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## PRESENT:

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

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

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

## OPENING OF MEETING:

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

Chair: I declare the meeting open.

Confirmation of minutes please.

## MINUTES:

**194/2022-23**

The Minutes of the 4692 and 4693 meetings of Council held on Tuesday 13 September 2022 and 25 October 2022, respectively, 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.

Chair: My apologies Councillors, I went over apologies.

Are there any apologies for today’s meeting?

## APOLOGY:

**195/2022-23**

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

**196/2022-23**

An apology was submitted on behalf of Councillor Steve GRIFFITHS, and he was granted a leave of absence from the meeting on the motion of Councillor Jared CASSIDY, seconded by Councillor Charles STRUNK.

Chair: Councillors, we move to Question Time.

Are there any questions of the LORD MAYOR or Civic Cabinet Chair—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: My apologies, okay. My apologies, we do have a Public Participant today, my apologies—I didn’t read the Agenda. We have a Public Participant, my apologies, Councillors.

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

Chair: I’d like to call on Mr Richard Tanner, who’ll address the Chamber on the success of the Wellers Hill Bowls Club. Billy, thank you, if you can show Mr Tanner to the microphone.

Councillor CASSIDY: Point of order, just sorry before this starts, Councillor COOK advises she’s in the waiting room and hasn’t been admitted to the meeting yet.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor.

We’re endeavouring to get her into the meeting, thank you.

Thank you, Mr Tanner, you have five minutes.

**Mr Richard Tanner – The success of Wellers Hill Bowls Club**

Mr Richard Tanner: Mr Chair, LORD MAYOR and Councillors, thank you so much for giving our club the opportunity to address the Council and I personally thank the Council for all the help that they have given our club to be reborn really. The club was born in 1962, but in 2019, you could say we were reborn. We have an injection of new blood on the board, we had a new direction that we looked at doing because things weren’t progressing real well as they were in the past. So like with everything else, you have to pick yourself up, dust yourself off and have a crack some other way, sort of thing.

The first thing we decided we needed to do was let the community know where we were. Wellers Hill as a suburb, a little suburb, was gobbled up by Tarragindi and there were a lot of new people in Tarragindi and didn’t even know where we were. So the best form, we thought, was the Tarragindi Community Facebook page and it’s the greatest little Facebook page you’ll ever see, because we started getting comments from people who would say I never ever knew this place was here. So it turned into a real community club, bowls clubs were good but they had run their day, so we decided to go down the community club way.

The first thing that we did, a lady by the name of Renae McBrien approached me and said this would be a great place for a community garden. With the help of Council—and especially I’d like to thank Councillor ADAMS, she got right behind us. We had a meeting where 50-odd people turned up, she helped finance it and I couldn’t thank her enough. Now that community garden, I’m so proud to say, has just won the Brisbane City Council (BCC) WasteSMART Community Award. Fifteen tonnes I believe was recycled, so you can’t get much better than that. We were so pleased for Renae and all her crew to win this award.

Also the other thing was I contacted by Council that we had no wheelchair access or disabled toilets. Unbelievably they got right behind us and they have built this renovation out there, where a person now can pull in a level car park, hop in their wheelchair, come through the front or the back of the club⎯it doesn’t matter⎯right through the club, down a ramp, on to the bowling green to play bowls. I mean it’s just unheard of, what the Council and the staff did for us was just unbelievable and again, nothing has been too much trouble for the Council. From the lady who you ring up on the phone, to the people, Gino and Lisa who look after us, we can’t thank those people enough.

The other big thing we did was put craft beer in, thinking outside the square and it’s amazing how many people love craft beer. I’m still an old lager man myself, but it was really taken to heart. We have 12 beers on tap now and we just get so much feedback from the community and it’s really made a community club out of it. There’s no better sight to see on a Friday, Saturday, Sunday afternoon, than people outside playing a bit of barefoot bowls, kids running around, kicking soccer balls and footballs and all this sort of stuff and little kids just running around. It’s just such a delight to see and when you see that you think wow, how lucky are we that the community has got behind us.

We got through COVID really well, we shut down for four months but that’s when we really started to find that the community wanted to stay local. They didn’t want to travel outside our area and again, they got behind us and gave us ideas. So we went with it, we have food trucks now on a Thursday, Friday, Saturday and Sunday, which is great and we rotate all the time so they’re not getting bored with it. So with the craft beer and the food trucks, the bellies are getting full and the club is fairing real well. Financially, when we took over in 2019, had a turnover of $140,000. Our finances last year we turned over $720,000, so it’s a—but again, I can’t thank Council enough and thank you very much for giving us this opportunity.

Chair: Councillor HOWARD, are you—

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

Councillor HOWARD: Yes, I’m very much looking forward to responding to you, Mr Tanner. My name is Vicki HOWARD and I’m the Civic Cabinet Chair for Community, Arts and Nighttime Economy, so you’re covering almost the whole three of those in what you’ve talked about today. Particularly with the craft beer, which I think probably is consumed after five o’clock and as I tell my colleagues, I take credit for anything after five o’clock that happens in our city. Your story is just the sort of story that we want to hear right across Brisbane and we really thank you and your team for working with us to make this a reality. We know that a lot of our clubs have done it tough, they were doing it tough before the pandemic some of them, but just the story that you’ve told here today is exactly what we are about in helping as many of our clubs as we can right across Brisbane.

We need people like you though, we need people like your committee, we need people like Renae and the community gardens and the craft beer, because that’s what makes the locals really want to come along and enjoy what you have to offer. We are delighted to be working alongside of you. We know that we have fantastic officers within our Council and I know that you’ve mentioned a few of them. They really enjoy getting in and working with the community to make sure that everything that we do with you is making a difference. I know that our access and inclusion grant has been really helpful with making sure that everybody can enjoy the wonderful bowls clubs. So, I really want to once again thank you so much for sharing with us today, we’ve really enjoyed your presentation. We look forward to continuing to work with you and really want to say a big thank you to you and your team for all that you’ve done. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor HOWARD.

Thank you for coming in, Mr Tanner, really great to have you here today.

Councillors, we do appear to be having a technical issue with the hybrid screen, I think we’re working hard on that—aren’t we—to include Councillor COOK?

Do you want to adjourn while we wait for Councillor COOK to be included?

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Is there a motion to adjourn the meeting while we work out the technical issues?

Is anybody moving that motion?

**ADJOURNMENT:**

|  |
| --- |
| **197/2022-23**  At that point, 2.41pm, it was resolved on the motion of Councillor Jared CASSIDY, seconded by Councillor Charles STRUNK, that the meeting adjourn until the Teams system allows Councillor COOK to join the meeting.  Council stood adjourned at 2.43pm. |

**UPON RESUMPTION:**

Chair: Thank you, Councillors.

Now we can move to Question Time.

## QUESTION TIME:

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

Councillor ATWOOD.

**Question 1**

Councillor ATWOOD: Thank you, Chair. My question is to the Chair of the Transport Committee, Councillor MURPHY. Councillor MURPHY, Labor Councillors have been very critical of this Administration’s clean and green transport solutions, including our electric bus trial. Can you please update the Chamber on this trial, including some observations about other electric bus users in Queensland?

Chair: Thank you.

Councillor MURPHY.

Councillor MURPHY: Well, thank you, Mr Chair and through you to Councillor ATWOOD for the question. We know that the Schrinner Council is a leader when it comes to electric transport, with e-scooters and e-bikes, the all-electric Brisbane Metro, and, as Councillor ATWOOD mentioned, our electric City Loop buses. We are dedicated to enhancing and expanding our public transport network to get more people on buses and ferries and less cars on the road. We also have a vision for a clean and green city, which includes a development of a plan to transition our substantial bus fleet to zero emissions vehicles.

In the last two years, around 30 electric buses have entered service in Queensland. Council added to that tally in June 2021 when we launched the first electric bus to operate the City Loop service, with another three that followed in July. That made us one of the first operators in Queensland to add fully-electric vehicles into our fleet. We were so ahead of the game that electric bus technology in Australia was only just getting started. So, we sourced the buses from Yutong, an experienced manufacturer who are world leaders in electric buses. That trial went extremely well and we have now entered those vehicles into full-time service.

Despite this, Councillor CASSIDY was not a supporter of the trial, calling it disgraceful and a slap in the face. The fact that Yutong used almost a dozen local and Australian suppliers to complete the fit out of these electric buses and employed Brisbane-based staff to support the maintenance of the vehicle didn’t seem to matter to Councillor CASSIDY, nor the improved air quality through zero tailpipe emissions, the reduced operational noise, or the reduced maintenance and whole-of-life costs associated with these buses. None of that mattered to Councillor CASSIDY. No, what mattered to Councillor CASSIDY, Chair, was the fact that they were made in China.

Well, thankfully, Chair, decision-makers in this State aren’t listening to Councillor CASSIDY. So, while he continues to throw his toys out of the pram about our electric buses, the rest of us are getting on with the job of the transition. Mr Chair, would you believe, of the 29 electric buses delivered to Queensland in the last two years, 14 were manufactured by Yutong, roughly half.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor MURPHY: By my count, with our four electric City Loop buses accounted for, that still leaves 10 Yutong buses in operation across the State. I wonder where they could be? More importantly, Mr Chair, I wonder who could have bought them? Well, I did a bit of digging and as it turns out, the bus operator, Sunbus, have five electric Yutong buses in Cairns and five on the Sunshine Coast. Just like Transport for Brisbane, Sunbus operates services on behalf of the Queensland Government through Translink, but can you take a guess at who funded Sunbus to purchase these buses? Well, it was none other than the Labor State Government—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor MURPHY: —who provided the funding to Sunbus to buy the Yutong vehicles, and judging by his outrage at our purchase of Yutongs, I hope that Councillor CASSIDY will now get on the phone to his friends at 1 William Street—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor MURPHY: —and berate them about their decision to buy Yutong buses months after ours were already on the road, but I won’t hold my breath, Mr Chair.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor MURPHY: What’s clear, Mr Chair, is that Councillor CASSIDY is embarrassingly out of step with his Labor colleagues when it comes to electrification of the fleet. He’s a hypocrite for calling out the Schrinner Council for doing exactly what his party pals down the road at 1 William Street are doing and he’s shown us just how weak the leadership of this Labor City Hall team are when it comes to keeping Brisbane clean and green. On one hand he says, ‘we need to do the real work to make Brisbane a more liveable, net zero emission city’, but at the same time, he criticises our leadership for taking the steps necessary to reduce our emissions. Well, Mr Chair, you can’t have it both ways.

We were pleased to see last year the Minister⎯Minister Bailey, announcing that the State would join with this Council in making the move towards zero emissions vehicles and we are pleased at the addition of every single electric bus to our State because we have found first-hand that the benefits are clear. We would love to see our next set of electric buses built right here in South East Queensland and we hope that the next set of buses will feature more local production components than the first four, but, Mr Chair, we make no apologies for taking the action necessary to deliver a cleaner, greener Brisbane future that residents want to see, not right now but also as we transition our fleet to net zero emissions.

As always, Chair, it is the Schrinner Council that has the forward-thinking commitment and the leadership to deliver for Brisbane residents. Those on the other side are rank hypocrites when it comes to the transition, when it comes to the environment, and when it comes to a clean and green fleet and we will not take any lectures on them when it comes to buses or the Brisbane Metro.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor MURPHY.

Further questions?

Councillor CASSIDY.

**Question 2**

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair. My question is to the LORD MAYOR. LORD MAYOR, do you believe the world is facing a climate emergency?

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: When you get any kind of emergency—through you, Mr Chair—Councillor CASSIDY, what do you do? Do you have a debate about it or do you actually take action? Now, we’ve always been a believer that you take action when it comes to an issue that needs attention and that’s why we are such a leader in the field of climate adaptation, emission reduction and also taking real steps to offset our emissions, as well. That’s why we are currently the largest government agency in Australia, of any three levels, that is carbon neutral. Now, if you’re facing—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —if you’re facing another kind of emergency—

Chair: Councillor STRUNK.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —like, for example, you’re facing a natural disaster, do you call a Council meeting and declare a climate emergency? Do you declare a natural emergency? No, you don’t. You actually get on and do the work that needs to be done. Now, it’s interesting. I think that, if you look at the Councils that have declared climate emergency, a lot of them slap themselves on the back. They have long-winded speeches about it. They think they’ve done something good, and then very little happens out of that. It’s grandstanding. It’s virtue signalling, and it’s got to be followed up with action. Well, we’ve skipped that unnecessary step and we’ve gone straight to the action. We did so not because—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —not because some—

Councillor CASSIDY: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: The question was very simple and the LORD MAYOR is required to answer it. Does he believe the world is facing a climate emergency?

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Well, Mr Chair, we wouldn’t be taking action if we didn’t think the matter was not that scale. We wouldn’t be—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —taking action if we didn’t think this was an utmost important issue, and so we have been taking action. In fact, in 2017, we became a carbon-neutral Council.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Point of order, Chair.

LORD MAYOR: 2017. Now—

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Sorry, just to the substance of the question there, it was sort of a yes or no question. Is the answer yes or no?

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: I think I’ve made my position really clear and, in fact—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —we have had a debate in this place before where I rejected virtue signalling, I rejected windbagging, which is what—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —which is what we’re talking about here when we have Councils declaring climate emergencies. Well, I wonder if Chris Bowen has declared a climate emergency in the Federal Parliament? Has he?

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: No. I wonder if the State Government—

Councillor CASSIDY: Point of order, Chair.

LORD MAYOR: —in George Street has—

Chair: Point of order—

LORD MAYOR: —declared a climate—

Chair: Point of order—

LORD MAYOR: —emergency.

Chair: Point of order to you—

LORD MAYOR: No, they haven’t.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair.

Chair: Have you finished, LORD MAYOR?

Councillor CASSIDY: The question was whether the LORD MAYOR believed the world was facing a climate emergency, not whether the Federal Government has declared one, not whether the State Government has declared one and not about a debate that happened here three or four years ago. My question was very clear, simple and succinct. Does the LORD MAYOR believe the world is facing a climate emergency?

