional sense, as well as some privately delivered housing, as well. The model, which I was listening along to Councillor SRI talking about, is one that sounds very familiar to me and it’s one that housing providers here in Brisbane are delivering already and advocating for in that very mixed model, whether that’s projects that Micah are delivering or Brisbane Housing Company, as well.

 What groups like the Brisbane Housing Company are trying to provide here in Brisbane are those affordable developments that provide a real mix of tenants and being able to provide rental homes to people who are essential to how our city works, people that might be working as a barista at the café at the PA Hospital or a cleaner at the RBWH, but are forced further and further out to live at Logan or Ipswich or Morayfield or Caboolture, and travel and put pressure on road networks and incur great costs in being able to provide for their housing, so to have those mixed developments that are genuinely affordable, they could be provided—some of that could be provided, depending on people’s income from the private sector, some from community housing, and of course, some publicly, as well.

 I’m not sure any—I’m not sure whether the LORD MAYOR or any LNP Councillors have taken the time to sit down with those community housing providers. We certainly have. We’ve been listening to them and talking in great, intricate detail about those challenges that renters are facing in the market at the moment, but also the challenges that those providers are facing from this Council when they are trying to seek approval for development through the development application process, with roadblock after roadblock after roadblock put up in their ways.

 Things that this LORD MAYOR is talking about here on a project that he has absolutely nothing to do with and seemingly advocating for, when it comes to a project that this Council does actually have skin in the game on in approving, we’re seeing that is very difficult for those community housing providers.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: Non-existent, yes, and the support there—I’ll take that interjection, Councillor JOHNSTON—the support for those community housing providers from this Council is absolutely non-existent. In fact, the support they should be getting is being given to billionaires building five-star hotels, as I said earlier. So, we will be supporting this amendment from Councillor SRI because what this could achieve in this model, in having a genuinely mixed yet affordable development at Woolloongabba would be a good thing.

Chair: Any further speakers on the amendment?

 LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Yes, thank you, Mr Chair. First of all, I want to thank Councillor SRI for this amendment and the spirit in which he has approached the debate. You know, it is—so far, it’s been a constructive contribution. Now, it’s interesting. Councillor SRI claimed that I supposedly was an LNP powerbroker and had real influence in the State LNP. I’m not sure if he understands how the LNP works, but thank you for your vote of confidence, Councillor SRI. It will be interesting to see how much pull Councillor CASSIDY has with the State Government, if he comes in here and supports 90%, to see whether he can actually get the State Government to deliver that outcome or whether he’s just ticking in a box to be seen to be doing the right thing.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: One of the fascinating things is that, when we discussed this, we were like, what is the State Government going to find acceptable? Because this is a genuine proposal that we have put forward in a spirit of cooperation, and certainly, nothing that I have said or nothing that I have put forward has been Party-political. I have not attacked the State Government. In fact, I’ve gone extremely softly on them, given their failure to deliver social housing. It’s appalling, but I didn’t make this Party-political, and I certainly haven’t attacked the State Government. I’ve just said, here is a great opportunity to get a good outcome.

 So, when we were discussing, well, what’s actually going to be realistic and the State Government is likely to accept, they put in, just be clear, they put in 15% of the site in their early plans would be social housing or affordable housing. Now, these are the definitions that they used and these are the targets that they set. So, we’re encouraging to lift their sites, double it. Be bold. We hope that they actually take this seriously because we’re actually being really reasonable here and we’re not pulling something that’s pie in the sky that they’re never going to accept.

 So we genuinely had a discussion in our team about, well, what’s reasonable for the State Government to say yes to? Because we actually want to get the outcome here. So we settled on 30% because it was a doubling of what they had proposed, but it was still an opportunity that gives them the opportunity to get some value out of the site which could help fund some good social housing outcomes. What 90% would do would mean that they couldn’t extract any value out of the site when it comes to using that money to invest in good housing outcomes.

 So we’re actually trying to work with them to get an outcome here where they’ve got a funding source which is the development that they can sell on the market, and then they can use that to double the social housing and public housing and affordable housing requirement. Now, for Councillor CASSIDY and the Labor Party to say, oh yes, 90%, great, well, you know what? Deliver. Let’s see what you can deliver. If you can pull off 90% on this site, I will sing your praises, Councillor CASSIDY, and will say, you know what? That guy, I rate him. He was able to get this done.

 I just don’t think the State Government would ever go for it. I don’t think they would ever go for it. In fact, what I suspect will happen is that they will back away and weasel away from their 15% target. Included in their plan is a way that developers can buy themselves out of their public and affordable housing requirement. So, this is where the State Government’s mindset is, not increasing but reducing, and so we were trying to get the right balance here. We thought 30%, being a doubling of the requirement, gave a good outcome, but it also gave them a funding source. 90% leaves them really with nowhere to go when it comes to a funding source.

 We know the State Government is dead broke, and we were trying to help them out to get a reasonable outcome. What we will see here—and this would be genuinely sad—if this Council voted to support a 90% plan, we might all go home feeling good about ourselves, but it’s never going to happen. It’ll never happen because the State Government needs a way of paying for new social housing, and we were trying to provide that through our proposal. So that’s really, like—my position is, if you can get them to do 90%, you’re a champion. You’re a genius. I’ll sing your praises, but it’s never going to happen.

 We need to be realistic here and actually get the outcome. I want to see a real outcome, and you know what? I’d prefer to go in here and say 30% or 600 units and actually get that outcome than patting myself on the back by saying 90% but get zero. So, we won’t be supporting this amendment because we simply believe that the State Government will not buy it. Thank you, Mr Chair.

Chair: Thank you, LORD MAYOR.

Further speakers on the amendment? No further speakers on the amendment?

Councillor SRI, right of reply.

Councillor SRI: Thanks, Chair. Do I have five minutes or 10?

Chair: You have five.

Councillor SRI: Thanks, Chair, and thanks to the Mayor and to Councillor CASSIDY for his support of the motion. I understand where the Mayor is coming from, and I think it’s a shame that the Mayor and the LNP Administration have essentially become a prisoner of their own low expectations. We have an opportunity to set a high threshold, to call for something genuinely bold and ambitious, and in so doing, broaden the parameters of debate and put a greater amount of pressure on the State Government.

 The Mayor’s right that the State Government is looking for an excuse to weasel out of any affordable housing on the site, and in that context, I think it’s important for us to reassert the position that this is public land. Once upon a time, not so long ago, even in my living memory, the Government used to build 100% public housing on government-owned land. It’s not so long ago. That was happening in the late ‘80s. So, this idea that 30% is bold, I think it just shows how far the pendulum has shifted.

 I mean, it’s not surprising that the LNP would capitulate to nihilism in that way, but it is disappointing that we’re having a debate here about 15% versus 30% affordable housing on public land when we should be having that debate about private development sites. There are other cities around the world that say to private developers, you’re building apartments on private land, you have to give us 20% of that housing back as public housing. That’s exclusionary zoning and that’s where we should be taking the conversation. It should be taken for granted that, on public sites like this, we have 100% public housing.

 I completely disagree with the Mayor that the State Government can’t afford to fund this unless they sell off most of the assets. The reality is that housing in this city is profitable, surprise. You can rent out—and this is what some of the rent‑to‑buy developers are doing now, they’re making big bucks building apartments and renting them out to middle class tenants on an ongoing basis and collecting big revenue streams via rental payments.

 So, if private developers can do that on private land and make that viable, then the State Government, when they already own this land, could similarly retain ownership of the housing stock, build it, rent it out long term and collect revenue from that. So I think the Mayor, respectfully, has become, I think, co-opted by a fairly narrow and close-minded view and understanding of how the State can provide public and affordable housing, and has forgotten that, if managed correctly and the right mix is delivered, you can have a significant proportion of genuine public housing, as well as a proportion of housing that raises revenue for the government on an ongoing basis.

 Public housing and affordable housing doesn’t need to be conceptualised as a cost that the government has to bear and that the government somehow has to find the money for. You take out a loan, you build it, you rent it out, you get the money back, you use that on ongoing maintenance. It’s not so bizarre. If thousands of private developers can make private development financially sustainable when they also have to pay for the significant land costs upfront, if all these private build-to-rent schemes are financially sustainable, then why can’t the State Government do its own build-to-rent schemes and retain ownership of this housing?

 That’s the conversation we should be having. I am grateful to the Labor Councillors for supporting my amendment because I think that does at least push the conversation along a little way, but I think the Mayor has fallen into the trap of expecting very little, and in so doing, creating a situation where the State Government won’t even live up to those expectations. You might be lucky to get them to 20%, and I don’t even know if you will in this context. From a political strategy perspective, it would actually be more compelling to say, this is public land, don’t sell it off.