Chair: The question—

Councillor CASSIDY: He needs to answer that question.

Chair: Thank you.

Thank you, Councillor CASSIDY. A question about climate emergency allows a broad-ranging response. The LORD MAYOR is providing that response.

LORD MAYOR: He doesn’t want to hear about what the State Government is doing. He doesn’t want to hear about what the Federal Government is doing. He doesn’t want to hear about what other Councils are doing. He just wants to play politics with an issue that is critical. He wants to play politics with an issue that we’ve been taking action on for years—

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —for years and if you ask if I think there’s a climate emergency, you’d better believe it. That’s why we’re taking action. I can’t be clearer than that, but it would be nice if other people actually took action, too. You know what? I don’t think it’s a problem that the State Government hasn’t declared a climate emergency, because once again, they’d be wasting their breath. Get on and deliver the things that they have committed to. Same with the Federal Government, let’s not waste time with politicians debating something when they should be taking action. So, this is classic Labor. It is classic Labor. Let’s have a virtue signalling debate, but not actually do anything. Classic Labor.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: It’s pretty much their position on every issue.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Let’s actually have a virtue signalling debate, show how woke we are—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —this is Labor, but then not actually do anything about it. These guys, who are supposed to care about public and social housing, yet they have let the entire State down. We’re in the middle of a housing crisis. There is a 50,000‑person waiting list for social and public housing, yet apparently, they care. These guys and girls are hypocrites.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: They are hypocrites. People need action, whether it’s housing, whether it’s climate change, whether it’s a whole range of issues. We believe in action and we will continue to make sure that this Council leads the agenda when it comes to getting on, rolling our sleeves up and doing what we need to do. So, that is what we’ve done for many, many years and that is what we will keep doing, because when we really believe something, we don’t just talk about it, we do it.

Chair: Councillor ADERMANN.

**Question 3**

Councillor ADERMANN: Yes, thank you, Chair. My question is to the Chair of the Infrastructure Committee, Councillor WINES. The Schrinner Council’s Moggill Road upgrade recently hit a major milestone with the construction works well underway. Can you please update the Chamber on the progress to date, including any other road projects that are getting residents home safer and sooner?

Chair: Councillor WINES.

Councillor WINES: Thank you, Mr Chair and thank you to Councillor ADERMANN for his question and for his enthusiasm with which he advocates for a better way of life for people in the western suburbs. Now, he identified in his question the Indooroopilly Roundabout Upgrade, or Moggill Road Upgrade Stage 1, which has hit a milestone about a very significant commitment of labour, time to get that project moving. Now, it is a marquee project for this Council that will have a material benefit throughout the entire western suburbs. I had the good experience at the recent centenary celebration of the QCWA (Queensland Country Women’s Association) here in City Hall where, talking to some members of that organisation from the Moggill-Bellbowrie branch about their problems on Moggill Road and they—when talking to them about their transport problems, they only identified one thing Councillor ADERMANN, Moggill Road. Moggill Road.

So, we are making a multi-$100 million commitment to make sure that people in the western suburbs get home sooner and safer. It’s important to remember, as well, while we discuss Moggill Road, that only part of it is within Council’s jurisdiction. A lot of the sections where the real trouble is, is within the State Government’s jurisdiction. So, Council will do what it can in its portion and what is it that we are building? We are building an overpass at the Indooroopilly Roundabout site, which will be one of the largest infrastructure spends in the western suburbs in many years. When the western suburbs were developed in the mid-to-late 1970s, there was a potential that the growth in population was not foreseen and that infrastructure projects such as this had to be built.

Can I thank the Federal Government’s contribution and their ongoing support for this project, in particular the previous government who arranged for the financial arrangements to make sure that we were able to get this project moving? As I’ve often said, the principal beneficiaries will be people who travel east-west. The huge number of vehicles that travel on that particular route will have a significant material benefit, not only on travel time, but in safety. Now, I have heard complaints from time to time that the old roundabout was fine the way it was and I don’t think that that’s a—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: I’ve heard it said. I’ve heard it said, and I don’t think—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: Well, people who are hostile—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: People who are—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: All I’ll say is people who are hostile to the concerns of ordinary people.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: I’ll put it like that. People who are hostile to the concerns of people who have to go to work each day and care for their families.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: I have heard it said that the old—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN.

Councillor WINES: I’m not really sure why Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN is identifying himself as a person who’s hostile to the concerns of ordinary people. It’s an odd thing to do, isn’t it? Wouldn’t you—you know, if I was to say, it’s by a group of people hostile to the concerns of ordinary people and start shouting out that it was them, it’s an odd thing to self-identify as. As I say, there have been people who have raised the concern that the old roundabout was sufficient and safe and that’s not true. I think any fair-minded person who experienced that roundabout in any meaningful way would not have that opinion. Lanes would come and go while you were on the roundabout. There were lights on a roundabout.

This new system will make life safer for people to move around. There was something in the range of 13 to 19 hospitalisations through motor vehicle accidents each calendar year. Those are the ones that are identified. That doesn’t include ones—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: These are—Councillor JOHNSTON says there’s more than 100, so perhaps there was.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: So now—and so I’m—look, it’s—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, please.

Councillor WINES: I’m having trouble hearing her exact words, but I know it’s—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: —in support of this project because, as a western suburbs Councillor, she would understand the material benefit—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: —that the—again, I can’t hear the words, but I know it’s in support, it always is.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: It always is.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, please. Enough.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: So, people in the western suburbs will materially—I had much more content than this. I assure you I did—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: —but it is a project that will—I haven’t even moved to Stage 2 yet.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: This is just Stage 1. Can I recognise, in the brief time I have left, the work of the officers to try to put the T-intersection in place? There was a huge amount of work involved into putting this in place. There is actually a huge amount of work that’s been done underground, and that’s where the bulk of the costing—

Chair: Councillor WINES, your time has expired.

Further questions?

Councillor CASSIDY.

**Question 4**

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair. My question is to the LORD MAYOR. LORD MAYOR, your short-term accommodation rates increase is expected to bring in an extra $985 per property on average. The ABC (Australian Broadcasting Corporation) recently reported that there were 679 properties in the suburbs of South Brisbane and Brisbane City alone listed for short-term accommodation, so that’s approximately $670,000 from these two suburbs this financial year you expect to raise. Across Brisbane, that could be in the millions of dollars on your figures. LORD MAYOR, given this policy is aimed at addressing housing affordability, will you commit this revenue to supporting the development of affordable housing, working with community housing providers?

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Well, it’s an interesting question because, in that same budget as we had announced the short-term accommodation changes, we also announced that we would, for the very first time, make the Pathways out of Homelessness program an ongoing program. Now, you’ll remember that this particular program was intended originally to be a one-off program. We had a temporary windfall from provisions that had been made for superannuation and those provisions that we’d put away to pay superannuation liabilities were met, plus there was extra money that had come in as a result of very, I guess, prudent investments by our finance people in Council.

So, we decided we would use—I think the figure was around $3 million, is that right, Councillor HOWARD? Three million across a three-year period, so $1 million a year for the Pathways out of Homelessness program. Now, we did the three years, the first program and it became such a worthwhile thing that, in the budget, I announced that we would be putting another $1 million a year in, in perpetuity. It would be an ongoing program. So, what started as a one-off now comes with $1 million a year of funding and this is working with the people at the frontline, not just to provide a Band-Aid solution to homelessness, but to really work with people to give them a pathway out of that situation.

It’s no good putting a Band-Aid on something that needs a treatment plan. That is exactly what the Pathways out of Homelessness program does and that’s why I announced the $1 million of funding each year in the budget. So, Councillor CASSIDY, you say, will we put the $1 million that comes out of this into those programs? Well, we’re already doing it and, in fact, even though we’re still gearing up the short-term accommodation changes, the money for Pathways out of Homelessness has already been budgeted and is being invested as we speak. So yes, we’re going ahead of the game.

Councillor CASSIDY: Point of order.

LORD MAYOR: Yes, we’re putting money—

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: I think that program’s fantastic and I support what the LORD MAYOR is saying there, but he might be a bit confused. I’m not talking about the Pathways out of Homelessness program. I’m asking specifically whether the revenue raised from this Airbnb short-term accommodation rates increase will be put into the development of affordable housing with community housing providers. It’s a totally different—

Chair: Well—

Councillor CASSIDY: —totally different topic.

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY, the question related to budget allocations for Pathways out of Homelessness and short stay accommodation. I believe the LORD MAYOR is relevant to the question.

LORD MAYOR: Yes. I will confirm, however, that we will not, we will not take away responsibilities that the State has. We’ve already done that enough with public transport. So, housing and the provision of social housing is the State and Federal Government’s problem and they need to invest. We already do enough to pick up the slack of their lack of investment in our city. We already do enough. There’s billions of dollars that we’ve had to put into infrastructure because the State Government has vacated the field.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: We’re doing more than our fair share of heavy lifting. We are not going to take on the provision of social housing that is quite clearly the State and Federal Government’s responsibility, but we will fund Pathways out of Homelessness, just as I’ve said. We’re putting $1 million a year into that program.

Chair: Further questions?

Councillor HUANG.

**Question 5**

Councillor HUANG: Thank you, Mr Chair. My question is to the Chair of the Finance and City Governance Committee, Councillor CUNNINGHAM. Councillor CUNNINGHAM, last week, the Federal Government handed down their budget for the 2022-23 year. Could you please update the Chamber on what projects Brisbane City Council can expect to be funded in the Local Government Area?

Chair: Councillor CUNNINGHAM.

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: Thank you, Mr Chair. So, while we were in the Chamber last Tuesday night, the Federal Treasurer, Jim Chalmers, was delivering the first budget of the new Government in Canberra. Naturally, we look closely at the State and Federal budgets to see how their priorities will impact Council’s project delivery. We know that we can achieve so much when all levels of government work together and the Schrinner Council seeks to work collaboratively with our neighbouring councils and the State and Federal Governments to deliver great outcomes for the people of Brisbane. The South East Queensland City Deal is a great example of this.

The funding for the City Deal remains unchanged from the May budget with over $300 million allocated through to 2025-26. The budget also included $24.7 million to support the preparation of the 2032 Brisbane Olympic and Paralympic Games. We know the budget saw a number of grant programs cancelled and reshaped, but for now, we understand that most of the projects, which were committed to Council by the previous government, will remain funded, which is a relief. Council has received correspondence from the Government, indicating that commitments of funding from the former Community Development Grants program will now be included in the Albanese Government’s Investing in Our Communities program. We’ve been advised that officers will be in contact in the coming weeks to assess our projects and develop the funding agreements.

I, for one, know that Easts Football Club in my ward will be hoping that the funding announced by the previous government will be honoured by the new Government in full. When it comes to tackling congestion, Roads to Recovery funding for Queensland for 2022-23 has reduced slightly to $93 million, but is back to its previous level of $101.7 million in the forward years. Council’s 2022-23 estimated allocation under Roads to Recovery remains at $11.7 million. Black Spot funding has also reduced slightly to a constant annual figure of $24.3 million on the forward projections. However, at this time, we believe that no projects locally are impacted.

The Urban Congestion Fund has been abolished and replaced with the Infrastructure Investment program. All previous Brisbane projects are continuing to be funded at this time. New initiatives announced include a $5 million planning study for Gympie Road, from Kedron to Petrie. The Government advises that the Gympie Road planning study will investigate options to remove blockages and ease congestion along the corridor. There is also $12.5 million for planning the next stage of the Ipswich Motorway, as part of the previously announced Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games business case development.

The Government has advised that the project will help to improve efficiency and network reliability and improve connectivity. The planning will include examining improved flood resilience and better connections with other Brisbane motorways. Of course, we welcome funding to be provided to local councils to deliver on our local priorities. The former Coalition Government’s Local Roads and Community Infrastructure (LRCI) program saw $87.6 million received by Brisbane City Council to deliver dozens of projects, big and small, right across our suburbs. These projects have supported our economic recovery during the pandemic and they continue to support us as we manage the impacts of the floods and the challenging global economic conditions.

The Coalition announced a two-year, $500 million extension in the May budget and we welcome the confirmation in the October budget of a further $250 million extension. As I have said before, local government is the level of government which is closest to the people and we greatly appreciate the support from Canberra in working with councils to deliver projects which create better communities. In fact, just on the weekend, I had the pleasure of joining with the LORD MAYOR to officially open the new clubhouse for the Brisbane Metropolitan Touch Association at Whites Hill Reserve.

Jointly funded by Council and the Federal Government through the LRCI program, the project involved constructing a new, purpose-built clubhouse. It’s a great facility and a fantastic example of how the Federal Government and Council can work together on delivering assets for our community for many years to come. We hope to work with the new Federal Government to deliver many more projects right across the suburbs just like this. A number of local commitments were made during the—

Chair: Councillor CUNNINGHAM, your time has expired.

Councillor JOHNSTON.

**Question 6**

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, my question is to the LORD MAYOR. LORD MAYOR, which streets or suburbs has Council prioritised for flood buy back and what criteria or guidelines is Council using to assess these priorities as part of the Resilient Homes funding?

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you for the question, Councillor JOHNSTON. Look, Council doesn’t prioritise the flood buy back scheme. That’s something that’s done by the Queensland Reconstruction Authority, the QRA. So, we work with them and we accept their list and then we implement their list. So I’m pleased to confirm that just in the last 24 hours, we have received another list of properties that have been assessed as appropriate for purchase under the Voluntary Home Buy Back scheme and these properties are spread across the city, but many of them are in some of the hardest-hit areas, including—

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, I would like to give the opportunity to the LORD MAYOR to correct his public statements now. I’ve been advised very clearly by the QRA and State representatives that Brisbane City Council is prioritising areas within Brisbane for flood buy back, that our Council is doing it differently to other councils.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, you are now debating the—you are now debating—

Councillor JOHNSTON: So I want to ask again—

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, please.

Councillor JOHNSTON: —which streets and suburbs have been prioritised—

Chair: Councillor—

Councillor JOHNSTON: —for buy back?

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, you’re—Councillor JOHNSTON, thank you. You are debating the point of order. The LORD MAYOR was relevant to the question, because he was explaining the process for the flood buy back program, administered by the QRA.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Look, I know, Mr Chair, in Councillor JOHNSTON’s world, everything is the fault of Brisbane City Council. That is her view of the entire universe. Everything is Council’s fault, according to Councillor JOHNSTON. Well, I can tell you, it is the QRA that makes the decision on which homes should be bought. Now, what we have done, there’s been a very cooperative and interactive process where they have asked us for various types of data, including flood impact data and a whole range of mapping and assessments and we have provided everything they have asked for, but then they gave us a list of properties to buy. That is the reality. That is the way the system works.

So, I was about to tell you the good news, Councillor JOHNSTON, before you interrupted. The latest round of properties, 61 properties have been assessed by the QRA within Brisbane as being the next on the list for acquisition, so this is good. We’ve had—I think it was 17 already. Now, on top of the 17, a further 61: 44 will be in Rocklea, five in Auchenflower, three in Oxley, two in Fairfield, two in Sherwood, two in Herston, one in Archerfield and one in Windsor. So, that’s the list the QRA has given us and we’ll get cracking on that process because we’re keen to progress this as quickly as possible. Obviously, there’s a process here. We get in touch with the owner. We let them know that you are now someone we want to negotiate with. Let’s progress this matter.

Obviously, there has to be an agreement reached. There are some of these people who had put their name on the list, but they may not ultimately agree to the buy back. That’s a process that we have to go through. This is not a resumption. This is a voluntary buy back. It’s not a resumption, so we don’t force people to sell if they don’t want to. People have expressed their interest and we’ve said, great, you’re on the list. Let’s talk about the acquisition. One of the good things, though, about this is 44 in Rocklea, obviously one of the hardest-hit areas, but giving us a significant group of houses in one area which can then be turned into parkland, effectively and so it’s—

*Councillor interjecting.*

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

LORD MAYOR: We work with the QRA based on the priority list they give us.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: So that is what we will continue to do and I think this is great. Sixty-one properties is a good outcome. We’ll continue working. Obviously, we’d like to see more, but this is the second transcript we’ve received and we’ll get cracking as soon as possible on this project.

Chair: Thank you.

Further questions?

Councillor TOOMEY.

**Question 7**

Councillor TOOMEY: Thank you, Chair. My question is to the Chair of City Standards Committee, Councillor MARX. Councillor MARX, with Brisbane’s weather becoming increasingly humid and wet, mosquito breeding grounds around the city will become more active. Could you please update the Chamber on how the Schrinner Council is protecting Brisbane residents from an increase in mosquito population?

Chair: Councillor MARX.

Councillor MARX: Yes, thank you, Chair and through you, I thank Councillor TOOMEY for the question. Brisbane City Council has one of the most sophisticated mosquito management programs in Australia, investing $4.7 million into our mosquito program this year to protect the residents of Brisbane. I’m proud to report to the Chamber that we remain the only Council in Australia to employ two expert entomologists that are based in the mosquito laboratory at Eagle Farm Regional Operational Centre, fondly referred to as the ROC. With an increased chance of above average rainfalls, thanks to a third consecutive *La Niña*, Council is doing everything possible to stay on top of mosquito populations.

This Administration has always committed to making available all funding and resources required to get the job done and this has never changed in the 10 years, going on 11 years that I have been a Councillor in this place. Council is prioritising the control of mosquitoes with crews working to ensure the spraying of mosquito breeding sites all over Brisbane. Chair, as part of Brisbane’s immediate flood recovery efforts, the LORD MAYOR quickly identified the risk of increased mosquito activity and potential increased mosquito-borne diseases.

As a result of this identification by the LORD MAYOR, the Mosquito Task Force was convened at the start of March to bring together key local and State Government agencies to provide a forum for information sharing and response planning. This actually happened to coincide with the outbreak of what we call the JEV, Japanese Encephalitis Virus, north of Brisbane and the height of media coverage of mosquito-borne disease. As this group has continued to meet since then, it became apparent that there is no significant increase in mosquito numbers or mosquito-borne diseases after the floods.

In fact, Mr Chair, we actually had our last meeting yesterday afternoon and I’d like to report we have Mayors and local council representatives from Lockyer Valley, Sunshine Coast, Gold Coast, Logan. We also had the Mayor of Gympie join us yesterday. We also have representatives from LGAQ (Local Government Association Queensland) and also, obviously, State Government representatives from the Health Department, as well as all their mosquito people and all that. So, it’s a wide-ranging group of people and I have to say, I’m very honoured and privileged that the LORD MAYOR entrusted me to run this task force for him, given the calibre of the people that are in that meeting. Council has one of the most extensive mosquito control programs in Australia, although most residents may only sometimes see Council officers carrying out mosquito control activities.

Entomologists continue to monitor mosquito activity weekly, mosquito traps and monitor wetland water levels via our remote water level sensors. The mosquito control team now has two eight-wheeled ATVs (all-terrain vehicles), six six-wheeled ATVs, two electric buggies and eight four-wheel drive spray trucks and these operate 52 weeks of the year. The LORD MAYOR and I both have had the opportunity to be out on any number of those vehicles over the past year. The control activities are scientifically managed, targeting specific areas where and when the breeding is known to occur.

What can residents do, Mr Chair? When adult mosquitoes are active, there are a number of measures residents can take to protect themselves. I know I always have mosquito repellent in the car, so that I can use it if needed out in the community. I also have a couple of bottles in the caravan, as well, whenever I manage to get away. After the recent rain, I recommend that residents take the time to look for stagnant water around the house so mosquitoes cannot breed. This includes our pets’ drinking bowls, bird baths, gutters, wheelbarrows and children’s toys which are also known to be water collectors.

Mr Chair, Council is acting quickly to limit the number of mosquitoes across the city and reduce the risk of residents being bitten. We are proud to have Australia’s leading mosquito spraying program and to be able to rely on the best advice and latest technology to protect our community from mosquitoes. Thank you, Mr Chair.

Chair: Thank you.

Further questions?

Councillor CASSIDY.

**Question 8**

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair. My question is to the LORD MAYOR. LORD MAYOR, on the LNP side of the Chamber, there are a lot of so-called accidents. First, Councillor OWEN accidentally charged ratepayers for cab rides to Cher and Keith Urban concerts.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: Then, there was Councillor ATWOOD, who forgot to declare the purchase of a $1.5 million property. Whoops. Now, we find out Councillor ADERMANN has accidentally used his ward office budget to buy a membership to something called the Conservative Breakfast Club.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: LORD MAYOR, are there any other so-called accidents lurking in your team, or is this actually evidence of a culture of rorting?

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Well, it’s no accident that these matters have come to light, because we are a Council that believes in transparency and, in fact, every dollar spent in this organisation is available for all Councillors to see and that is important. It is an important transparency and accountability measure. Now, if you were to ask, for example, someone in the State Government what they spend their money on, they have these sessions called estimates, budget estimates, where a lot of people spend a lot of time not answering questions about what is supposedly going on when it comes to expenditure.

They certainly don’t have a system in place where every MP (Member of Parliament) can see every expense in the organisation, like we do. So that is a really good thing and this is something that we believe in strongly, just like when we introduced the *Hansard* system into reporting in this Chamber, so that every word that is uttered in this place is recorded and can be there as an accountability and transparency measure. Now, certainly, there are Councillors on both sides of the Chamber that have made some mistakes and it is important that those mistakes are fixed up. I would simply say that, but I simply would say that these have only come to light because of our openness and transparency.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: It is a simple fact that we expect the highest standards from all of the Councillors, including Opposition Councillors, and, you know, people in glass houses, I would simply say, should not throw rocks—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —because we know that accidents or mistakes can happen. The important thing is that they are identified and they are rectified. That is what I expect because we do expect and I do expect, the highest standards of accountability and transparency.

Chair: Thank you.

Further questions?

Councillor LANDERS.

**Question 9**

Councillor LANDERS: My question is to the Chair of the Community, Arts and Nighttime Economy Committee, Councillor HOWARD. Councillor HOWARD, the Schrinner Council’s QUBE Effect program has recently reached an important milestone. Could you please update the Chamber on the progress of this year’s competition?

Chair: Thank you.

Councillor HOWARD.

Councillor HOWARD: Well, thank you. Thank you, Mr Chair, and thank you for—through you, thank Councillor LANDERS for the question and for her keen, ongoing interest in how the Schrinner Council supports our creative sector and emerging artists. Since 2015, Brisbane City Council has delivered The QUBE Effect, a contemporary youth music program that provides performance, promotional and professional development opportunities for emerging and professional young Brisbane musicians aged 12 to 25 years old. Since then, the program has supported over 180 young and emerging artists, with some alumni going on to tour nationally, win Queensland music awards and place on *Triple J’s Hottest 100*. Now in its ninth year of production, the program creates pathways and career development opportunities for young artists and focuses on retaining and developing talent within our city.

It accomplishes this by providing real opportunities for young people to access Council programs, contribute to our city and achieve their future aspirations. The competition showcases and promotes Brisbane’s young and emerging musicians and builds sustainable partnerships between Council, the music industry and young, emerging artists. I’m happy to announce that, just recently, after assessing a pool of more than 70 qualified—that’s 7-0, 70 qualified applicants—we have announced the finalists for The QUBE Effect 2023. As a result, 24 young and emerging Brisbane-based finalists will take part in The QUBE Effect program, which will run over six months to enhance the skills and career opportunities of all those as part of the program.

Covering genres such as industrial pop, R&B, hip-hop, and electronic, The QUBE Effect finalists for 2023 represent Brisbane’s first music scene and incredible talent of our city that we’re very much famous for. Beginning shortly, these finalists will be given a number of opportunities to develop their musical careers, taking part in one-on-one mentoring with some of Brisbane’s most talented and experienced music professionals, live performance coaching, recording studio time and coaching, experience filming and music video and marketing, branding and public relations coaching. These really are some invaluable ways that our QUBE Effect finalists are supported to develop their musical talents, helped in no small part to the dedication of musical professionals that offer their time and expertise to support Brisbane’s young and emerging artists.

This year’s finalists will benefit from the mentorship and collaboration with some of the biggest names in Australian music, including Bernard Fanning from Powderfinger, ARIA (Australian Recording Industry Association) nominated artist Danny Widdicombe and The QUBE Effect alumni, Hope D. There really is an expert line-up of mentors and it gives me great pleasure to say that QUBE Effectalumni, Hope D, will also be a part of this year’s expert panel, after having completed the program herself in 2019. She’s an amazing artist, having taken home prizes in the 2021 Queensland Music Awards and she speaks very highly about the positive impact The QUBE Effect has had on her musical career.

Previous alumni of The QUBE Effect have also had very positive things to say about the program, including winner of the Lord Mayor’s Live Event Award, Andy Martin, who said The QUBE Effect gave him the chance to expand his music industry network with mentorship from prominent musical figures in the scene and to have a high-quality video produced. From here, our QUBE Effect finalists will embark on their professional development by working with an industry panel to develop their skills and knowledge through an initial needs assessment, workshops, live music, creating their own music video and personal mentoring sessions. In April, our finalists will have the opportunity to perform live for the residents of Brisbane, with the program culminating at The QUBE Effect Awards event, scheduled for July 2023.

The QUBE Effect program really is a fantastic development opportunity for Brisbane’s emerging artists and we are keen to follow along with this year’s finalists. Another positive outcome of The QUBE Effect is seeing finalists and award winners perform at events and venues across Brisbane and to have their creative talent recognised on a national level. While the past two and a half years has been particularly challenging for the arts and creative industries, it’s very heart-warming to see and hear QUBE Effect alumni performing across a number of different platforms over the last 12 months. As an example, QUBE Effect alumni performed as part of this year’s Brisbane Festival, such as the Beddy Rays, who performed at the Princess Theatre.

It’s particularly heart-warming to hear about QUBE Effect alumni going on to play and be a part of the program of the Brisbane Festival, which of course supports hundreds of Brisbane-based artists and showcases the very best that Brisbane has to offer every year. A number of QUBE Effect alumni have also gone on to be recognised for their musical talents, including Sycco.

Chair: Councillor HOWARD, your time has expired.

Councillor HOWARD: Thank you.

Chair: That ends Question Time for today.

Councillor CASSIDY: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor CASSIDY.

**198/2022-23**

At that juncture, Councillor Jared CASSIDY moved, seconded by Councillor Charles STRUNK, that the Standing Rules be suspended.

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY, you have three minutes to establish the reason for doing this now.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair. The reason that it’s urgent to do this now is because we’ve only just found out the LORD MAYOR’s views, in black and white and very clearly, about the housing crisis facing Brisbane today. We know he’s danced around this subject a bit over the last few months. When you say—describing someone’s view in this way, that it’s somebody else’s problem, sometimes that’s a sort of paraphrasing way of describing somebody’s actions, but when it comes to this LORD MAYOR Adrian SCHRINNER, we know now that that is absolutely his view.

Councillor WINES: Point of order, Mr Chair.

Councillor CASSIDY: We heard today him answer in Question Time—

Councillor WINES: Point of order, please.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor WINES.

Councillor WINES: I appreciate that Councillor CASSIDY is speaking to the need for urgency, but what is the subject that is the cause of the urgency? It would be appreciated so that those of us he’s seeking the endorsement of to carry out this debate would have some idea what it is that he’s actually proposing, so that we may consider it within the three minutes in a meaningful way.

Chair: In order to establish urgency, there needs to be some outline of what the urgency is, and I think Councillor CASSIDY has been doing that, Councillor WINES.

Councillor CASSIDY: Oh, thanks very much, Chair. Forty seconds in. So, we heard the LORD MAYOR say not 15 or 20 minutes ago that it is literally someone else’s problem, not Council, to address the housing crisis engulfing our city. He said it’s—

Chair: Point of order.

Councillor CASSIDY: —the Federal Government’s problem.

Chair: Point of order, LORD MAYOR.

Councillor CASSIDY: He said—

LORD MAYOR: That is blatant misrepresentation. I claim to be misrepresented.