 We know how sensitive Labor is about concerns about asset sales, and if the LNP called this what it is and said, this is an asset sale of astronomical proportions, don’t sell off any of it, develop it as public housing, if you don’t have the money to develop it right now, leave some of it as greenspace and develop it later on, that would be a better approach. This site isn’t actually going to be redeveloped in the next few years. There’s a decent chance that, if the Olympics goes ahead at the Gabba stadium—which I hope it doesn’t, but if it does, this site may not be developed as housing until after 2032.

 So there’s plenty of time for the Government to find the money it needs to build public housing on this site. The mistake and the trap is if this site is sold off for private development before then. This would be one of the largest asset sales of public land or private development rights over public land in the history of Brisbane’s inner southside, if not the city as a whole, perhaps second only to the Queen’s Wharf mega casino.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor SRI. Your time has expired.

 We’ll now put your amendment to the vote.

The Chair put the motion for the amendment to the notified motion to the Chamber resulting in it being declared **lost** on the voices.

Thereupon, Councillors Jonathan SRI and Peter CUMMING immediately rose and called for a division, which resulted in the motion being declared **lost.**

The voting was as follows:

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

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

ABSTENTIONS: 1 - Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON.

Chair: We now return to the substantive motion.

 Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, thank you, Mr Chair, for allowing me to enter the debate. Look, I’m afraid I’ve got some concerns with what’s going on here, and I’m going to put them on the record. Firstly, this motion is clearly a political stunt by the LORD MAYOR. It is a complete bit of political chicanery that deserves to be called out for what it is. This motion before us today—and look, the LORD MAYOR has immediately gone off the screen. The motion before us today is calling on the State Government to act. It has zero, zero reference to Brisbane City Council. It makes no attempt by Brisbane City Council, the organisation that we represent and we are here to debate about, to engage in practical or policy measures to improve social or affordable housing.

 What’s worse is the LORD MAYOR’s duplicity in undertaking this motion has been exposed by his own words. He’s voted against Councillor SRI’s amendment to increase the amount to 90% because he’s said that the LNP Councillors don’t believe the states will buy it. Now, does anyone actually believe in the LNP Administration that the ALP State Government are going to buy this amendment that they’re putting forward? The idea that somehow, this is anything more than a political sleight of hand is absolutely a bit of spin by this LORD MAYOR.

 Now, I am outraged, outraged. Look, there’s so much politics going on in here. I understand that Councillor SRI is a genuine and long-term supporter of more public housing. I understand that his intentions are good here. The ALP Councillors don’t want to cause a problem here, so they’re just rolling along with it, but the LNP’s objectives here are political. They are purely political.

 If they were genuine about this Council and this city engaging in a proper debate about public or affordable housing, we would see measures coming forward that commit our Council and our city to responsive and necessary policy and practical changes to support social, public and affordable housing. None of that is happening. Instead, we’ve got an overtly political motion here from the LORD MAYOR that’s playing politics. It is just a pure bit of political chicanery. I find it offensive, offensive, and I just would like to put on the record the following issues.

 Firstly, we don’t hear anything from the LNP Opposition at a State level, so clearly, this is something that the LORD MAYOR is doing to attack the State Labor Government. It’s something that the LNP State Members don’t want to get their hands dirty with. They don’t want to be talking about public housing. They don’t want to have a policy on public housing. You’ve got the LORD MAYOR out there doing it for purely political purposes. That is not on. If this was a genuine, genuine issue, we would see it being raised by the LNP State Opposition, and they are silent on the issue and making no attempt to do better.

 Secondly, this Council, this Council has failed to do what it is telling the State Government to do. The Council’s own investment vehicle, the CBIC, which undertakes development for Council, it gets free land from this Council which it then uses to convert into commercial, residential, industrial property that it then sells for a profit, even its signature residential development, Augustus Residences in Toowong, 90 apartments. Now, to take up both the LORD MAYOR and Councillor OWEN’s feedback, close to a really significant bikeway, the Centennial Bikeway, access to ferries, new green bridges being delivered, and right on the train line.

 So, what did our Council do? Did it mandate that there should be 30% of Brisbane City Council supported apartments in this complex dedicated to social and affordable housing? No, it did not. It gave it to the CBIC to develop it privately to make a profit. Now, this Council has repeatedly sold off pieces of land, some of which are not suitable for public housing, but others that are. Is there any issue—is there any process going on behind the scenes to identify any land within Council to make sure that there are suitable vehicles for the Brisbane Housing Corporation, who are doing a great job and get barely any support from our Council, to deliver practical measures that our Council can do something about? No.

 Apparently, what’s going on in the LNP Party room is to have a little chat about how we can pick on the Queensland State Labor Government and try and score some political points.

Councillor SRI: Point of order.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Well, that is pathetic, absolutely pathetic.

Councillor SRI: Point of order.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor SRI.

Councillor SRI: Thanks. I have some sympathy with this line of argument from Councillor JOHNSTON. I wonder if Councillor JOHNSTON would take a quick question?

Councillor JOHNSTON: Sure.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, will you take a question?

Councillor SRI: Thanks, yes. I think you’re bang on that there’s a lot of politicking going on here, and I agree that Council should be doing more to address the shortage, as well. If you had to put, like, a figure on it or a rough—I agree Council should be putting land towards public housing, as well, but what sort of dollar value per year should Brisbane City Council be putting towards delivering public housing directly or giving that money to Brisbane Housing Company, for example?

Councillor JOHNSTON: Thank you for your question. I’m not in a position right now to put a dollar value on anything, but I know from working with the Brisbane Housing Corporation myself they have some great and innovative models and we should be working with them. We should be supporting them with land, funding, and policy to do more. So, a great question and I appreciate it, but look, that would need a policy from this Council to support public and affordable housing and what we could do. Again, I know you are a genuine supporter of this issue and this is something you and I have discussed privately, as well. I just want to continue with this line of thought, though.

 I just am extremely concerned that this LNP Council is prepared to tell the State Government to do something but will take no steps to do anything in this area of important social policy with a genuine issue to address the problem. The LORD MAYOR, his behaviour here is just pure political chicanery, and I am offended, offended that he thinks that the State Government is going to buy it because he’s putting up this motion before us today. I am offended that the discussion in the LNP Party room has been around, well, we’ll just double what the State Government has said.

 Where’s your policy? Where’s your reasoning? Where’s Council’s contribution to this? None of that. This is purely political, and it is offensive to me. I am extremely disappointed that this is the way that this Administration has decided to go on such an important Party-political issue. The LORD MAYOR is just trying to make himself look good by having a go at the Queensland State Labor Government without doing a single thing. He is the leader of this City. He is the person responsible under the Act. He leads policy. He controls the majority.

 What does this man do to progress an important social issue in our community for Brisbane residents? Nothing. He moves a political motion to attack the State Labor Government, and he thinks it’s going to score him some points. He thinks it’s going to make him look green and furry and nice to everybody. Well, no, it’s not. This Council needs real solutions to real problems, and this LORD MAYOR is only interested in playing political games and political chicanery.

 I’ll just say this, I’ll be abstaining from the substantive motion, as well, because I think people who live in public and affordable housing do have cars. I’d be really worried if there’s no car parks in this development. In addition to, obviously, service providers, NDIS providers, nurses, Meals on Wheels, all those people who need car access, particularly to vulnerable people who do live in public housing, but many people in public housing do have a vehicle. Often, for many of them, they’ve lived in their cars for a very long period of time.

 My neighbours are in public housing. We have quite a lot in Tennyson Ward, which is great. It’s well integrated into our community, but we cannot just say no car parking because there are many people who do need it, plus we obviously need space for service vehicles. In this part of the city, they’ll never get a parking permit, and you will create a terrible, terrible problem for people.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor JOHNSTON. Your time has expired.

 Further speakers? Further speakers?

 Councillor CUNNINGHAM.

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: —and the residents of—

Chair: Sorry, Councillor CUNNINGHAM, could you start again? You were on mute.

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: Oh, certainly, Mr Chair. Thank you. Sorry about that. Look, I wish to enter the debate and support the LORD MAYOR’s motion, and also offer some perspective as being from the neighbouring area. Now, obviously, it falls outside my ward, and I’m familiar with it and the residents of my ward traverse through this part of our city daily. My view is that we have an opportunity here to create a community which has access to employment opportunities, recreation and services, all supported by a variety of green transport options including cross river rail, a busway station and of course the separated bikeway. One of the reasons that people tell me that they choose to live in the eastern suburbs is just that. It’s about convenience and the lifestyle choices on offer. Within the bounds of our city, space to expand housing product is pretty limited. Gradually, like in all global cities, the inner suburbs will have to accommodate different housing typologies if we are to accommodate more residents—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: —and to ensure—sorry was someone interjecting then? I couldn’t quite hear. I’ll continue—if we are to accommodate more residents and ensure that we do provide options. As demand increases and supply decreases, particularly in this area, there are limited ways for us. We are not able to just grow more land. Here we have a brownfield site—a large brownfield site. It’s a unique opportunity for our city to create a master plan development. It will offer variety to ensure there are options for families and for essential workers. I also wanted to take the opportunity to comment on a related issue important to some residents in my ward.

 That is that the families of students at East Brisbane State School are still waiting for a plan about the future of that campus. There’s a chance that perhaps this site could be considered for that, but I don’t know if it’s the right place for a school or not. But there’s been a complete vacuum of information about the school’s future from the State Government. For all I know, they could be planning to permanently close East Brisbane State School. While the Olympics are 10 years away I believe the Gabba redevelopment will be well and truly underway before then. There are families in the area that need certainty on educational options that will be available to them.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: There are families who want to live in the inner eastern suburbs. We need to make sure that there are options for them. Mr Chair, time after time I’ve seen local candidates from the other parties jump on their soapbox and create these fake social media campaigns that fight development, to fight increased housing supply. These techniques are entirely paradoxical to what they claim to stand for. If they truly want better access and more affordable housing options, then I hope they will start to encourage their candidate to be more measured in their comments on social media.

Chair: Thank you.

Further speakers?

Councillor ADAMS, DEPUTY MAYOR.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair. I couldn’t figure out where my hand was going to come up so you could see it. Thank you for the call. I stand to support the substantive motion that we have here before us today and just a little bit of clarity around what was a sincere and genuine call on the State Government to do more in the public and affordable housing—social and affordable housing space—in Brisbane. Because let’s talk about the history of public and social housing when it comes to Brisbane. It was the Newman government in 2013 who announced and signed contracts for 2,600 new public housing—public houses in the Logan area—1,000 refurbishments. That was 3,600 houses to be built or refurbished.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

DEPUTY MAYOR: What happened to those?

Chair: Excuse me DEPUTY MAYOR, point of order to Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: This is about the Woolloongabba Station priority development area, not Logan, not Campbell Newman, not previous LNP State Governments. I would appreciate it if you can get the DEPUTY MAYOR to address the motion and be relevant.

Chair: The debate has been fairly free-ranging on the whole issue of public housing, but Councillor ADAMS I remind you of the motion before us.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Absolutely, thank you, Mr Chair. I am very happy to debate this motion as everyone has been doing. Councillor JOHNSTON spoke about the LORD MAYOR whose name is not even in this motion for eight of her 10 minutes. So I’ll explain why we are calling on the Queensland Government to do more because they have done nothing. With the cancellation of 3,600 homes from the Newman Government that were going to be built or refurbished in 2013, which would be on the ground now for those families that need them—

*Councillor interjecting.*

DEPUTY MAYOR: —they cancelled them and announced 70. As we’ve heard in the statistics today, that the tenancy increase over the last four years has been 287 houses and the wait list has increased to 800. This is not political Councillor STRUNK. I will take your interjection. This is about calling on a government to do what is their role to do on public government land with public housing that there is responsibility, take the opportunity. Councillor SRI stands beside us on that. Take the opportunity. I’m sure Councillor SRI understands that we are not lowering our expectations on this.

 But we also have something that sometimes Councillor SRI and the Greens don’t get, and that is reality. The reality is we really want to see a doubling of what they are suggesting at the moment. We want to see a cancellation of that in-lieu opportunity to convert it to a financial contribution as well. We think that 30% is reasonable for them to say, yes we totally agree. So did Councillor CASSIDY, can I say, until you came up with something else Councillor SRI. So the hypocrisy of Labor saying, oh yes, yes, yes, they sit on the coattails, none of their own ideas.

 They’re talking to housing providers but we haven’t heard a policy. We didn’t hear a policy last election. It wasn’t even rated in the con that was Patrick Condren when it came to policy announcements. But now apparently it is important again because we’ve brought it up. We’ve brought it up because public housing is the State Government’s role and we call on them to step up and do something about it. As the LORD MAYOR mentioned the 600 apartments on this site that is a possibility for 30% doubles—triples anything they’ve done in the last four years. It goes a long way to actually providing that housing.

 Now there’s a question about definitions here. Let me be clear, as some others may say, definitions are provided by the State Government. It is the State Government that define affordable and public housing. We are calling on either or all of any version of this in the 30%. Because again, Councillor CASSIDY said, let’s get some clarity. Well some clarity would be nice. But the State Government never clarify how much of their PDAs are going to be public or affordable housing. Even if they do, they then don’t stick to their guidelines when they deliver it.

 At the moment nothing in North Shore Hamilton that was supposed to be public and affordable housing—which I’m sure the Chair of the Council will be familiar with—and we’ve got five per cent for the athletes village when it comes back online in 11 or 12 years’ time. But we think the opportunity now on this high transit orientated spot is perfect to make that call. By all means, Councillor SRI we will stand there with you. If they want to go higher than 30% let’s see it. That would be fantastic. Because it is about a site that is in public ownership, that has the opportunity and does need a reduction in car parking for that to happen.

 I’ll note too, that we did not say no car parks on this site, something again that we don’t totally agree on Councillor SRI, I understand, but a reduced car parking definitely. Brisbanites always need garaging. They’re still in that phase. That’s one of the reasons why public housing is so controversial in the low density suburbs of Brisbane, when they only do .7 car parking. Because people do have cars. So there does need to be some car parking here. But we definitely support a reduced car parking rate on this site because of all of the reasons that Councillor OWEN mentioned when it came to transport.

 Let’s also think about what Council is doing here. We are advocating—yes the LORD MAYOR is advocating to the level of government whose responsibility it is. But that does not mean that we don’t have our own policies. It does not mean that we are not doing work in this place. Our community housing partnership has housed over 1,400 people since 2003, more than any other Council can say that they’ve done right across the State as well. We do a lot of work in this space. We do support Brisbane Housing Company.

 I can say in my own ward, the State Government—which State Government was that—oh that’s right, the Newman State Government, gave State Government land to Brisbane Housing Company at Mount Gravatt East, right behind Mount Gravatt Central in 2012 and now there is a five storey public apartment housing sector there which has been fantastic. For the locals who can move out of their public housing when they don’t need three rooms any more, open it up for families and downsize into apartments that are very, very nice. Wouldn’t mind moving in there myself.

 But that’s the opportunity you have when you have a government that does have social morality. The Newman government were there doing it. This government does not care. Ironic, the minister—

*Councillor interjecting.*

DEPUTY MAYOR: —his local area—his local area that he cancelled—had a philosophical desire to cancel 3,600 public houses in 2016 and has nowhere near made up to that difference as well. So we welcome those Councillors that are supporting this debate today. It’s been a long time coming until everybody agrees on something. I still think that Councillor CASSIDY is coming kicking and screaming because we don’t hear the policy. We just hear the berating. But we’ll take their agreement on this motion and we’ll ask if they’re supporting Councillor SRI’s—

*Councillor interjecting.*

DEPUTY MAYOR: —if they are supporting Councillor SRI’s 100% on public or social housing on this site. I ask them to get down there to the other end into 1 William Street and pull the strings that Councillor CASSIDY believes he has down there, because we’d love to see it. It would be a great outcome.

*Councillor interjecting.*

DEPUTY MAYOR: It would be an outcome that would be a good outcome as long as they’re working on the green space. But we do not expect that that would be happening as the LORD MAYOR made very clear. This is based in reality. This is based on a good outcome for the local community as Councillor CUNNINGHAM said, for the residents of East Brisbane that live and travel through this site to reduce the car parking and the traffic, particularly with the Olympic venue as well. I fully support this motion to call on the State Government to increase it to 30% minimum on this site.

Chair: Thank you.

Are there any further speakers on the substantive motion? No further speakers?

LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair. Thank you to all Councillors who have talked on this issue. We came in a genuine spirit to get a genuine outcome. We’ve seen some really interesting contributions here. It’s interesting to see both Labor Councillors and then Councillor SRI somehow trying to claim some kind of high moral ground. Yet if you actually go and have a look at the facts there’s some interesting things that have been revealed here. First of all we haven’t seen Labor put forward any proposals to boost social and affordable housing in Brisbane.

 Both Labor and the Greens, what their contribution to housing affordability in Brisbane is, is to oppose every new development that happens that they get the slightest bit of heat on. They oppose it and they hold up developments. They oppose developments and they try to stop development from happening. That certainly doesn’t improve affordability. We know that to be the case. So they speak with forked tongue on these issues. The same goes for the so-called independent Councillor who opposes even a blade of grass being touched in her ward. So that’s not helping housing affordability.

 Yet when we are making a helpful and positive contribution to help the State do their job, then suddenly the squealing and the squirming and the stepping over each other to try and outdo each other happens with both Labor and the Greens. Now Labor has, as I said, not proposed anything in this space. We’ve never heard anything from them and suddenly they’re interested in it. Suddenly they want to jump on board. First they were happy to support our 30%. Then they got a bit of one-up from Councillor SRI and they jumped on that as well. They jumped on it because they know that their State Labor Government will not buy 90%.