Councillor CASSIDY: The LORD MAYOR said, it’s the Federal Government’s problem, it’s the State Government’s problem and it’s not his problem and he’s done enough. Those were his exact words. The LORD MAYOR said he has done enough. Check that *Hansard* you’re talking about, LORD MAYOR.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: He said he had done enough, Chair. So, what we put to the LORD MAYOR in Question Time was seeking a commitment that the potentially millions of dollars in extra revenue raised this year by levying extra rates on short-term accommodation properties be put into the delivery of new affordable housing properties, alongside community housing providers. His answer was, it’s somebody else’s problem. Now, we’re trying to help the LORD MAYOR and this LNP Administration here, Chair, to fix up the mess that they are creating.

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY, I think you’re moving into your substantive motion. I think you’ve said enough to establish the reason for urgency.

I’d like to move to the vote on whether urgency has been established.

Councillor CASSIDY: I didn’t realise you could do that, Chair.

Chair: Yes.

Councillor CASSIDY: Is that your discretion, the right to stop a Councillor—

Chair: So, whether or not you’ve provided sufficient reasoning for the suspension of standing rules.

Councillor CASSIDY: Which I have three minutes to do.

Chair: Yes, you have up to three minutes and my ruling is that you’re now debating what you would believe or want to be the substantive motion.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: So, we can move to the vote on whether or not you’ve established a sufficient reason for the suspension of standing rules.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: But it was two minutes. It was two minutes. So, this Administration, aided and abetted by you, a partisan Chair, now in saying that a Councillor can’t have three minutes to establish why this matter is really urgent—

Councillor WINES: Point of order.

Councillor CASSIDY: Look, it’s urgent—

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor WINES.

Councillor CASSIDY: It’s urgent because people who are fleeing family and domestic violence situations—

Chair: Excuse me, Councillor—

Councillor WINES: No, that was not raised earlier, Mr Chair.

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY. Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: —are sleeping in cars tonight.

Councillor WINES: That was a completely pointless attack on you.

Councillor CASSIDY: It’s urgent because people with complex mental health issues—

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: —are homeless—

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: —and this LORD MAYOR—

Councillor WINES: There is a—

Councillor CASSIDY: —says it’s somebody else’s problem.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor WINES: Point of order.

Councillor CASSIDY: It’s somebody else’s problem.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY, please stop talking while there’s a point of order. I’m taking the point of order of Councillor WINES.

Councillor WINES: Mr Chair, you’ve made a ruling. You’ve made your position clear. Councillor CASSIDY is making a gratuitous attack on you and your character, which is unjustified and unfair. You are exceptionally generous to Mr CASSIDY and I ask he consider that in his very, very unfair attack on you.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: The point of—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: The point of order is that the Chair has made his decision, and I—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: I have made my point of order and—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: Well, it turns out that’s—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: It turns out that’s—

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: You believe that point of orders can be debated all day and all night.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor WINES, please.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY, you’ve had your three minutes whether or not urgency is required, whether or not to suspend standing rules.

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

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

ABSTENTIONS: 1 - Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Point—just a moment, Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN.

Oh, okay, Councillor CASSIDY’s moving.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN, your point of order.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Thanks, Chair. I’d like to move suspension of so much of standing orders as it’s necessary.

LORD MAYOR: Point of order. There’s a claim of misrepresentation—

Chair: Oh sorry, my apologies.

LORD MAYOR: —that needs to be dealt with, and then we can move to—

Chair: Okay, claim of—yes, LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Yes, thank you.

Chair: You claim to be misrepresented.

LORD MAYOR: Yes. I was very clear in what I said earlier, which is the provision of public and social housing is a State and Federal Government responsibility. We are not taking on that responsibility and while we’ll deal with organisations for the provision of crisis services such as Micah and through the Pathways out of Homelessness initiative, we are not about to take on the provision of State and Federal responsibilities in the area of housing.

Chair: Thank you. Before we move on, I just want to make this point about suspension of standing rules. The obligation is for Councillors to assert and to determine why it couldn’t—why the required motion, the motion that you would like to debate, wasn’t on the notice paper. You have up to three minutes to establish urgency. That doesn’t mean you have three minutes to make your case. So, you have up to three minutes to establish why the suspension of standing rules is necessary to allow you to move a motion. It doesn’t give you *carte blanche* to have a three-minute speech.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN.

**199/2022-23**

At that juncture, Councillor Jonathan SRIRANGANATHAN moved, seconded by Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON, that the Standing Rules be suspended.

Chair: Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN, you have three minutes—up to three minutes to establish why urgency is required.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Thanks, Chair. The motion—the motion I propose to move is somewhat similar to a notified motion that I submitted to the Chair and the Council clerks about a week ago. I sent that notified motion in according to the proper process and then, over the last few days, I noticed, oh, it’s not on the notice paper. Yesterday, I realised it hadn’t been circulated to other Councillors and hadn’t been included in the Agenda. So I made a few phone calls and I said, oh, how come the notified motion we sent through is not on the notice paper? Only after making those phone calls was I informed that, actually, the Council Administration had decided that the motion was out of order because it was subject to legal impediment, but they hadn’t told me.

So it was only yesterday afternoon when I found that out. I then wanted to submit an amended notified motion with different wording, but unfortunately, it was too late, we’ve missed the cut-off. So basically, the reason I couldn’t bring this as a notified motion was that I did bring it as a notified motion, it was ruled out of order and I didn’t have time to submit amended wording. So the motion I propose to bring today is somewhat similar to that notified motion, but substantially different enough that it should comply with the relevant regulations and legislations, so that it can be brought and won’t be ruled out of order.

So the motion I propose to bring is that Brisbane City Council resolves to start the process of amending City Plan and other relevant documents in order to limit all new residential, mixed use, industrial and commercial development proposals on land that is mapped under Brisbane River Flood planning areas 1, 2a, 2b, and 3 within the Flood overlay. These changes should be drafted so as not to limit development applications that seek to renovate or raise existing buildings in order to improve flood resilience. So, that’s the motion. I think it should be compliant. The Chair has apologised for not getting back to me and I accept that apology. Hopefully, next time I’ll be given a bit more notice and we can work this stuff out before the meeting, but hopefully, the Chamber will accept the case for urgency and we can debate this later today.

Chair: Thank you, Councillors.

The motion before us is to allow the suspension of standing rules, to allow Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN to move a motion.

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

Chair: Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN, you have the—please move your motion.

**200/2022-23**

It was moved by Councillor Jonathan SRIRANGANATHAN, seconded by Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON, that—

*Brisbane City Council resolves to start the process of amending City Plan and other relevant documents in order to limit all new residential, mixed use, industrial and commercial development proposals on land that is mapped under Brisbane River Flood planning areas 1, 2a, 2b and 3 within the ‘Flood’ Overlay.*

*These changes should be drafted so as not to limit development applications that seek to renovate or raise existing buildings in order to improve flood resilience.*

Councillor LANDERS: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor LANDERS.

**201/2022-23**

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

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

Chair: We will now move that item to the end of today’s agenda. Item for debate at that point.

LORD MAYOR, Establishment and Coordination Committee (E&C) meeting, please.

## CONSIDERATION OF COMMITTEE REPORTS:

### ESTABLISHMENT AND COORDINATION COMMITTEE

The Right Honourable, the LORD MAYOR (Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER), Chair of the Establishment and Coordination Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Sarah HUTTON, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 24 October 2022, be adopted.

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Now, Mr Chair, we’ve seen the continuation of a trend in this Chamber, where it’s not enough for the Opposition and the Leader of the Opposition to hold us to our record or to hold us to a position. They make up positions entirely. They manufacture positions. They manufacture this bogeyman, which they call the LNP and they attribute things to the LNP which just aren’t true.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: It is their political strategy. It is their political strategy—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —but it is—

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Will the LORD MAYOR take a question about whether the LNP still exists?

Chair: LORD MAYOR, will you take a question?

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: No, that was a—

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Okay, moving on. Councillor CASSIDY thinks all of this is really funny because—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —it’s purely a political strategy.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: It is a political strategy. Look, Councillor CASSIDY has this inveterate hatred for the LNP. We understand that. He’s motivated more by his hatred for the Opposition, rather than any desire to do good.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Look, I get where his motivation lies, but the reality is, you can’t just make stuff up. You can’t just manipulate the truth to suit your political narrative. The reality is, if Councillor CASSIDY and his colleagues really cared about the housing crisis, they wouldn’t vote against everything when plan after plan comes through. We had one just recently in Bridgeman Downs. Four thousand new homes was the opportunity there. Did they vote yes to that? It wasn’t even in their own area. I could understand the nimbyism coming out in places like Sandgate, where he voted against his own neighbourhood plan—Councillor CASSIDY, that is—and I can understand Councillor GRIFFITHS opposes every kind of development that happens in his area, but even in an LNP ward, they still voted against 4,000 new homes and then they claim to care about housing.

They don’t hold the State Labor Government or the Federal Labor Government accountable for not having appropriate levels of investment in public and social housing. No, apparently we’re supposed to fix that problem as well, just like we have been forced to invest in public transport because the State Government won’t do it, but I can tell you, we have invested billions into public transport and infrastructure and we don’t have the capacity to do another State Government or Federal Government responsibility on top of that. We simply do not.

So, we will continue to do our part, and the biggest part of our role when it comes to housing is to make sure there is adequate supply available. We also, as I said, will continue to do additional things like supporting the Pathways out of Homelessness, supporting Homeless Connect, supporting to fund our officers on the street which are engaging and supporting our rough sleepers every day out in the community and linking them up with services.

We’ll continue to do all of those things, but we can’t afford to get into State and Federal areas of housing that are their responsibility. It is as simple as that. Why? Because we’ve got a responsibility to the ratepayers of Brisbane to make sure that we are focusing on those core requirements that they expect of us. Yes, Brisbane ratepayers expect us to support infrastructure and public transport and to provide a good level of service for the basics out there, but I think they expect the State and Federal Governments to provide social and public housing. You ask the average punter on the street, that is exactly what they will tell you.

So, Councillor CASSIDY, don’t try and twist my words. The reality is that we will continue doing our part and if you really care about housing, then you will stop voting against new development. You will stop voting against new homes being built. You will maybe stop attending rallies to stir up residents against new development, like you did just two weeks ago in Moorooka.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: I will never forget the way that Councillor GRIFFITHS carried on during my budget speech. He literally carried on like a pork chop.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: You know, in front of the cameras, called me a liar, said all types of things—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —and yet, he’s out there once again, fanning the anti-development flames, opposing development in his area, which is exactly what I said he did. So, despite the fact that there’s endless proof points of what I said—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —he called me a liar and then, yet a matter of weeks later, he’s out there fanning the anti-development flames, opposing new homes being built in his ward. You can’t have it both ways, to use your words, Councillor MURPHY. You can’t say you care about housing supply and affordability. If you vote no to 14 out of 16 neighbourhood plans, you can’t say it. No one will believe that the Labor Party cares about housing if they keep voting against neighbourhood plans which provide more housing supply.

Now, there’s an opportunity today, Councillor HUANG. It is the Eight Mile Plains Gateway neighbourhood plan. I wonder what Labor will do. Now, there may not be a huge amount of homes being provided here, because it’s largely a business district, but let’s see what they do. Will they vote yes or will they vote no? I wonder. The reality is, they’ve got an opportunity, and they’ve had multiple opportunities to show their support for more housing supply, to show their support for the provision of homes to Brisbane residents, but time and time again, they vote no.

Now, in terms of Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN and his motion that he’s put up for debate later on, I’ll simply say, he’s asked me a question before in Question Time about whether homes or buildings should be built in flood zones. I’ve answered those questions, but the reality is, we know that it is only the State Government that can prohibit development of any kind in the State of Queensland. The State Government can prohibit development. Councils cannot prohibit development. The State Planning Act basically confirms that reality.

Now, if Councillor SRI is suggesting that we can prohibit, I think he would be barking up the wrong tree because we can’t. The State Government can, but is he suggesting we can limit? My response will be, we already do limit development in flood-prone areas. We do limit it by putting very strict conditions on any requirements. We do limit it by putting requirements on the type of buildings and structures that can be built and a whole range of requirements on buildings and homes in flood areas. That is something that already happens to this day.

I remember having a discussion with some residents in my former ward, where they had bought a property that was subject to overland flow. They wanted to build a slab-on-ground house. Our officers came back and said, you cannot do that. There’s overland flow on this property. You must raise the house. You must put this house on stilts. They weren’t happy. I can tell you right now, they were not happy, but it was only a matter of two years after the house was built, we had a flood through the area. They did admit to me, I am grateful that the Council dug its heels in and put conditions on this development so that the house was raised. We are doing this already. This is built into our planning framework, and so it’s something we will continue to do.

Now, moving on, lighting up Council assets. We had both last night and tonight the assets lit up in blue and pink for the T20 Men’s World Cup, with the international tournament being held throughout Australia this year, with games at The Gabba beginning this week.

Wednesday night, tomorrow night, our assets will be lit up in red to support 35 years of Rosies and we know Rosies provide community connection and friendship and support to those who are homeless or at risk of homelessness. This month, we support 35 years of Rosies in our community and we honour them for the great work they do.

On Thursday and Friday, our assets will be lit up in green to support Lung Cancer Awareness Month. The Lung Foundation is a leading charity in Australia, providing support and a voice for people with a lung disease. During November, this campaign raises awareness and funds to support research into lung cancer, providing hope to over 13,000 Australians who are diagnosed each year.

Also, on another note, this weekend is the beginning of the Virtus Oceania Asia Games. Now, we’ve had previously—Councillors will remember a couple of years back, we had the INAS (International Federation for Athletes with Intellectual Impairments) Global Games here, which were an incredible event here locally in Brisbane that we supported very heavily for athletes with an intellectual impairment. It was just a wonderful display of inclusion and excellence in sport. INAS has morphed into Virtus, and Virtus are having their Oceania Asia Games here in Brisbane from 5-11 November and once again, we are very heavily supporting them.

Chair: LORD MAYOR, your time has expired.

Councillor LANDERS: Point of order.