 So it is very cynical what we’ve seen happen here. The other thing is—I mentioned—I didn’t politically attack the State Government. If you think this is an attack you haven’t seen anything. Literally this was on low heat. This was like number one on the stove heat. If they want to see number 10, they’ll be in for a surprise, but this is—we’ve been very—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —I—to just sum up I just wanted to talk about Councillor SRI. Now Councillor SRI has a very good way of saying, oh look this was our idea. It’s good to see the LNP coming part of the way towards our idea. They try and claim credit for basically everything we’re doing, suggesting that it was somehow Greens policy or their idea. Well in this case I’ve got a document here—it’s a little bit hard to see given the Zoom setup—but it’s actually Councillor SRI’s ideas for the Gabba site. It has two visions—two alternative visions that he’s put forward and that he’s posted on his website and social media.

 Now one of them is a mixed use vision and one of them is a blue green vision. Now in his mixed use vision—this is his proposal for the site—is it 90% public housing? Councillor ADAMS, is it 90% public housing?

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: The interesting thing is that parts of the site are taken up with office buildings. Parts of the site are taken up with a whole range of sporting facilities and other things. So it’s quite fascinating. He’s quite happy to have office buildings on the site. No one is living in office buildings. That’s part of his plan. Guess what? The other one is even better. The second proposal for the site includes no housing—no housing whatsoever—zero housing. He calls it the blue green vision. I like the sound of that. I’ve got a blue green vision too. It’s about building green bridges and public transport and improving the liveability and sustainability of our city.

 But his blue green vision has no housing. So what’s 90% of zero? That’s zero. Zero. So Councillor SRI is suddenly really for 90% housing but when he put out his proposal for the site there was no housing on one of the proposals. There was however an urban—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, please, no interruptions.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: There was however an urban produce farm, artisan fresh produce markets. There’s a good comment here about how sweet and tender the asparagus is going to be from that urban farm. So focused on growing asparagus on the site but not on providing housing in one of his plans going forward. So let’s get something that we can actually achieve. Let’s get a real outcome here that can deliver real benefits—600 units—600 units—more than the supply that the State Government has provided for five years across the whole region. That is a real outcome. That is a positive outcome. That’s what we’ve put forward. That’s what we’re supporting today.

Chair: Thank you. LORD MAYOR.

 We now move to the vote.

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

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

The voting was as follows:

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

ABSTENTIONS: 1 - Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON.

## CONSIDERATION OF NOTIFIED MOTION – NAMING OF GODIVA AVENUE PARK, YEERONGPILLY

**407/2021-22**

The Chair of Council (Councillor David McLACHLAN) then drew the Councillors’ attention to the notified motion listed on the agenda, and called on Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON to move the motion. Accordingly, Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON moved, seconded by Councillor Jonathan SRI—

*That, with Ms Barty’s agreement, this Council names Godiva Ave Park bordered by King Arthur Terrace and Godiva Ave, Yeerongpilly, adjacent to the Queensland Tennis Centre, in honour of Ash Barty, an extraordinary Queensland sportswoman, world number one and Australian Open Champion.*

Chair: Is there any debate?

Councillor LANDERS: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Councillor LANDERS.

Councillor LANDERS: Chair, under section 42(2)(c) of the *Meetings Local Law 2001*, I move that the motion lie on the table until the appropriate—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, don’t interrupt the debate.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: This is a procedural motion Councillor JOHNSTON. It has been moved by Councillor LANDERS that the motion moved by Councillor JOHNSTON lie—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: —on the table. I will now put the motion.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY. I didn’t hear you say that. I couldn’t hear Councillor LANDERS, I’m sorry. For what period of time?

Chair: There’s no definition of how long.

Councillor CASSIDY: No, no Councillor LANDERS did say something then.

Councillor LANDERS: I said until the appropriate consultation—

Chair: Sorry, there were interjections.

 Councillor LANDERS, can you read your motion again?

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor LANDERS: That the motion lie on the table until the appropriate consultation—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Excuse me, Councillor JOHNSTON.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor LANDERS: —as well as the Barty family.

Chair: Is there a seconder?

*Councillor interjecting.*

DEPUTY MAYOR: I am happy to second.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: Sorry, I still didn’t hear her.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Yes, I’m happy to second that, Chair. I’m putting my hand up to second it, but I please ask Councillor LANDERS be heard in silence.

Chair: We’ve had a motion that this item lay on the table. It has been moved by Councillor LANDERS and seconded by Councillor ADAMS.

 All in favour of—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: I am raising a point of order about section 42(c). It says that the motion may be moved at the conclusion of a speech on the matter by a Councillor. I have not actually been allowed to speak. This motion has been tabled before any Councillor has spoken. So the invocation of section 42(c) is being used improperly without any debate on this matter being conducted.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Okay, Councillors my error. I agree. We should allow debate to occur first before accepting the motion that has been forecast that it lie on the table. Councillor JOHNSTON, I give you time to debate.

Councillor JOHNSTON: I am so ashamed of this LNP Council. I noticed the LORD MAYOR has immediately dived off from this debate. This is a disgusting and a shameful exhibition.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Point of order, Mr Chair.

Chair: Point of order to you Councillor ADAMS.

DEPUTY MAYOR: May I just ask for a clarification on moving a motion during a point of order to lay on the table. Can I now lay the motion on the table now that Councillor JOHNSTON has started the debate?

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor ADAMS the motion can be moved at the end of the debate.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Thank you.

*Councillor interjecting.*

DEPUTY MAYOR: Point of order, Mr Chair.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Point of order, Councillor ADAMS.

*Councillor interjecting.*

DEPUTY MAYOR: I ask Councillor GRIFFITHS to apologise and withdraw the full comments he just made on me for asking a question of the Chair. I merely asked a clarification question.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor GRIFFITHS, please.

Councillor GRIFFITHS: I am not withdrawing it. There you go.

Chair: Your behaviour will be noted in the minutes.

Councillor GRIFFITHS: Yes, noted.

Chair: Thank you.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, please.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Can I just check I’ve got 10 minutes now?

Chair: Yes.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Thank you.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: On the weekend, an extraordinary young Queensland woman won the Australian Open—I’m so upset by you people. What is wrong with you? This is a young woman who her whole life has dedicated herself to sport, to community and to inspiring young people. She’s an extraordinary sportswoman, an extraordinary athlete and an inspirational role model to young people and, particularly, young Queenslanders who play tennis. Two years ago, I conducted a survey in my ward to determine whether a park in Yeerongpilly, a new park, should be named after Ash Barty.

 That survey was comprehensively supported by Tennyson Ward residents. We raised the matter with Queensland Tennis and, at that stage, Miss Barty wasn’t—she felt that her achievements were not of a sufficient magnitude to have a park named after her. Now let’s be clear, I have conducted further consultation. I have raised this with the Queensland Premier. I have raised this with her Federal Member, Milton Dick, and I have raised it with the CEO of Tennis Queensland again. I am appalled that my own Council is trying to block this motion. This young woman is an extraordinary role model.

 This young woman—Indigenous woman has achieved something that no other woman has achieved in 44 years. I note that this LORD MAYOR went out and named the Ashley Cooper Walkway in Yeerongpilly without any consultation with anybody. So he went out and named a walkway after a man without consultation, without any reference to me or the local community, and it is appalling that this LNP Administration is now saying there’s got to be fake consultation done to do something that we know my local community supports, we know the tennis community supports, and we know that everybody, except the LNP Councillors, support.

 I am appalled that I have to have this argument over what should have been a very simple and a very straightforward recognition of an extraordinary young woman. You people are embarrassing and a joke. Now, on top of her recognition, she has a specific connection to my ward. During her time as a cricketer, Ash played cricket at Western District Cricket Club just down the road. She was part of a premiership winning team. This is a young woman who has made an extraordinary contribution to sport in our city, in my local community and in our State. It is up to her whether she would like to have the park named after her.

 But I would have hoped today that this Council would send a clear message to her that we admire and respect her role as an extraordinary athlete, sportswoman and role model to young people around this State. My aim in moving this motion was to show her that we are unanimous, that we are full of admiration for her, that we are proud of her achievements. At the heart of the Queensland Tennis Centre, a park that doesn’t have a name—it’s got a default name after a street—we’re asking that a park be named after a young woman who absolutely deserves it.

 Now it shouldn’t be up to Councillor Sandy LANDERS from Bracken Ridge to claim that no consultation has been done. It shouldn’t be up to Councillor Sandy LANDERS to go out and do the dirty work for the LNP LORD MAYOR, who can’t be bothered to be part of this debate or vote for a woman to have a park named after her. He is prepared to have sporting men have things named after him, but when it comes to an open and relevant debate about an extraordinary young sportswoman, he sends out an LNP backbencher to do his dirty work.