**202/2022-23**

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

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you. So, we will see up to 1,000 athletes and officials from New Zealand, Asia, the Pacific nations, all come together in Brisbane for this event. Councillors may be aware that—and it was in the paper today—the City of Brisbane and, indeed, myself has been asked to represent the city at the UN (United Nations) climate change conference, COP27 (27th Conference of the Parties of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change), which is coming up in a couple of weeks’ time.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Now, the Leader of the Opposition appears to have planned his entire Question Time based on what Craig Zonca asked on the radio this morning. Look, it was interesting because Craig Zonca asked a—he was asking legitimately and it was a great opportunity to explain to people exactly what our record was when it comes to real action on climate change. Craig was quite surprised to hear that we were carbon neutral and are still the largest government agency in Australia that is carbon neutral. I’m sure the listeners on *ABC Radio* would have been interested to hear that, as well, because more people need to know this important information, but it is sad that the Leader of the Opposition is so lacking in ideas that he has to literally recycle a question which I was asked on the radio this morning for his first question in Question Time.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: It is really, really sad.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Who’s cranky?

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: I do get cranky when we see all types of emissions coming out of people’s mouths when we could save those emissions with real action.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: So, let’s reduce the emissions in places like Council Chambers and Parliaments and let’s actually get on with our action. That’s what our motive has been. Look, I’m really excited about the opportunities as we go towards the 2032 Olympics, to have Brisbane 2032 as a climate-positive Games is a significant step and one that I’m really excited about. Now, as an organisation that provides services to the people of Brisbane, some of those key services we provide are also the source of major emissions. For example, Councillor MURPHY touched on transport and the fact that we’re moving⎯we’re starting the transition towards a zero tailpipe emission fleet. What has Labor done? The two components of that transition, the Brisbane Metro and the first electric buses, they’ve criticised both of those things and they claim they care about climate change.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: They claim they care about a climate emergency. Well, it’s either an emergency or it’s not.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: The reality is—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —we’re getting on and taking action. Labor Councillors just criticise from the sidelines and, in fact, even their own State Labor Government is buying the same buses that we have put onto our trial.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Now, as Councillor MURPHY said, we really are excited to see how the local bus building industry is evolving into this electric vehicle and even hydrogen vehicles for public transport and we’re looking forward to working with them and we’re looking forward to teaming up with the State Government to get on with this transition to a zero tailpipe emission transport fleet in Brisbane. This is a real opportunity for our city over the next 10 years as we approach the Games, but also another major source of emissions for our city is the fact that we provide landfill. So, we collect people’s waste each week and we have the recycling bins, we have the green waste bins, but the red-top bin, obviously, is a major source of emissions generation through landfill.

Once again, we’re taking real action. We’ve been harvesting and capturing landfill gases across many different sites of the city and in many of those sites, we’re actually generating clean energy. The site at Rochedale, the biggest landfill, the Brisbane landfill at Rochedale has a generator going 24-7 with captured landfill gas and then putting green energy back into the grid, powering thousands of local homes. These are the type of practical things we’re doing. We’re working to reduce our emissions in so many ways, whether it’s adapting to LED lights, whether it’s putting solar panels on our buildings and a whole range of things, we’re taking real action.

So I’m really looking forward to being part of this climate change conference, to learning from other places, but also talking to those other places about what Brisbane is doing and learning what we can do as part of our next steps going forward. Now, this is something that I’m proud to have been invited to and I’m also proud to be part of the official Australian delegation. Together with Ministers like Chris Bowen from the Federal Labor Government, we’ll be there in solidarity, talking about how we can work together across the different levels. It was an honour to meet with Chris Bowen recently when I was in Canberra with the Mayors of the capital cities and the CoMSEQ (Council of Mayors South East Queensland), as well, to talk about how we can work together on things like community batteries.

Labor had a policy at the Federal level of supporting community batteries across Australia. I really am excited about the opportunity for Brisbane. We can be part of the solution here and that is something that I offered to Chris Bowen⎯don’t forget councils, we can really work with you here when it comes to community batteries. You know, we have this great solar State where we’re generating more solar power during the day than we actually use and getting this solar power stored and then fed back into the grid during peak times is going to be a major advancement⎯so, these are just some of the opportunities that we’ll be looking at and we look forward to working with the other levels of government to make sure that Brisbane, Queensland, Australia are truly sustainable places going forward.

Item A is the Grange Road and Raymont Road intersection upgrade, rejection of a claim for compensation. Council has been attempting negotiations with the owner of this site and their representatives since 2016. Unfortunately, this has been going on a significant period of time. The claims which have been previously submitted have been significantly more than what we see as the actual value of the land that Council resumed. I guess the claims that have been made, we believe are unreasonably high and that is confirmed by independent valuers.

So we have decided to reject those claims, but we’ll continue to work with the owner in terms of a more suitable compensation arrangement, which is representative of the actual value of the land. Now, there’s a process that we go through here where each party gets their own valuer, submits their view of the valuation and usually we can come together at a midpoint and resolve the matter. Obviously, this hasn’t happened in this case, but we’ll continue working on it.

Item B is the Stores Board submission, the amendment to the significant contracting plan (SCP) for the construction of the new Everton Park Library. This is an important upgrade and a community hub which was first built in 1967 and needs a bit of a lift, Councillor DAVIS. We committed to providing this upgrade, but obviously, as everyone is seeing at the moment, there’s significant volatility in the markets when it comes to any kind of project that is underway at the moment. So that market volatility and changing prices for different commodities, challenges with supply issues, are affecting, obviously, what can be provided and the cost of what can be provided.

Having said that, we are delivering a community library that will include 1,000 square metres of floorspace, a multipurpose meeting room to support learning, reading and community activities and also the rejuvenation of Fallon Park, which is at the rear of the building and a great opportunity to combine a community library and hub together with a refreshed park, as well, creating a precinct. So the recommendation proposed by amending this SCP is to approve and increase some—to allocate funding to complete these works as committed to.

Item C is the lease of premises for the Riverview Asphalt Plant. We have two asphalt plants in Brisbane. One is at Eagle Farm and one is at Riverview. For those of you who are thinking, hang on a second, is this inside Brisbane or outside Brisbane, this is outside the City of Brisbane, close to the boundary, however, it’s in Ipswich, but we’ve got, for various reasons, two different locations that we can supply our asphalt from. So this is an existing plant and we are proposing a new 10-year lease with the Ipswich City Council. Obviously, this is an ongoing arrangement which we’re asking to be extended. At the end of this 10-year lease, we’ll be reassessing whether a continuation or whether a new site is more appropriate. It is likely that it will be a new site. We also have to look at—

Chair: LORD MAYOR, your time has expired.

LORD MAYOR: I’m almost done.

Councillor LANDERS: Point of order, Chair.

**203/2022-23**

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

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you. We also have to look down the track at a new site for our Eagle Farm Plant, as well, because in 10 years’ time, there’s a little event happening called the Olympic and Paralympic Games and our Eagle Farm Asphalt Plant will be quite close to the Olympic Village. Not the ideal situation for visitors to the city to be located near an asphalt plant, so that is a matter we’ll be considering, as well. So, with this extension and with the need to have a look at an alternative site for the Eagle Farm Asphalt Plant, we’ll be looking at those as a holistic matter for the city. In the meantime, obviously, we need the extension of this current arrangement.

Item D is the lease of land to community organisations. We’re seeking to renew leases with 69 community organisations and in accordance with section 2(17) of the *City of Brisbane Regulation 2012*, Council cannot enter into a valuable, non-current asset contract unless it first invites written tenders for the contract or offers the valuable, noncurrent asset for sale by auction. As we know, section 226 of the Regulation provides a number of exemptions and these are cases where we’re providing a renewal of lease to what is an existing tenant of the land—of the site. This is something that we do from time to time in the Council Chamber and this is about renewing leases to people who already have leases in place. So, I commend item D to the Chamber.

Item E, I mentioned briefly before, the Eight Mile Plains Gateway neighbourhood plan. This neighbourhood plan was located at a key part of the city, the gateway between Eight Mile Plains and Rochedale, the rapidly growing area of Rochedale, ably represented by Councillor HUANG. The new neighbourhood plan will ensure that planning guidance is provided to the local area over the coming years. We can commence the neighbourhood planning process in March 2019. The draft amendment was available for public consultation between 8 November and 6 December last year and a relatively small number of submissions were received.

The second State Interest Review was held on 2 September 2022. The Minister approved the neighbourhood plan to proceed to adoption without conditions. The neighbourhood plan allows for housing to be developed in a range of scales and densities and focuses increased density near schools, services, employment and public transport infrastructure, while retaining the existing low-density residential housing across the balance of the area. Further to this, it provides housing choice close to the future Rochedale busway station, as well and also supports existing employment through various zones on Livingstone Road, Underwood Road, Millers Road and Logan Road.

The growth of the Brisbane Technology Park is also supported by increasing the allowable building heights to six storeys around the border of the precinct and up to eight storeys in the centre of the precinct. We’ve seen in Brisbane Technology Park, obviously, a transition over time where it started as purely business and then there was a convention centre set up there and there’s now a hotel that’s been set up and a range of different uses have come into that park. That’s a great thing, because it’s more of a precinct and we’re obviously supporting that transition.

The neighbourhood plan continues to support the operation of the existing Eight Mile Plains busway station and surrounding uses, and the future Brisbane Metro depot on School Road. By changing these sites to special purpose transport infrastructure zone, following adoption today, it is anticipated the plan will become effective on 2 December 2022. I certainly do hope this time, we get the support of Labor Councillors.

Chair: Thank you.

Further speakers?

Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair. I rise to speak on these items before us today. Clause A, we’ll be supporting this item before us. Council has allowed the claim to proceed, despite being outside the approved normal period. We think the significant claim is based on a genuine experience and a claim, obviously, is legitimate there. However, the amount being sought is very high and beyond independent valuers’ estimates. The bulk of the claim is for disturbance. Again, I’m sure the experience these people have had throughout the project is very legitimate, but we will be supporting the position Council has arrived at regarding the issue of disturbance before us.

On Clause B, the amendment to the significant contracting plan for the Everton Park Library—and this is just another example. A week goes by, another example comes up of how badly managed every single Council project under this LNP Administration is. It is still an LNP Administration, isn’t it? I’m not sure, after what the LORD MAYOR said earlier, whether the LNP still exists. I’m not sure what we’re meant to call them, but they are, as far as I know, still all part of the LNP here in Queensland. So, we’ve seen week after week significant contracting plans shift. We’ve seen major changes, and this one’s quite extraordinary, given it’s a seven-figure variance just a couple of months after the plans were approved.

Now, people expect—and I agree with the LORD MAYOR on this point—people expect that when they pay rates to Council, they get services and projects out in the suburbs in return for them and they expect decent value for money for their rates. What they don’t expect is for those services and projects to be so badly managed by this LNP Administration that their rates have to go up each year to pay for the blowouts on these projects and they’re still getting the exact same project for it. We see it on road projects week-in, week‑out, on bridge projects, we see it on IT projects, we see it on the Metro and now we’re seeing it on library projects. So it’s pretty clear from this item and just about every E&C report that comes to this Council for endorsement each and every week, residents aren’t getting good value for money from this LNP Council.

Clause C is the lease of the premises for the Riverview Asphalt Plant. This lease arrangement with Ipswich City Council at Riverview for the asphalt plant is certainly a good deal for ratepayers, and we thank the Ipswich City Council for this arrangement, and we support this lease going forward.

Clause D is the standard leasing process now that we’ve been through here for the last couple of years with community organisations, in establishing the power, I suppose, to negotiate under the Act. So we support this, of course and all the local councils will have been consulted about the community organisations that are going through this process now in their respective wards. We are, of course, at this stage representing our communities here and making decisions on their behalf and when a community lease becomes available, it’s put to the community and a negotiation takes place on the conditions of that lease, whether that be for a year-long licence use or four years or 10 years or 30 years—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: —except of course that example we saw last week with the Brisbane Racing Club. So, what’s happening today is the right and proper process, of which that authority is being sought and that negotiation has occurred there. That certainly didn’t happen last week when we saw that behind-closed-doors arrangement between Crushers, the Brisbane Racing Club and this LNP Administration for that long, long, long-term lease on that community site. So, we support this item today because this is how the process should work, not just sometimes but every time.

On the Clause E, the major amendment to *Brisbane City Plan 2014*, the LORD MAYOR is very, very interested in our views on this, seems to be really interested in our views on everything because, you know, this LNP Administration’s entire strategy these days is around—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: Yes, that’s right, because if we decide to, in their words, vote it down, it won’t proceed and there’ll be no housing in Brisbane whatsoever. I’m saying that with my tongue placed firmly in my cheek, of course, because we know that the decisions around whether a neighbourhood plan or an amendment to City Plan take a majority of this place and the LNP⎯the LNP has a vast majority for a little while longer in this place here. So we’ll just have to wait and see when the vote comes, to see how we’re going to support this or not, Chair.

Chair: Thank you.

Further speakers? Further speakers?

Councillor HOWARD.

Councillor HOWARD: Thank you. Thank you, Mr Chair. I rise to speak on items B and D and turning to item B, we know of course that, due to the increase in the market volatility that Council has experienced, that this amendment to the significant contracting plan is very important to ensure that we can undertake the works and deliver the project of the Everton Park Library. This significant upgrade will truly transform the library’s experience of the locals and residents who use the Everton Park Library and so we—and we also know full well that right across the world, in fact, there is an experience of market volatility and, of course, that is the reason that this amendment is here today. So I would urge people to support this amendment.

Turning to item D, the lease to land for community organisations, I’m pleased to hear that the Opposition will be supporting this, because it is indeed an important thing to do. Item D is seeking Council’s approval to apply the exemption set out in section 266(1) of the Regulation and to renew the 69 community leases without going to tender. As Councillor CASSIDY and the LORD MAYOR said, this is a standard process that we go through each time a community lease is due for renewal to ensure that community organisations can continue operating unhindered and continue to deliver the great work that they do for the local community. So, through our network of more than 600 community lease sites across Brisbane, the Schrinner Council aims to empower and support our valued community organisations. With that, I commend item D to the Chamber.