 I am ashamed and disgusted by this Council. Moving this motion today was to show her that we supported—supported her, recognised her achievements and in the heart of the Tennis Centre of this State, that we recognise her significant and extraordinary achievement as a young woman. You people have absolutely destroyed your reputations, embarrassed yourselves and forced me to have a debate about something that should have been, isn’t Ash Barty brilliant? Isn’t this a great achievement? Yes, our local community supports it. She’s got connection to it in place, local, State and citywide.

 I am ashamed—ashamed of you people. Councillor Sandy LANDERS, if you’re going to lie this motion on the table, I will just—I’m ashamed of you too. This should be a very straightforward and a very simple recognition of a young woman who is an extraordinary role model in our community. It is the right place to name a park after her. It is an unnamed park—an unnamed park. It is appropriate; we don’t have any parks in this precinct named after women and it would be extraordinary to have one named after Ash Barty.

 Of course, there is more consultation to do with Miss Barty herself. I don’t know what she would like it named, whether it’s Ash Barty or Ashleigh Barty. But let me be clear, this Council needs to start this process and this motion is designed to do that. The consultation has already been undertaken; more consultation is already underway. Councillor Sandy LANDERS showed her true political gamesmanship by trying to stop me from even speaking on this motion.

 I am appalled and ashamed—ashamed more deeply than anything you’ve ever done, because this woman does not deserve the disrespect that you people have shown today and I hope every single person who is watching this livestream or hears about it, understands how awful and pathetic you people have been today.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Further debate?

 Councillor ADAMS.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair, and Councillor JOHNSTON believes she can pick out a cynical political ploy when she sees it. Well, we just saw that one there, because those tears were not about an Ash Barty naming of a park.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Councillors, please.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor ADAMS, to the motion, please.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair. I am standing on this motion to say we are not supporting this motion because Ash—

*Councillor interjecting.*

DEPUTY MAYOR: —Barty is an amazing, extraordinary Queensland sportswoman, a world number one and an Australian Open champion, a French Open champion and a Wimbledon champion, as well as having Indigenous background, and the naming of a pocket park that is a detention basin is absolutely not the standard—

*Councillor interjecting.*

DEPUTY MAYOR: —we think should be for Ash Barty. Pat Rafter Arena—

*Councillor interjecting.*

DEPUTY MAYOR: Mr Chair, could you please ask her to turn her microphone off so she can hear what we have to say.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON and Councillor STRUNK, please allow the speaker to be heard in silence.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Pat Rafter is also an amazing tennis player and has an arena named after him at the Tennis Centre, and he only won two of the Grand Slams. Ash Barty has already won three in the last 12 months. Godiva Park is not of a standard that we would expect in a tribute of a woman of such outstanding ability and representation for her community.

 The reason we are laying this—I foreshadow that we will lay this on the table is to talk further with Tennis Queensland, who are already in that discussion about the appropriate tribute to this extraordinary Queensland sportswoman. A detention basin pocket park, no matter how close it is to Yeerongpilly Tennis Centre, is not appropriate for the outstanding achievements of this woman.

**Procedural motion – Motion that the notified motion lie on the table**

**408/2021-22**

The DEPUTY MAYOR (Councillor Krista ADAMS) moved, seconded by Councillor Sarah HUTTON, that the notified motion lie on the table whilst discussions take place with Tennis Queensland about an appropriate recognition of the extraordinary tennis player Ash Barty. Upon being submitted to the Chamber, the motion was declared **carried** on the voices.

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

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 17 - The DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Krista ADAMS, and Councillors Greg ADERMANN, Adam ALLAN, Lisa ATWOOD, Fiona CUNNINGHAM, Tracy DAVIS, Fiona HAMMOND, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Sarah HUTTON, Sandy LANDERS, James MACKAY, Kim MARX, Peter MATIC, David McLACHLAN, Angela OWEN and Steven TOOMEY.

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

## PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS:

Chair: Councillors, General Business. I call to your attention General—Petitions first, my apologies, I’m running ahead of myself.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Sorry, correction, yes. Councillors, are there any petitions?

 Councillor ALLAN.

Councillor ALLAN: Mr Chair, I have a petition that relates to improved cycle facilities and cycleways on Nudgee Road.

Chair: Thank you.

 Are there any further petitions?

 Councillor OWEN.

Councillor OWEN: Thank you, Mr Chair, I have a petition with five signatories in regards to bus services in Pallara.

Chair: Thank you.

 Any further petitions?

 Councillor LANDERS, may I have a motion for receipt of the petitions, please?

**409/2021-22**

It was resolved on the motion of Councillor Sandy LANDERS, 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** |
| 137/220/594/63 | Adam Allan | Requesting Nudgee Road be more bike friendly with the extension of bike lanes and removal of car parking spaces from existing bike lanes.*Petition previously received by Council during the Summer Recess 2021-22.* |
| 137/220/594/64 | Angela Owen | Requesting public transport for Pallara. |

## GENERAL BUSINESS:

Chair: Now, Councillors, we move to General Business.

Councillors, are there any statements required as a result of an Office of the Independent Assessor or Councillor Ethics Committee order?

No Councillors standing or raising their hand.

Councillors, are there any matters of General Business?

Councillor HUTTON.

Councillor HUTTON: Thank you, Chair, I just rise to wish all of our wonderful Vietnamese community a very happy Lunar New Year. Obviously, today kicks off the new year, as we start to celebrate the Year of the Tiger. On Friday night, I was very fortunate to celebrate with my local Vietnamese community, the Vietnamese Community in Australia Queensland Chapter, and the festival is undoubtably one of the highlights of our cultural calendar here in the Jamboree Ward.

 It’s a great opportunity for locals from all backgrounds to celebrate what is amazing about our lunar celebrations, enjoying the wine, dancing, delicious food and, of course, fire crackers. So, as we say goodbye to the Year of the Buffalo, we welcome the arrival of the Year of the Tiger, a symbol of strength, courage and confidence. There is one word that really stands out for me and that is strength.

 One thing that resonates in this beautiful Vietnamese community is the wonderful President, Doctor Bui, so it was wonderful to see on last week, him acknowledged for his hard work in our community. He was actually appointed as a Member of the Order and this prestigious appointment was made for his significant services to multiculturalism, refugees and, of course, the Vietnamese community.

 Doctor Bui and his wife, Doctor Kim Bui, are remarkable Australians and it is fantastic to see their work acknowledged in this way. Just as a final thing, I would love to say congratulations to Doctor Bui and to wish everyone celebrating the Tết celebrations over the coming days, we wish you all the very best for a happy and prosperous new year.

Chair: Thank you.

 Further General Business?

Councillor STRUNK.

Councillor STRUNK: Yes, thanks, Mr Chair. I want to echo those well wishes to Doctor Bui, the Queensland Chapter President, who has been a stalwart for his community for probably 37 years now, or more. The facility over at Darra, which—where the Chapter is based, was established to actually look after some refugees’ kids from Vietnam all those years ago.

 It was supported by the Queensland Government and I think Peter Beattie had something to do with that, but I don’t know the full history. But I just remember the love and the great satisfaction that Doctor Bui, when he talks about that time, the great work that he and others did in looking after those kids that were displaced from their families for one reason or another and found themselves alone in a country that wasn’t their homeland.

 Certainly, the Vietnamese Tết festival, which usually sees around about 10,000 people attend, was very much scaled down as it was last year, because of COVID, but the Vietnamese community are resilient and they weren’t going to let a bit of COVID to—not to be able to celebrate in a—certainly, in a reduced way, over at the Chapter. There were a couple of hundred people there, instead of 10,000 and, of course, the Premier was there and Milton Dick, the Federal Member was there and, of course, Sarah Ebberley represented the LORD MAYOR.

 Then we had a Senator—we had a Senator there, as well, Senator Scott, he was there as well, and he and Milton made a special presentation for Doctor Bui’s elevation to, probably, one of the highest awards that you can get as a civilian in Australia.

 I just—I’m just always amazed at how connected that community, the community of—the Vietnamese community is and it’s such great strength that they get from that connectedness and make sure that the kids that are coming up are well schooled in the Vietnamese language, in the Vietnamese writing and reading, and the culture, of course.

 You can see it’s right—whether they’re two or three years old and they’re running around having a bit of fun, you can just see the culture that they’re running around with, as well. They really, even at that young age, embrace it.

 The other item I was going to speak about, and now I’m a little bit embarrassed to speak about it, only embarrassed for the family of Ash Barty. But on Sunday, I was walking around the lake having a look because we’re starting the new planting there and the harvester’s out and everything, and I came across Ash Barty’s grandparents.

 They were just so full of joy and happiness and were talking to anyone and everyone, because they do live in the area and they traverse the lake on a regular basis. I’m so thankful I didn’t mention this motion because it wasn’t a done thing. I—so I’m really thankful I didn’t mention it because I’m sure they would be horrified if they even get wind or hear about this debate about naming a park after their granddaughter, because they’re just so proud of her.

 I just am appalled at the way the debate went forward and it just reinforces me that anything Nicole brings up, no matter what it is, how great it is, the LNP are just not interested in anything that she brings up, however valuable it is. In this particular instance,—I just think if this is not a front page somewhere online tomorrow, I don’t know what is; it should be front page right around Australia, what actually happened in this Council Chamber today.

 I’m just embarrassed that this—the way this went forward and the way it was just dismissed, because it’s not good enough for Ash. I think that’s up to Ash Barty and the family and listen, we can name parks, we can name other infrastructures, there wouldn’t be enough to be named. So, I don’t know why we’re just getting so caught up in the fact that it’s not a big, massive park like Victoria Park. I’ll just finish my comments, there. Thank you, Mr Chair.

Chair: Thank you.

 Further speakers on General Business? Can I remind all Councillors to set the topic at the beginning of your speech before you talk to it?

Councillor STRUNK: Yes. Sorry about that, Mr Chair.

Chair: Councillor SRI.

Councillor SRI: Thanks, Mr Chair. I’d like to speak briefly on the food waste program that Council’s set up and also on greenspace in Highgate Hill. I want to congratulate the Administration for that very positive initiative, I think it’s a really good first step. Once again, good to see you picking up a Greens idea, I’m sure the Mayor will love hearing me say that. But it’s a start; it doesn’t quite go as far as I would have hoped, but I think it is a step in the right direction and it will be interesting to see how the trial develops.

 I did specifically want to point out though, and draw to Councillor MARX’s attention and to the attention—actually of any of the Councillors in the inner city—Councillor Vicki HOWARD should probably pay attention to this, as well. I say this because those areas that have particularly high rental populations, is that currently for a renter to get a green bin can be a fair bit of a rigmarole.

 You have to reach out to your real estate agent, we know how slow real estate agents can be to get back. The real estate agent has to pass on the request to the landlord, maybe the landlord takes a while to consider it., then the landlord might decide, okay, yes, we’ll get the green bin. It can take quite some time and some landlords will just say no just because they’re jerks or because they don’t want the hassle, or they don’t want the costs or whatever.

 My concern is that while this scheme is really good, there is a practical barrier for tenants to get green bins and so hopefully Councillor MARX, you’ll listen to this and will reflect on this and think about whether there’s a way we can create a fast‑track process for tenants to request green bins, even if they have to pay the cost or whatever so they can participate in those compost schemes.

 I—for example, in my electorate, I think it’s now about 65% of residents are renters; that’s huge. So, you’re rolling out this trial in suburbs like Dutton Park and Highgate Hill, and I’m a little worried that because not many people have green bins to start with and it will be quite difficult for renters to get green bins, that maybe the uptake won’t be quite as high. Even though there are heaps of people, and heaps of tenants, in particular, who would love a system like this and to be able to participate.

 In particular, noting that often it’s renters who might have a bit more trouble getting permission from their landlord to set up a compost system on their own site. A tenant—maybe a landlord will say, no, you can’t have a compost pile in the back yard or no, there’s no room for composting bins on site, so tenants, in particular, would really benefit from being able to access this scheme.

 I believe, and maybe this is worth further investigating, but tenants do have the ability to request repairs for recycling bins and stuff like that, so there’s already that mechanism for tenants to do that without the landlord having to be involved. It would seem to me that this is a fairly small thing about accessing a free service, that—or a service that Council’s providing as a matter of routine.

 I think it—it doesn’t seem to too unreasonable to suggest that tenants should be able to request green bins directly. They’re—we allow tenants to get other things, other Council services that are connected to the property address. I think now tenants can even get native plant vouchers, can’t they? That was something we were pushing for a little while ago. Anyway—waste vouchers, *et cetera*.

 We have a—we already have many precedents in Council where tenants can request stuff that we would normally leave up to the property owner and I just really think it’s quite important that we don’t overlook renters in this—on this one, because it’s really a good idea and I really want the trial to succeed. But I’ve already had tenants approach me and say, Oh, Jonno, we really want to participate, but we don’t have a green bin, we don’t even—our landlord never gets back to us about stuff.

 So, simple online form, request a green bin, doesn’t have to be the owner of the property, they just have to show proof of their lease or whatever. I think there are some other Council processes where we ask for say a resident parking permit; if you’re a tenant, you can get a resident parking permit, even if you’re not the property owner, and you just have to show proof of your lease. So, there’s already precedent and mechanisms there.

 I won’t labour the point, but please do think about it and hopefully it’s something that we can move on soon, rather than be like, yes, we’ll think about it and six months later you’re like, oh yes, by the way, tenants can get green bins. Let’s do it now while everyone’s really excited about the trial and there’s a lot of interest in it.

 Turning to the second thing I wanted to—actually, just briefly on composting, I will just add that we shouldn’t lose sight of the importance and the sustainability value of encouraging composting in local areas. That collection service is a great idea, but particularly in high density inner city areas, there’s still a lot of value. In fact, not just high-density inner city areas, any part of the city, it is most sustainable for residents to be composting food scraps on their own property.

 I live on a houseboat and we compost all our own kitchen scraps; we even compost our poo, which is another story. But if we can compost on a houseboat and do it safely and sustainably, there’s no reason that we shouldn’t be encouraging other people to do it, as well. Great that we’re collecting compost, but remember that there is a big carbon footprint and a big environmental footprint, and a traffic footprint of lots of garbage trucks having to drive all the way out to the outer burbs.

 So, it makes sense and it saves on landfill and, on balance, I can see that it is better for people to be putting their food scraps into a green bin that get composted, as opposed to be put in a landfill truck, but we do really need to be encouraging localised composting as well as that.

 But turning to the other point I wanted to speak about, which was another idea that I hope the LNP will take up or copy at some point, and I just wanted to put it out there. Any Councillors who are in front of a computer might like to quickly look up this location I’m talking about. The easiest way to find it on Google Maps is to search for 115 Gladstone Road, Highgate Hill; it has a few street addresses.

 But if you look up 115 Gladstone Road, Highgate Hill, you’ll see on the aerial map a large, red-roofed structure, which is an old water reservoir. It’s still active and it’s on Council land and it’s owned by Brisbane City Council and essentially managed and operated by Queensland Urban Utilities. This is a really interesting location, because it’s right at one of the highest points of Highgate Hill. That’s why they chose it, because it’s at the top of the hill; makes sense for a water reservoir.

 This is an amazing location for a public park or public space and, I think, presents a really good opportunity for Council to be able to create new public parkland on that site without actually having to fork out and pay the cost of buying a site. So, I’m putting this on the radar and I’m encouraging Councillor Tracy DAVIS, in particular, to look at this.

 I realise it’s a complex set of steps to negotiate with Urban Utilities and all that sort of stuff, but looking at the current structure, it does seem quite feasible that the structure could be reinforced with a stronger roof, covered over and turned into a public park with the water reservoir underneath.

 We’re not saying decommission the water reservoir, we’re just saying, this is inner city land with great hilltop views in an area that’s low on greenspace; why don’t we make it fill two roles? I know that there are a few other water reservoirs around Brisbane that Council has taken a similar approach, where you can go up on the water reservoir to a lookout or you can—essentially, the roof of the reservoir functions as a public space, and I think that would be great to see that happen here on this site.

 So, it’s on Gladstone Road, it’s next to Hazlewood Street and I really encourage the LNP Administration to take a look and if any Councillors are driving along Gladstone Road, just pull into Hazlewood Street and have a look at the—imagine what the views would be like from that park if we created that as a riverside park—sorry, as a hilltop park.

 Just on that same topic of greenspace in 4101, Councillor DAVIS, I’ve written to your officers about the site at 129 Hardgrave Road; 129 Hardgrave Road is a vacant block of land, it’s 1,000 square metres. It was an old block of flats and the owners demolished it without really warning anyone and are now selling it.

 It’s right in the area that’s identified on the Local Government Infrastructure Plan as being appropriate for a new park, so it’s—this location is in the LGIP as future parkland. It’s very rare for blocks like this to come up for sale in West End and I know in the past, Council has been reluctant to acquire sites for parkland where it would involve demolishing character housing.

 Councillor ADAMS and I have had some good chats about that in the past, but this is a vacant block of land, which would be a great opportunity to create a new public park and like I said, it’s already—this location is already listed in the LGIP, so 129 Hardgrave Road. Please raise this with your officers; I understand it’s going up for auction soon.

 It would be a really good opportunity for Council to secure that site, knowing that our officers have been trying to find land for parkland in that area for some time and haven’t been able to identify any other suitable sites. So, let’s get on to this one while the opportunity is there. Thanks for that.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor SRI.

 Any further speakers on General Business?

 Councillor LANDERS.

Councillor LANDERS: Thank you, Mr Chair. I wish to speak about the LORD—to thank, actually, the LORD MAYOR and Councillor WINES, the Chair of Infrastructure, on the completion of another road upgrade over the Summer Recess.