Chair: Thank you.

Further speakers?

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Thanks, Chair. I just thought I’d weigh in really briefly on item A to say that I never did support this road widening project and I don’t think we needed to take this family’s front yard. I don’t support the item and it just makes me wonder yet again why we keep wasting so much money on road widening when there are so many negative impacts on neighbouring homes and residents. So, I guess I want to place on the record to whoever these householders are, I’m very sorry that the Council has basically trampled all over you here and not recognised the severe negative impacts that this road widening has no doubt had on your life. I tend to think that the amount of compensation that the Council is offering is nowhere near satisfactory or sufficient, considering the impacts and the amount of land that they have taken off their yard. Thanks.

Chair: Thank you.

Further speakers?

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, thank you. I rise to speak on all the items before us today. Firstly, I agree with Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN. Unfortunately, we’ve seen the very appalling impacts that these partial resumptions can have on people and, again, I don’t know the circumstances of what’s happened here with the negotiations, but it’s not good if the people are not happy with the offer Council’s made and they’re left with a giant road running straight out the front of their house. I think there are other options here for Council and it’s disappointing that, yet again, more residents are being burnt by this LNP Administration’s we’ll do it our way at all costs with no consideration for the community.

I want to speak briefly for item B, as well, the Everton Park Library. Yet again, we’ve seen massive blowouts in Council’s contracts for contracting plans for basic Council services, in this case, a library. It’s not that long ago that Council actually brought the significant contracting plan to Council. It was brought here for approval on 7 June 2022, so that’s—July, August, September—that’s four months ago. Now, four months ago, there was absolutely issues around market volatility and supply chains. There have been issues around for over a year or even a bit longer, with respect to these matters. They’re not new. They are not new in any way, shape or form, yet less than four months later, we’re back here at Council because the LNP have failed to manage a major contract.

What is an eye-watering amount of money that Council wants to keep secret and I’m not allowed to discuss is being increased by another eye-watering amount, including the original eye-watering contingencies that weren’t enough, that have actually also been increased, both in dollar value and percentagewise. This is just poor financial management by the LNP. It’s actually Labor-like behaviour, because this is the way the Labor Party run things.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: Seriously, this is the way, this is the way that the LNP hop up and claim that Labor can’t manage the finances.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: It’s pretty clear that this Council Administration have got the same economic management philosophy when it comes to financial administration. They just don’t seem to be able to manage their money—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: —and they think the ratepayers of Brisbane are just an ATM that they can keep ripping money out of, when they’re forgetting that we don’t have drains cleaned up in Brisbane, we don’t have parks reopened from the floods, yet hugely eye-watering sums of more money can be found, poof, like this for the Everton Park Library. Well, look, I don’t begrudge a library over Everton Park, but I can tell you, we got some paint in Corinda a few years ago. We got Fairfield fixed up after the flood—it had to be gutted—but we’ve never had a new library out my way, and this Council only last week voted against doing major renovations to the Fairfield—sorry, the Annerley Library and Hall.

Again, a little lick of paint there was enough, but over in Everton Park in an LNP ward, you beaut libraries get built. Then, when it looks like the millions and millions and millions of dollars that they budgeted just four months ago aren’t enough, sure, we’ll just turn the tap back on and we’ll get millions more out of this Council budget. That money is coming from other projects in this city and it is absolutely not good enough that the LNP Administration cannot manage major projects. The contingency in this project just four months ago should have been enough to cover any unexpected costs, so somebody is not doing proper budgeting, proper scoping and that’s just not good enough.

Item D is the lease to community organisations. Now, I just want to put on the record, this is, I think, the third time I have raised in this Chamber that the Carrington Boat Club do not have a lease from Council. I actually signed off on the first request for the lease in February 2021. I then signed off for a second time for a lease on 3 September 2021. I’ve again signed off on the lease on 28 April 2022. That’s more than six months ago. I’ve written to the CEO. I’ve asked the Council officers. This poor, flood-affected club who have been seeking a lease from Council for two years, two years, still have not had a lease brought forward to Council.

Now, there are still discussions going on behind the scenes, but I signed off on the lease back in April 2022. What has Council been doing in the last six months that the Carrington Boat Club lease has not been brought up here for consideration? It is appalling behaviour by Council. This is a flood-affected club. They had issues with being able to apply for grants and they certainly are in some distress because Council has not renewed their lease. The residents of Fig Tree Pocket caused a huge amount of concern, which had nothing to do with the club and that’s just outrageous that this club is being penalised by Council, because there’s no other way to describe it now. It does not take two years to renew a lease.

I’ve again written to the CEO. It’s honestly not good enough that Council is doing this. I just don’t know what the problem is. The officers don’t get back to you. Yes, Councillor, we’ll get back to you. They don’t get back to you. Months go by. It is absolutely appalling, unprofessional behaviour and it is wrong, wrong that this Council has not brought the Carrington Boat Club lease up for approval. It needs to do so urgently and before Christmas, because otherwise, it’ll be another six months before it comes back to Council in the next batch to be processed.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, probably. That’d be right. How many more of those are they going to hand over to the Brisbane Racing Club? I mean, it was bad enough that Council—this is a boat club, right, that have a pontoon. It’s bad enough that in the lease that Council sent the boat club, they put in conditions about how they had to look after their fields. So, the Boat Club wrote back saying, we don’t have fields. I mean, this is how bad the process has actually been, but it is unacceptable that, six months after I’ve signed off on it, supporting the lease, that it’s still not been processed by Council and that deserves explanation and it deserves Council’s utmost urgency in resolving the lease and ensuring it is approved by Council as is required. I think that’s it.

Chair: Thank you.

Any further speakers?

Councillor MARX.

Councillor MARX: Yes, thank you, Mr Chair. I rise to speak on item C, the lease of premises for the Riverview Asphalt Plant. The Riverview Plant was built in 1999 and has produced over two million tonnes of asphalt since that time.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor MARX: This plant produces over 100,000 tonnes of hot mix asphalt annually for both Council projects and external customers, as well as producing all the cold mix asphalt for both Riverview and the Eagle Farm depots. The Riverview supplies asphalt to Council’s usual road resurfacing projects in the south‑western suburbs of Brisbane, as well as contributing to flood recovery tasks on our roads, such as filling potholes. I’m extremely supportive of this item, and I trust all Councillors will be as supportive, as well. I wanted to add here to the mix, the specialty that this Riverview Asphalt Plant does is they actually do what we call bespoke asphalt mixes.

So, whereas Eagle Farm does a number of bulk asphalt mixing, as you would be very well aware of, given that it’s in your ward, Mr Chair, out at Riverview, they actually do bespoke mixes where customers will come in and dial up the mix that they actually want and it’s made specifically for them. I’ve actually been out to the place a couple of times. One of the last times I was there, I noticed they had this really big, huge drum that was due for replacing, so we actually did a Committee presentation on that. As the LORD MAYOR mentioned, the timing of this is actually quite good, given what’s happening in 2032 and, obviously, Eagle Farm will also need to be looked at, at the same time. So, the officers are working on this particular issue as we speak. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you.

Further speakers?

Councillor LANDERS: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Councillor LANDERS

**ADJOURNMENT:**

|  |
| --- |
| **204/2022-23**  At that time, 4.27pm, 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 4.31pm. |

**UPON RESUMPTION:**

Chair: Thank you, Councillors, we’re in the E&C debate.

Are there any further speakers?

Councillor ALLAN.

**Seriatim - Clause E**

|  |
| --- |
| Councillor Adam ALLAN requested that Clause E, MAJOR AMENDMENT TO *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014* – EIGHT MILE PLAINS GATEWAY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN, be taken seriatim for voting purposes. |

Councillor ALLAN: Thank you, Mr Chair. I rise to speak on item E, the major amendment to City Plan, adoption of the Eight Mile Plains Gateway neighbourhood plan. Located close to major public transport nodes, including the future Brisbane Metro station and the Rochedale busway station, this area, including Eight Mile Plains and Rochedale, is identified as a key economic growth area in Brisbane. Also within the neighbourhood plan area is the Brisbane Technology Park. As I said last week, Brisbane’s industrial landscape is changing and this Technology Park supports a diverse mix of businesses and industries, with a high concentration of advanced manufacturing, research and tech-based industries.

The zone changes proposed, such as increasing the allowable building heights to six storeys around the border of the precinct and up to eight storeys in the centre of the precinct, will continue to support the ongoing development of this important employment hub and create thousands of new jobs. The locality already contains a range of residential living areas, including conventional detached housing, townhouses, relocatable home parks and new apartments. But the proposed plan allows greater housing choice by allowing a range of scales and densities in key locations around schools, employment clusters, public transport, community facilities and shops.

This is balanced with retaining existing low-density residential housing across the remainder of the neighbourhood plan area. The appeal of the area will be further improved by providing shade trees, landscaping and wider footpaths. The proposed plan will also take advantage of the significant investment in infrastructure across the precinct, particularly around public transport and road network infrastructure. The Eight Mile Plains Gateway neighbourhood plan is just one way the Schrinner Council is ensuring residents are close to the services they need, as well as the lifestyle and leisure opportunities they want.

Now I’m hoping—and certainly Councillor CASSIDY has left us in suspense as to how the Opposition might vote on this particular item⎯certainly they’ve got form in voting against neighbourhood plans where housing is a key deliverable. In this particular case, this will be primarily about the delivery of greater employment opportunities, more economic activity and more jobs. Something that typically the Labor Party would support, so I would be very hopeful that they will support this plan and I commend it to the Chamber.

Chair: Thank you.

Any further debate?

Councillor HUANG.

Councillor HUANG: Thank you, Mr Chair. I rise to speak in item E of the E&C report, on the Eight Mile Plains Gateway neighbourhood plan. Mr Chair, I’d like to take this opportunity to congratulate Councillor ALLAN and his team in City Planning for delivering this major amendment to our City Plan, that will cater to one of the fastest growing areas in our city. Mr Chair, as the local Councillor, I’m fully supportive of this amendment, just like the old saying, the key to choosing property is location, location, location.

The Eight Mile Plains Gateway neighbourhood plan shows that Eight Mile Plains is the location to be. The Eight Mile Plains Gateway neighbourhood plan covers Upper Mt Gravatt, Eight Mile Plains and part of Rochedale. It has been identified as an area with strong population growth, strong development opportunities, also as an economic and employment hub. It is also conveniently located at the junction of South East Freeway, Gateway Motorway and Logan Road, with the Metro depot and two stations located within the precinct.

Mr Chair, the area covered in this neighbourhood plan is filled with job creation potential⎯as Councillor ALLAN said there could be thousands of jobs created through this neighbourhood plan, as well as cultural and religious diversity. I’m glad to see the amendment acknowledges these diversities and supports Brisbane’s multicultural and multifaith communities in the area. Well, Mr Chair, whilst Councillor CASSIDY was trying to be mysterious about how Labor is going to vote on this motion, can I say I believe he’s going to vote for it, because within this neighbourhood plan the State Government has put in a so-called satellite hospital within this area, which did necessitate changes to the neighbourhood plan to accommodate for this new facility.

It was also disappointing to see that no community consultation was undertaken before announcing the location of the satellite hospital. The community feedback that I have received was that the money could be better spent on improving the QEII (Queen Elizabeth II) Hospital rather than following the footsteps of the failed super clinics of the Rudd-Gillard years and I’m sure that’s something Councillor CASSIDY would like to support. Mr Chair, I’d just like to end my comments by commending the LORD MAYOR and Councillor ALLAN for delivering this amendment to City Plan. This will provide the framework for the city’s future development and will leave long-lasting legacies that the people of Brisbane will benefit from for decades to come. I commend the item to the Chamber.

Chair: Thank you.

Any further debate? No further debate.

Councillors, we move to the vote on items A, B, C and D of the E&C report.

**Clauses A, B, C and D put**

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

Chair: Councillors, item E.

**Clause E put**

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

Thereupon, Councillors Adam ALLAN and Sandy LANDERS immediately rose and called for a division, which resulted in the motion being declared **carried**.

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 20 - Councillors Greg ADERMANN, Adam ALLAN, Lisa ATWOOD, Fiona CUNNINGHAM, Tracy DAVIS, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Sarah HUTTON, Sandy LANDERS, James MACKAY, Kim MARX, Peter MATIC, David McLACHLAN, Angela OWEN, Steven TOOMEY, Andrew WINES, the Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Jared CASSIDY, and Councillors Peter CUMMING, Charles STRUNK and Nicole JOHNSTON.

NOES: 1 - Councillor Jonathan SRIRANGANATHAN.

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

The Right Honourable, the Lord Mayor (Councillor Adrian Schrinner) (Chair); and Councillors Adam Allan, Fiona Cunningham, Tracy Davis, Vicki Howard, Sarah Hutton, Kim Marx, Ryan Murphy and Peter Matic.

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE:**

The Deputy Mayor (Councillor Krista Adams) and Councillor Andrew Wines.

#### A GRANGE ROAD AND RAYMONT ROAD INTERSECTION UPGRADE PROJECT – REJECTION OF CLAIM FOR COMPENSATION

**112/20/711/1240**

**205/2022-23**

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

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

3. By Taking of Land Notice published in the *Queensland Government Gazette* dated 2 November 2018, Council resumed part of the property at 56 Howard Street, Grange, described as Lot 108 on SP288326 and shown outlined in yellow at Attachment B (submitted on file), for the Raymont Road and Grange Road Intersection Upgrade project. The resumed land is 22 square metres in area and is situated along the Raymont Road frontage of the property. A copy of SP288326 is shown at Attachment C (submitted on file).

4. On 1 September 2022, the former owners (claimants) submitted a claim for compensation in the amount of [Commercial-in-Confidence]. Although the three-year time limit to lodge claim had expired, Council granted approval to receive and consider the claim on 20 September 2022.