 I’d also like to firstly just clarify that we are all proud of Ash Barty and that is why we would like to really do something special. By discussing with—this with Ash and Tennis Queensland, I believe that she will be well aware that we feel that way and that we want to do something significant.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor LANDERS: I am disappointed that I was personally attacked and for something that was just a sensible suggestion that seems to have been lost on others.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor LANDERS: But getting back to the infrastructure in my local area, this is another project that was completed on time despite unpredictable weather and the Dorville Road upgrade at Aspley has included drainage, kerb and channelling, road resurfacing, more street parking, footpath and active travel upgrades, and thanks to the Federal funding following lobbying by the local Member for Petrie, Luke Howarth, we received this Federal funding and, yet again, we’ve been able to complete another local road upgrade.

 I have to say that every time I’m out at the local shops or out in my community lately, residents are actually engaging with me to say thank you and how fantastic this upgrade is and what a difference this—the Norris Road/Barbour Road intersection is and what a difference it is making in their commute every day.

 We are of course very excited that Stage 2 of the Norris Road will be commencing soon and this upgrade will further increase the safety of the road. It will see Pritchard Place intersection at Norris Road signalised, with intelligent lights that will allow school traffic to flow safely during peak times and also create a safer crossing for pedestrians and a loading zone for buses and commuters.

 Of course, everyone is looking forward to the Beams Road upgrades, and I want to say thank you to the Council officers, who have worked on all these projects throughout the pandemic. They have not slowed down and they’ve managed consultation with the community throughout the pandemic, while delivering all these projects on time and under budget. Meanwhile, they’ve created local jobs using local workers.

 Can I just finish by saying that all the infrastructure projects not only benefit my local area, but all of Brisbane and in fact, even Moreton Bay. That community is benefiting from all these upgrades as well and all these works have gone to making Brisbane even better by improving safety while busting congestion for all residents. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you.

 Further General Business items?

 Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thank you very much, Mr Chair. Just briefly, I just want to talk about Ash Barty and correct the record in something that Councillor LANDERS just said. She claimed and is trying to re-write history that she was personally attacked, Chair. Councillor LANDERS said that she was personally attacked for putting up a suggestion for a different park to honour Ash Barty, when in fact she did nothing of the sort. But what she tried to do is shut down debate immediately before Councillor JOHNSTON could even move that motion and speak to that motion.

 So, I understand the DEPUTY MAYOR got—made that point after the standing rules of this place were reminded—you were reminded about the standing rules of this place. But Councillor LANDERS was not attacked for—in my mind, for putting up a different suggestion. What she did and what she continues to do in this place, meeting after meeting, is shut down debate and shut down democratic debate.

 That’s something that we are now raising with the Departments of Local Government in seeking how you are running these meetings, Chair, how LNP Councillors are abusing the rules and bastardising democratic debate in this place. What we saw this afternoon was a pretty bad example. If Councillor LANDERS or the DEPUTY MAYOR had some concerns, why didn’t they just pick up the phone and speak to Councillor JOHNSTON about it? I raise it before the end of the meeting—here we go—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor, please.

Councillor CASSIDY: —raise it before the meeting instead of just moving a procedural motion, let it lie on the table with no explanation. They say, Mr Chair, the LNP Councillors say they want people to put notices of motion, give notice, put motions on the notice paper and then out of the blue, they just move that they lie on the table—in some cases, in some cases for years. This is a complete bastardisation of Council’s process, for their own political gains.

 But, to the substantive part of what Councillor JOHNSTON was trying to achieve in recognising Ash Barty’s great achievements over the weekend, I think, was something very good and that’s why I supported her in not just recognising that locally in a significant district park—I’m not sure if Councillor ADAMS has been out there. She said it was a detention basin; I thought the word was retention basin, but perhaps it is detention basin, but it’s a great park.

 If you look on Google Maps, which maybe the DEPUTY MAYOR did, I think it shows that it was under construction at some point, but it’s actually a lovely park with some great facilities in it adjoining the Tennis Centre. Sure, when things are named after people and statues are put up, they’re often not the only thing and it was a very nice gesture.

 That performance we saw from Ash Barty was certainly one of the most formidable performances we’ve seen in a very long time and she’s going to be—she’s going to go down in history as one of the real greats. Not just as a Queensland great and an Australian great, but a world great.

 She’s humble, gracious, inclusive, respectful and kind, and a very proud First Nations woman, and a great role model, not just for young people, but I think for all people across the country. We’re very lucky to call her someone who comes from South East Queensland. I know Ipswich has that claim to fame as her home, but of course, Brisbane’s played a very big role in her success, and it’s all our success, as well as a sporting region.

 I think that starting that discussion in naming a park, a great local park after her would have been a very good thing and it was actually very disappointing to see how this LNP Administration treat those kinds of suggestions. If you can’t make it a notice of motion, you can’t suspend standing orders to debate things in here, then what is the point of even pretending that this is a place of democracy, Mr Chair?

Chair: Thank you.

 Any further speakers in General Business? Nobody raising their hand.

I declare the meeting closed.

## QUESTIONS OF WHICH DUE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

*(Questions of which due notice has been given are printed as supplied and are not edited)*

**Submitted by Councillor Steve Griffiths (received on 27 January 2022)**

**Q1.** How many flooding complaints have been lodged with Brisbane City Council for each of the following months: January 2019 – January 2022 inclusive (broken down by month):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **MONTH + YEAR** | **TOTAL** |
|  |  |

**Q2.** How many complaints about flooding in Doboy Ward have been lodged with Brisbane City Council for each of the following months: January 2019 – January 2022 inclusive (broken down by month):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **MONTH + YEAR** | **TOTAL** |
|  |  |

**Q3.** How many complaints about flooding in Hemmant have been lodged with Brisbane City Council for each of the following months: January 2019 – January 2022 inclusive (broken down by month):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **MONTH + YEAR** | **TOTAL** |
|  |  |

**Q4.** How much has been spent by Council on legal fees so far in fighting Extinction Rebellion in court over an appeal to ban the group from using Council meeting rooms (including libraries).

**Q5.** What Law Firm or Firms have been engaged by Council to fight Extinction Rebellion in court over an appeal to ban the group from using Council meeting rooms (including libraries).

**Q6.** Is Extinction Rebellion still banned from using Council meeting rooms?

**Q7.** How many complaints have been made to Brisbane City Council in regards to potholes, broken down by suburb and Ward, in the last three months?

**Q8.** How many complaints have been made to Brisbane City Council in regards to grass cutting not being done, broken down by suburb and Ward, in the last three months?

**Q9.** Provide details of the most recent approval date and expected expiry date for Council grass cutting contracts, broken down by suburb and Ward?

## 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 7 December 2021)**

**Q1.** Please provide the results of the Brisbane City Council’s latest Employee Satisfaction Survey.

***A1.*** *Council does not conduct Employee Satisfaction Surveys.*

**Q2.** Provide a breakdown of all legal services which have been engaged to date for the BrisbaneMetro project identifying which aspect of the project it is involved with, as well as a description of those services and the amount paid:-

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NAME OF LEGAL SERVICES PROVIDER** | **VEHICLES/ DEPOT/ BUSWAY CHANGES/ OTHER (INDICATE)** | **BRIEF DESCIPTION OF SERVICES PROVIDED** | **TOTAL AMOUNT** |
|  |  |  |  |

 ***A2.***

| ***NAME OF LEGAL SERVICES PROVIDER*** | ***VEHICLES/ DEPOT/ BUSWAY CHANGES/ OTHER (INDICATE)*** | ***BRIEF DESCIPTION OF SERVICES PROVIDED*** | ***TOTAL AMOUNT*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Clayton Utz* | *Business Case* | *Support such as the preparation of legal and regulatory considerations and procurement strategy discussions for the business case.* | *$303,699.40* |
| *Clayton Utz* | *Inner City Infrastructure*  | *Various activities since the inception of the project resulting in the successful completion of the tender process, award of contract and contract management matters.* | *$1,236,068.40* |
| *Clayton Utz* | *Metro Vehicle* | *Various activities since the inception of the project resulting in the successful completion of the tender process, award of contract and contract management matters.* | *$839,993.30* |
| *Clayton Utz* | *Depot* | *Various activities since the inception of the project resulting in the successful completion of the tender process, award of contract and contract management matters.* | *$364,703.80* |
| *Clayton Utz* | *Systems* | *Various activities since the inception of the project contributing to the release and evaluation progress of the procurement process.* | *$242,298.50* |
| *Clayton Utz* | *Stakeholder Management* | *Various activities since the inception of the project including drafting and advice pertaining to the State Project Deed and subordinate agreements demanded by the Queensland Government, various interface agreement drafting and execution support (e.g. Arts Queensland, Queensland Rail, Qld Fire and Emergency Services, Urban Utilities etc)* | *$556,046.90* |
| *Clayton Utz* | *Other* | *Various support for activities including early works, accessibility, project verifier procurements, Victoria Bridge, Brisbane Metro trademark, legal correspondence where required since the inception of the project* | *$528,197.25* |
| *City Legal Practice*  | *Ad-hoc* | *Ad-hoc legal support where requested on matters not pertaining to commercial aspects of Brisbane Metro.* | *$108,279.70* |

**Q3.** What is the total number of bus services which have been cancelled due to staff availability for each of the following months: January 2017 – December 2021 inclusive (broken down by month):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **MONTH + YEAR** | **TOTAL** |
|  |  |

***A3.***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | ***2017*** | ***2018*** | ***2019*** | ***2020*** | ***2021*** |
| ***January*** | *29* | *34* | *37* | *45* | *68* |
| ***February*** | *131* | *66* | *64* | *47* | *67* |
| ***March*** | *237* | *108* | *119* | *127* | *97* |
| ***April*** | *47* | *45* | *66* | *69* | *8* |
| ***May***  | *81* | *62* | *124* | *46* | *79* |
| ***June*** | *122* | *72* | *72* | *48* | *61* |
| ***July*** | *215* | *95* | *86* | *118* | *44* |
| ***August*** | *236* | *91* | *167* | *116* | *85* |
| ***September*** | *110* | *78* | *133* | *146* | *70* |
| ***October*** | *49* | *87* | *93* | *121* | *40* |
| ***November*** | *90* | *80* | *31* | *92* | *50* |
| ***December*** | *52* | *71* | *35* | *84* | *37* |

**Q4.** How many First Home Owner Rebates have been granted since it was established and what is the total amount of the rebates, broken down by financial year plus the amount allocated in the Council Budget:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DWELLING** | **NUMBER** | **TOTAL REBATE AMOUNT** | **BUDGET ALLOCATION** |
| 2019-2020 |  |  |  |
| 2020-2021 |  |  |  |
| 2021-2022 (year to date) |  |  |  |

***A4.***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***DWELLING*** | ***NUMBER*** | ***TOTAL REBATE AMOUNT*** | ***BUDGET ALLOCATION*** |
| *2019-2020* | *2180* | *$321,177* | *$548,309* |
| *2020-2021* | *5221* | *$2,475,571* | *$2,498,834* |
| *2021-2022 (year to date)* | *1266* | *$1,849,932* | *$2,320,244* |

**Q5.** How many Universal Housing Design Incentive payments have been granted since it was established, what is the total amount of the rebates, and the total Council Budget allocation, broken down by development type:

| **DEVELOPMENT TYPE** | **NUMBER OF REBATES** | **DWELLING YIELD** | **TOTAL REBATE AMOUNT** | **BUDGET ALLOCATION** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Individual Dwelling (Owner Occupied) |  |  |  |  |
| Commercial Development |  |  |  |  |

***A5.***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***DEVELOPMENT TYPE*** | ***NUMBER OF REBATES*** | ***DWELLING YIELD*** | ***TOTAL REBATE AMOUNT*** | ***BUDGET ALLOCATION*** |
| *Individual Dwelling (Owner Occupied)* | *1* | *9* | *$31,557.77* | *$138,000* |
| *Commercial Development* | *-* | *-* | *-* | *-* |

**Q6.** How many Brisbane Green Buildings Incentive Policy payments have been granted since it was established, and what is the total amount of the rebates since 1 June 2020, broken down by development type:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DEVELOPMENT TYPE** | **NUMBER OF REBATES** | **DWELLING YIELD** | **TOTAL REBATE AMOUNT** | **BUDGET ALLOCATION** |
| Individual Dwelling (Owner Occupied) |  |  |  |  |
| Commercial Development |  |  |  |  |

***A6.*** *Zero. Requests for payment open on 1 July 2022.*

**Q7.** What is currently the average speed of vehicles in the Brisbane CBD 40kmh zone for the following times:-

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TIME** | **AVERAGE SPEED** |
| Weekday AM Peak |  |
| Weekday (Outside AM and PM Peak) |  |
| Weekday PM Peak |  |
| Saturday |  |
| Sunday |  |

***A7.*** *Council is unable to produce the average speed for the Brisbane CBD 40 km/h zone.*

**Q8.** What was the average speed of vehicles in the Brisbane CBD 40kmh zone for the following times during 2020:-

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TIME** | **AVERAGE SPEED** |
| Weekday AM Peak |  |
| Weekday (Outside AM and PM Peak) |  |
| Weekday PM Peak |  |
| Saturday |  |
| Sunday |  |

***A8.*** *Council is unable to produce the average speed for the Brisbane CBD 40 km/h zone.*

**Q9.** What was the average speed of vehicles in the Brisbane CBD 40kmh zone for the following times during 2019:-

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TIME** | **AVERAGE SPEED** |
| Weekday AM Peak |  |
| Weekday (Outside AM and PM Peak) |  |
| Weekday PM Peak |  |
| Saturday |  |
| Sunday |  |

***A9.*** *Council is unable to produce the average speed for the Brisbane CBD 40 km/h zone.*

**Q10.** What was the average speed of vehicles in the Brisbane CBD 40kmh zone for the following times during 2018:-

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TIME** | **AVERAGE SPEED** |
| Weekday AM Peak |  |
| Weekday (Outside AM and PM Peak) |  |
| Weekday PM Peak |  |
| Saturday |  |
| Sunday |  |

***A10.*** *Council is unable to produce the average speed for the Brisbane CBD 40 km/h zone.*

**Q11.** Under the Brisbane City Council Health, Safety and Amenity Local Law 2009 Division 1 Amenity, Section 18 ***Unsolicited advertising material and community newspapers***, “*A person must not deposit any unsolicited newspaper or advertising material at premises other than by placing the newspaper or the material in a letter box or within the curtilage of the building*”. How many warnings and fines have been issued for each of the following categories broken down by Council region during 2021?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **REGION** | **WARNING** | **FIRST OFFENCE** | **SECOND OFFENCE** | **THIRD AND SUBSEQUENT OFFENCE** |
| North |  |  |  |  |
| South |  |  |  |  |
| East |  |  |  |  |
| West |  |  |  |  |
| Central |  |  |  |  |

***A11.*** *Council officers have advised that jobs are not captured in regions.*

**Q12.** Under the Brisbane City Council Health, Safety and Amenity Local Law 2009 Division 1 Amenity, Section 18 ***Unsolicited advertising material and community newspapers***states that *“A person must not deposit any unsolicited newspaper or advertising material at premises other than by placing the newspaper or the material in a letter box or within the curtilage of the building*”. How many warnings and fines have been issued for each of the following categories broken down by Council region during 2020?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **REGION** | **WARNING** | **FIRST OFFENCE** | **SECOND OFFENCE** | **THIRD AND SUBSEQUENT OFFENCE** |
| North |  |  |  |  |
| South |  |  |  |  |
| East |  |  |  |  |
| West |  |  |  |  |
| Central |  |  |  |  |

***A12.*** *Council officers have advised that jobs are not captured in regions.*

**Q13.** Under the Brisbane City Council Health, Safety and Amenity Local Law 2009 Division 1 Amenity, Section 18 ***Unsolicited advertising material and community newspapers***states that *“A person must not deposit any unsolicited newspaper or advertising material at premises other than by placing the newspaper or the material in a letter box or within the curtilage of the building*”. How many warnings and fines have been issued for each of the following categories broken down by Council region during 2019?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **REGION** | **WARNING** | **FIRST OFFENCE** | **SECOND OFFENCE** | **THIRD AND SUBSEQUENT OFFENCE** |
| North |  |  |  |  |
| South |  |  |  |  |
| East |  |  |  |  |
| West |  |  |  |  |
| Central |  |  |  |  |

***A13.*** *Council officers have advised that jobs are not captured in regions.*

**Q14.** Under the Brisbane City Council Health, Safety and Amenity Local Law 2009 Division 1 Amenity, Section 18 ***Unsolicited advertising material and community newspapers***states that *“A person must not deposit any unsolicited newspaper or advertising material at premises other than by placing the newspaper or the material in a letter box or within the curtilage of the building*”. How many warnings and fines have been issued for each of the following categories broken down by Council region during 2018?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **REGION** | **WARNING** | **FIRST OFFENCE** | **SECOND OFFENCE** | **THIRD AND SUBSEQUENT OFFENCE** |
| North |  |  |  |  |
| South |  |  |  |  |
| East |  |  |  |  |
| West |  |  |  |  |
| Central |  |  |  |  |

***A14.*** *Council officers have advised that jobs are not captured in regions.*

**RISING OF COUNCIL: 6.01pm.**

**PRESENTED: and CONFIRMED**

 **CHAIR**

**Council officers in attendance:**

Victor Tan (Council and Committee Coordinator)

Dorian Maruda (A/Council and Committee Officer)