5. The amount claimed comprises the following:

Land [Commercial-in-Confidence]

Disturbance [Commercial-in-Confidence]

**Total** [Commercial-in-Confidence]

6. A copy of the claim for compensation is shown at Attachment D (submitted on file).

7. Whilst the amount claimed for disturbance has not been particularised, the claimant has advised that it is claimed for the impact of the construction works on the health and safety of the claimant’s family, funding the purchase of temporary accommodation, replacement of the dwelling located on the property, erection of temporary fencing, replacement of the fence removed due to the road works, and additional costs associated with other property developments being undertaken by the claimant.

8. Apart from the cost of a replacement fence, Council does not agree that the other disturbance items claimed are compensable. Council’s estimate to construct a similar fence to the one removed is $25,000.

9. Council engaged Horrigan Kamitsis Valuers to assess the value of the land. They provided preliminary advice which assessed the compensation for the lost land at [Commercial-in-Confidence], exclusive of disturbance. A copy of the valuation advice is shown at Attachment E (submitted on file).

10. All amounts claimed are therefore considered excessive and it is proposed that Council reject the claim for compensation.

11. Under section 23 of the *Acquisition of Land Act 1967,* following a request for an advance from a claimant, Council is required to pay that advance against compensation in the amount of Council’s assessment of compensation attributable to the resumption.

12. The claimant has not yet requested an advance against compensation. Should the claimant do so, given the quantum of the claim, another Full Council decision would be required. In order to avoid this, it is recommended that an advance of compensation in the amount of [Commercial-in-Confidence] be approved, should the claimant make such a request. This amount comprises the assessment of compensation and the replacement of the removed fence.

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

14. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A  
Draft Resolution**

**DRAFT RESOLUTION TO REJECT A CLAIM FOR COMPENSATION ARISING FROM THE RESUMPTION OF PART OF THE PROPERTY AT 56 HOWARD ROAD, GRANGE, FOR THE GRANGE ROAD AND RAYMONT ROAD INTERSECTION UPGRADE PROJECT AND APPROVE THE PAYMENT OF AN ADVANCE AGAINST COMPENSATION IF REQUESTED.**

As:

(i) Council, by a Taking of Land Notice published in *Queensland Government Gazette* on 2 November 2018, resumed part of the property situated at 56 Howard Street, Grange, described as Lot 108 on SP288326 (the property)

1. the former owner of the property submitted a claim for compensation under the *Acquisition of Land Act 1967*,

then Council:

1. resolves that the claim for compensation, as set out in Schedule 1, Part 2, of this resolution, is rejected as excessive based on the preliminary compensation advice as set out in Attachment E (submitted on file)
2. resolves to approve the payment of an advance against compensation in the amount of [Commercial-in-Confidence] should the claimant request an advance, as set out in Schedule 1, Part 3, of this resolution.

**Schedule 1**

**Private Property Resumed for Depot Purposes**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Part 1** | **Details of resumption** |
| Claimant | [Commercial-in-Confidence] |
| Property resumed | Part of the property located at 56 Howard Street, Grange, described as Lot 108 on SP288326 |
| Purpose of resumption | Road purposes for the Raymont Road and Grange Road Intersection Upgrade project |
| **Part 2** | **Details of claim** |
| Details of claim | Land [Commercial-in-Confidence]  Disturbance [Commercial-in-Confidence]  **Total** [Commercial-in-Confidence] |
| **Part 3** | **Details of advance** |
| Amount of advance if requested | Land [Commercial-in-Confidence]  Replacement of removed fence [Commercial-in-Confidence]  **Total** [Commercial-in-Confidence] |

**ADOPTED**

#### B STORES BOARD SUBMISSION – AMENDMENT TO THE SIGNIFICANT CONTRACTING PLAN FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE NEW EVERTON PARK LIBRARY

**165/210/179/4487**

**206/2022-23**

15. The Chief Executive Officer provided the information below.

16. The Significant Contracting Plan (SCP) for the Construction of the New Everton Park Library was adopted by Council on 7 June 2022. During the development of the SCP and the tender period, there has been continued and significant market volatility, including further inflationary pressures and supply chain disruption.

17. It is proposed to amend the SCP for the Construction of the New Everton Park Library to provide for increased estimated contract expenditure and allow flexibility to the construction delivery staging.

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

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

20. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A  
Draft Resolution**

**DRAFT RESOLUTION TO AMEND the SIGNIFICANT CONTRACTING PLAN for the Construction of THE NEW EVERTON PARK LIBRARY**

As:

(i) Council approved a Significant Contracting Plan for the Construction of the New Everton Park Library

(ii) the Significant Contracting Plan needs to be amended to provide for increased estimated contract expenditure and allow flexibility to the construction delivery staging

(iii) section 211(5) of the *City of Brisbane Regulation 2012* provides that Council may, by resolution, amend a Significant Contracting Plan at any time before the end of the financial year to which the plan relates,

then:

(i) Council resolves to amend the Significant Contracting Plan for the Construction of the New Everton Park Library, as set out in Attachment B (hereunder).

**Attachment B**

**Amendment to the Significant Contracting Plan for the Construction of the New Everton Park Library**

Purpose

That the Stores Board recommends approval to amend the Significant Contracting Plan (SCP) for the Construction of the New Everton Park Library to provide for increased estimated contract expenditure and allow flexibility to the construction delivery staging.

Background/business case

In 1967, the Everton Park Library was constructed on land at 555 and 561 South Pine Road, Everton Park. Alterations and expansions have been undertaken over the years to meet changing requirements with the last major refurbishment being completed in 1993-94. In 2015-16, the library required floor and foundation stabilisation due to the excessive structural movement within the building.

The library building is now at the end of its life and Council is proposing to replace it with an expanded new library. Community feedback has highlighted the need for an increase in parking, improvements to accessibility, increased size, better zoning of space and increased connection to the outdoors. Council has acquired three adjoining property lots to accommodate the larger new library. Staged demolition and construction were planned to permit a reduced library service (click and collect) during construction in a portion of the existing library.

The new Everton Park Library will include:

* an increase in library floor space from the existing 454m² to over 1,000m²
* an undercover car park with a new vehicle access driveway off Gearside Street
* multipurpose spaces and meeting rooms which support a diverse range of learning, literacy and cultural programs
* library collection spaces to support information, learning and leisure needs
* a computer lounge and Wi-Fi seating to support digital inclusion through supported technology access
* a children’s space to support early literacy development, learning through play and growing a love of reading
* dedicated quiet rooms for independent work and study, and varied seating options to support collaborative work
* restoration and widening of the Everton Park Bowls Club access road for the library and Fallon Park precinct including construction access.

Council has secured $650,000 in funding from the Queensland Government through the South East Queensland Community Stimulus Program to repair the adjacent Everton Park Bowls Club car park and these works will be delivered as part of the new library. Priorities following the recent flood event have been reviewed and considered, and Council has confirmed that this project is to proceed.

The SCP for the Construction of the New Everton Park Library was approved by Council on 7 June 2022. During the development of the SCP and the tender period, there has been continued and significant market volatility including further inflationary pressures and supply chain disruption.

Following submission of pricing, an SCP amendment is required to revise the expected contract cost and increase flexibility in negotiations for delivery staging with respect to the existing library function and construction of the new library.

The approved SCP provided for staged closure of the existing library during construction of the new library. Budgetary pressures and safety concerns pertaining to the staging of delivery now require the flexibility to negotiate with the tenderers.

Amendments to the Significant Contract Plan

Estimated contract expenditure:

The approved SCP estimated total expenditure for the Construction of the New Everton Park Library is increased from [Commercial-in-Confidence] million, with a contingency of [Commercial-in-Confidence] million (approximately [Commercial-in-Confidence] of the estimated contract sum) to [Commercial-in-Confidence] million with a contingency of [Commercial-in-Confidence] million (approximately [Commercial-in-Confidence] of the estimated contract sum).

Staged demolition:

The approved SCP is amended to allow flexibility in how any temporary library services are provided during construction.

Revised anticipated schedule

The anticipated post-market approval date is revised to early November 2022, subject to completion of the tender evaluation and any negotiations.

Recommendation

That the Stores Board recommends approval to amend the Significant Contracting Plan for the Construction of the New Everton Park Library to provide for increased estimated contract expenditure and allow flexibility to the construction delivery staging.

**ADOPTED**

#### C LEASE OF PREMISES FOR THE RIVERVIEW ASPHALT PLANT

**112/445/444/1379**

**207/2022-23**

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

22. Council has leased the premises at 2B Kenneth Street, Riverview (Lot 1 on RP215975), since 1998 (refer Attachment D, submitted on file). The premises accommodates the Riverview Asphalt Plant which produces, tests and delivers a full range of asphalt mixes to internal and external customers of Council, including supplying asphalt to Ipswich City Council. The plant also supports Council’s road resurfacing program in the south western suburbs of Brisbane, reducing the material cartage costs from the Eagle Farm Asphalt Plant. The current lease over the premises expires on 30 November 2022.

23. The lessor, Ipswich City Council, has agreed to enter into a further ten-year lease. The proposed commencing net rental is $145,000 (excluding GST) per annum or $5.63 (excluding GST) per square metre. Outgoings are estimated at $60,000 (excluding GST) per annum or $2.33 (excluding GST) per square metre. This is an increase of 2.9% on the current rent payable under the current lease. The annual net rental will be increased by three per cent per annum on each anniversary of the commencement date, with a market review of the rent occurring in the fifth year of the lease.

24. The lessor’s offered net rental is below the range of rentals for this type of property, which ranges from $12 (excluding GST) per square metre to $27 (excluding GST) per square metre (refer Attachment C, submitted on file).

25. The premises represents the most suitable site due to location, Council’s pre-established buildings and fit-out, and existing environmental approvals. The cost to make-good the premises is estimated at $1 million and there would be a loss of revenue to Council should the plant close in order to relocate.

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

27. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A**

**Draft Resolution**

**DRAFT RESOLUTION TO ENTER INTO A NEW LEASE OVER EXISTING PREMISES FOR THE RIVERVIEW ASPHALT PLANT LOCATED AT 2B KENNETH STREET, RIVERVIEW**

As:

(i) Council’s lease of the land located at 2B Kenneth Street, Riverview, known as the Riverview Asphalt Plant, expires on 30 November 2022

(ii) the lessor has provided an offer for a new 10-year lease of the existing premises at the Riverview Asphalt Plant

(iii) Council will incur annual rent for the lease which will extend beyond Council’s four‑year budget cycle

then Council:

(i) resolves to enter into a new lease over existing premises for the Riverview Asphalt Plant at 2B Kenneth Street, Riverview in accordance with the lease terms, as set out in Attachment B (submitted on file) and otherwise on terms and conditions satisfactory to the Asset Portfolio Management Manager, Asset Management, Brisbane Infrastructure and the Chief Legal Counsel, City Legal, City Administration and Governance.

**ADOPTED**

#### D LEASE OF COUNCIL LAND TO COMMUNITY ORGANISATIONS

**112/445/444/1386**

**208/2022-23**

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

29. In accordance with section 217 of the *City of Brisbane Regulation 2012* (the Regulation), Council cannot enter into a valuable non-current asset contract (relevantly, a lease in respect of land or contract for the disposal of land) unless it first:

(a) invites written tenders for the contract; or

(b) offers the valuable non-current asset for sale by auction.

30. Section 226(1) of the Regulation provides a number of exceptions that Council may apply to the disposal of an interest in land other than by way of tender or auction, including, but not limited to, land that is to be leased to a government agency or a community organisation.

31. Council currently leases properties to the community organisations listed in Attachment B (submitted on file) for community, sport, recreation and cultural purposes.

32. To ensure the continued effective management of Council’s community, sport, recreation and cultural facilities, it is proposed that Council resolve to apply the exception provided by section 226(1)(b)(ii) of the Regulation to the properties identified in Attachment B (submitted on file).

33. Local Councillors have been informed of Council’s intention to apply the exception and continue lease negotiations with the relevant organisations within their ward.

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

35. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A**

**Draft Resolution**

**DRAFT RESOLUTION TO DISPOSE OF AN INTEREST IN LAND BY LEASE IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 226(1) OF THE *CITY OF BRISBANE REGULATION 2012***

As:

(i) Council is the owner of the land (freehold), or the trustee of the land, as set out in Attachment B (submitted on file), which is used, or is proposed to be used, for community, sport, recreation and cultural purposes

(ii) Council proposes to renew existing leases in respect of land which is used, or is proposed to be used, for community, sport, recreation and cultural purposes

(iii) section 226(2) of the *City of Brisbane Regulation 2012* requires that Council decide by resolution that exceptions set out in section 226(1) of the *City of Brisbane Regulation 2012* may apply before disposing of a valuable non-current asset other than by way of tender or auction,

then Council:

(i) resolves that the exception set out in section 226(1)(b)(ii) of the *City of Brisbane Regulation 2012* applies to the disposal of the properties by way of lease, as described in Attachment B (submitted on file).

**ADOPTED**

#### E MAJOR AMENDMENT TO BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014 – EIGHT MILE PLAINS GATEWAY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

**152/160/516/495**

**209/2022-23**

36. The Chief Executive Officer provided the information below.

37. At its meeting of 26 March 2019, Council resolved to amend *Brisbane City Plan 2014* (the planning scheme) to include the Eight Mile Plains gateway neighbourhood plan (the neighbourhood plan), make associated amendments to planning scheme policies and undertake consequential amendments (the proposed amendment).

38. At its meeting of 25 May 2021, Council resolved to send the proposed amendment to the Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning (the then Minister), to request a State interest review and approval to publicly consult on the proposed amendment.

39. By letter dated 28 September 2021, the then Minister confirmed that State interests were appropriately integrated in the proposed amendment, and advised that public consultation may proceed, subject to conditions.

40. Public consultation on the proposed amendment was carried out from 8 November 2021 to 6 December 2021 in accordance with the *Minister’s Rules and Guidelines* (the Guideline).

41. At its meeting of 14 June 2022, Council resolved to modify the proposed amendment in response to submissions received, to make associated amendments to planning scheme policies pursuant to the Guideline, and to request the Minister’s approval to adopt the proposed amendment.

42. By letter dated 2 September 2022 (refer Attachment B, submitted on file), the Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister Assisting the Premier on Olympics Infrastructure granted approval for the proposed amendment to be adopted into the planning scheme without any conditions. The proposed amendment to be adopted is set out in Attachment C (submitted on file). The proposed amendment is in a form consistent with the *Planning Act 2016*.

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

44. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A**

**Draft Resolution**

**DRAFT RESOLUTION TO AMEND *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014* TO INCLUDE THE EIGHT MILE PLAINS GATEWAY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

As Council:

1. decided, pursuant to section 16.1 of Part 4 of Chapter 2 and section 2.1 of Part 1 of Chapter 3 of the *Minister’s Guidelines and Rules* (the Guideline) to amend *Brisbane City Plan 2014* (the planning scheme) and planning scheme policies to include the Eight Mile Plains gateway neighbourhood plan and make associated consequential amendments (the proposed amendment)
2. sought, pursuant to section 21.1 of Part 4 of Chapter 2 of the Guideline, the Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister Assisting the Premier on Olympics Infrastructure (the Minister) approval to adopt the proposed amendment to the planning scheme
3. was advised by the Minister, by letter dated 2 September 2022 (refer Attachment B, submitted on file), that it could adopt the proposed amendment without conditions,

then Council:

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

**ADOPTED**

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

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

Councillor Sarah HUTTON, A/Civic Cabinet Chair of the Economic Development and the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Sandy LANDERS, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 25 October 2022, be adopted.

Chair: Councillor HUTTON.

Councillor HUTTON: Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to start by updating the Chamber on this week’s events at the Brisbane Hub. We have firstly got Embracing Diversity to Overcome 21st Century Challenges Panel Discussion on Thursday, 3 November and we also have Drive Productivity and Performance in Your Team on Tuesday, 8 November. I would please encourage you to let your communities know about these wonderful programs that we do have on offer at the Brisbane Hub.

Moving to the Committee report. As always, our first Committee presentation for this session is delivered by our Economic Development Manager to provide an update on Brisbane’s economic activity. There was a focus on jobs growth and recovery in Brisbane, with current data showing our unemployment rate is approaching record lows at 3.4%, or around 28,000 unemployed, still below the Queensland unemployment rate which is currently sitting at 4.3%.

While this is a good sign that people are re-joining the workforces and businesses are taking on more staff, the number of jobs advertised in Brisbane is still hovering around 35,000 job advertisements at any one time. There’s a slight increase to the previous quarter, indicating that we are still dealing with a shortage of workers across all industries, not just in hospitality and tourism as to be expected, but largely in professional, administrative and managerial roles in Brisbane. What we are hearing from industry is that there is an apparent mismatch of skills to jobs and a growing need for new employment and training programs to combat these vacancies.

An update on the growth in median house prices in capital cities across Australia indicated a downward trend, with Brisbane down nearly 1.5% from March this year. Domestic travel through Brisbane Airport has increased significantly since the previous update in August, having grown from 50% pre-COVID levels to now 90%. While international travel still remains well below pre-COVID levels, we are seeing a strong upward trajectory as more routes continue to open up and airlines increase frequency of flights, a promising sign for the tourism industry here in Brisbane.

Lastly, our foot traffic in the Queen Street Mall is on the rise, with pedestrian counters currently sitting at 80% of pre-COVID levels, having recently hit the highest at 85% over the September school holidays⎯fantastic for our city traders. With the city coming back online and with more to see and do locally, I encourage everyone to get out and about and to support our local businesses over this coming Christmas period.

Chair: Thank you.

Further debate? No further debate

I’ll move the report.

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

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

Councillor Sarah Hutton (Deputy Chair), and Councillors Greg Adermann, Jared Cassidy and Steven Huang.

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE:**

The Deputy Mayor, Councillor Krista Adams (Civic Cabinet Chair) and Councillor Kara Cook.

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – BRISBANE ECONOMIC UPDATE

**210/2022-23**

1. The A/Economic Development Manager, City Planning and Economic Development, City Planning and Sustainability, attended the meeting to provide a Brisbane economic update. He provided the information below.

2. The Committee was shown a graph demonstrating Brisbane’s weekly payroll employee jobs index which indicated the percentage change from 14 March 2020 to 13 August 2022. This data is an indicator of job growth and recovery in Brisbane. Current data shows job growth is above pre-COVID levels and the unemployment rate is approaching record lows.

3. The number of jobseekers in Brisbane in August 2022 was at 28,340 which is a record low, and the Brisbane unemployment rate was at 3.4%, which is lower than the Queensland unemployment rate at 4.3%. The number of jobs advertised in Brisbane in June 2022 was 34,900. The Committee was shown a graph of the number of job advertisements by eight categories of occupation from May 2010 to August 2022. Following a significant decline in the number of job advertisements by occupation in mid-2020, the number of job advertisements by occupation had increased in August 2022.

4. The Committee was shown graphs regarding the median house and unit prices in major Australian capital cities, which indicates all major capitals are trending down. The growth in median house prices in Brisbane was at 5.2% in June 2022, which is a slight decline from 6.6% in March 2022, although remaining higher than pre‑COVID levels.

5. The Committee was shown graphs of the number of domestic and international passengers arriving at Brisbane Airport from January 2018 to July 2022, which serves as an indicator of air travel into Brisbane and Queensland. Domestic arrivals at the Brisbane Airport are currently at 90% of the pre-COVID level, and although international arrivals remain significantly lower than the pre-COVID level, the trend is increasing throughout 2022.

6. The Committee was shown graphs in relation to the annual change in the consumer price index (CPI) from January 2012 to June 2022. The annual change in CPI for Brisbane had increased to 7.3% at June 2022. The annual change in Greater Brisbane CPI in relation to major consumption items in June 2022, demonstrated the greatest increase in transport, housing, food and non-alcoholic beverages and health.

7. An audit of the pedestrian index in Queen Street Mall (QSM) and surrounds was undertaken between 20 January 2022 and 16 October 2022. Combined sensors in the QSM and surrounds indicates pedestrian movement is currently at approximately 79% of the pre-COVID average.

8. Following a number of questions from the Committee, the Deputy Chair thanked the A/Economic Development Manager for his informative presentation.

9. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

Chair: Councillor MURPHY, Transport Committee report please.

### TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

Councillor Ryan MURPHY, Civic Cabinet Chair of the Transport Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Steven HUANG, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 25 October 2022, be adopted.

Chair: Councillor MURPHY.

Councillor MURPHY: Mr Chair, our last Committee presentation was an update on *Brisbane’s New Bus Network*. I spoke last week in the Chamber about the launch of our new network and the start of community consultation. Council is undertaking the largest bus network consultation in over a decade, inviting residents to have their say on *Brisbane’s New Bus Network* over a nine-week consultation period. Today we’re almost halfway through the consultation period, with the feedback survey open from 14 December⎯sorry, until 14 December, I should say. The engagement tools and materials have delivered truly a new benchmark for community engagement and feedback. We spent a lot of time studying previous network reviews, both near and far and I know that our process in engagement has been better for the lessons that we’ve learnt.

One of the more recent examples, Mr Chair, was in Auckland, where they completed a major bus network review between 2016 and 2019. There are many synergies between Brisbane and Auckland, which is appropriately one of our Sister Cities and we’ll celebrate 35 years of that relationship next year, Mr Chair. Recently I went on a trip to Auckland, Mr Chair, where I met with representatives from Auckland Council, Auckland Transport and the New Zealand National Transport Authority, Waka Kotahi. Auckland’s review was intended to make public transport in the city easier to use, to improve connections between bus and rail and to optimise services. Does that sound familiar, Councillors? Because it’s very similar to what we are trying to achieve here in Brisbane.

Auckland’s existing network featured high levels of duplication and extremely low frequency on some routes. Like in our review, some routes were removed and replaced with more frequent services that sometimes did require a transfer. We learned a lot about Auckland Transport’s approach to community consultation and explaining the changes that would need to be made to residents, which is reflected in the materials that we’ve created for Brisbane residents. In addition to discussing the network review, we also learned a lot about Auckland’s other transport projects. Auckland are moving ahead with electrifying their bus fleet, which you heard me speak about earlier in the Chamber and they’ve had great lessons to share about the start of their transition and how they’ve worked to retrofit some of their diesel vehicles to become zero emissions buses.

Right through the centre of the city they’re also constructing a City Rail Link, which will be the city’s first underground rail tunnel. It was interesting to see how the cut and cover construction methodology differed from our own tunnelling process with the Adelaide Street tunnel and I can tell you, I felt so justified, Chair, in the decision that this Council and this LORD MAYOR made to go underground, given the state of some of the businesses who are struggling with that cut and cover methodology. It’s a very difficult thing to have to continue to trade when you have construction occurring outside your business for several years, so I think we were very justified in that decision.

Auckland are also in the process of contemplating light rail, which we went through a number of years ago, Chair, when ultimately we decided on the Brisbane Metro solution. It was great to return the favour this week, Mr Chair, with Brisbane currently hosting a delegation from New Zealand. Just this morning I was out at the Eagle Farm depot, taking the delegation through the Metro vehicle and that includes many representatives from both Auckland and Wellington and the various government agencies that fund national land transport in New Zealand.

Yesterday I was privileged to present at a summit with the delegates, sharing with them some of the transport projects that we have underway here in Brisbane. There were conversations and exchanges around city planning, economic development, transport, parks and gardens and of course housing affordability. Let me just say, Mr Chair, they were very impressed with the vision and the innovation that we have here in Brisbane and the commitment the LORD MAYOR has to improving our transport network and the political courage that he has taken to take the city in this direction with a network review and a new form of transport. But most importantly, it’s great to see knowledge sharing and productive discussions that can come out of some of these now getting on in the years Sister City relationships between Brisbane and Auckland. Long may it be the case and I’ll leave further debate to the Chamber.

Chair: Thank you.

Is there any further debate?

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, thank you, Mr Chair. I rise to speak on the Brisbane new bus network. This is the second review of Council bus routes—the word is routes—that I have seen undertaken by Council. Like in 2011-12, Council is promising one thing but delivering something else completely. For years now the LORD MAYOR and the Transport Chair have been saying publicly that there will be more buses for the suburbs and that there’ll be better buses for the suburbs. They’ve said it over and over and over again. The Transport Chair has pooh‑poohed what I’ve said about bus services being cut and truncated⎯no, no, she doesn’t know what she’s talking about. Well, the bus network review shows very clearly how Council is putting a knife through bus services in the southern suburbs of Brisbane.

In Council’s own information pack that they provided to my office they openly admit that only 91% of residents in Tennyson Ward will get the same or a similar service. Almost 10% of residents are going to be worse off under this bus network review that has been proposed by Councillor MURPHY and LORD MAYOR, Adrian SCHRINNER. Ten per cent of residents will be worse off. They’re not getting a better bus service; they’re getting worse off. The other 91% are getting the same or similar, so the public promises of better bus services for the suburbs is just a mirage.

Pretty much I think they’re believing their own publicity, because what they are actually doing in the suburbs is very different to what they say they are doing. In my ward there are multiple services that are being cut or truncated. This means there are less services going into the city and it impacts residents in almost all areas. There will be no direct service any longer between Yeronga and Indooroopilly, which is the principal activity centre for residents who live in Yeronga. Their only option will be to go to the city or to change buses somewhere on the side of the road where Council won’t put in a bus shelter because it’s only a local bus stop and they’ll have to stand in the heat and the rain on the side of Fairfield Road. Guess who these people mainly are? The elderly, the elderly. They are extremely concerned.

There are no new bus routes proposed in Tennyson Ward. There are no services at all in some areas at night or on weekends. It’s 1.4 kilometres for some people in Oxley to walk to the local train station when there is no bus service on the weekend. Or—Councillor STRUNK, you’ll appreciate this—they can walk further out over the Ipswich Motorway, past the Bunnings at Oxley and that’s 1.1 kilometres for those Oxley residents to get to a bus service. Now Council’s standard of service is, my understanding is 400 metres and that’s clearly not being met.

There are no upgrades proposed to bus stop infrastructure, particularly on Ipswich Road, so Ipswich Road is going to carry more buses that are coming from other parts of Brisbane and they’re going to transit through Annerley Junction. So I asked the transport planners what improvements are you going to make to the footpaths which are as old as the hills? Council won’t fix those. Are you going to build better bus indents? What are you going to do? Oh, no, Councillor, that’s not part of the scope of the project. So there’s no new infrastructure to support the changes that Council’s talking about, other than where they want it in the inner city, where they’re spending billions of dollars. Remember this was a $944 million project that’s now costing $1.7 billion, that’s what they admit to today and it’s likely to be a lot more. So as a result of the LNP’s signature transport project, the cost of the project has almost doubled.

Residents in my ward are getting a worse bus service and they’re not getting any new infrastructure to upgrade areas where there will be more buses transiting through, such as Ipswich Road which, as Councillor WINES wants to ignore, has about 100 accidents per year on Ipswich Road. Brisbane City Council won’t invest any money into that road, but over at Indooroopilly, sure, there’s a few crashes there, they’ll spent hundreds of millions of dollars. So it just shows pretty clearly the priorities of this LNP Administration. What they have said is completely false and their own information reveals that. I feel very sorry for the residents who have to deal with the consequences of this.

There is really only—apart from the cuts and truncations, there’s really only one sort of change, which is the extension of the 192 into Yeronga, but that’s a circuitous route into the city for those residents and their direct route has been truncated now at the Cultural Centre, I think, yes, the Cultural Centre. So it’s swings and roundabouts out here, but the fact that Council can’t say that my residents, none of them are getting a better bus service, they’re getting the same or similar or worse, I think that reflects very poorly on Council. I know my residents are extremely upset, they have been emailing and writing to Council. They’re not playing the stupid games that Council wants to play, they’re real people who have serious concerns about the impact of buses in their lives and these are schoolchildren and mainly the elderly.

Now it’s also very clear that Council does not understand that schoolchildren in my ward don’t use school buses. Some do, but most children in my ward rely on public buses to take them to their homes. A lot of them go to private schools and there are not buses available for them. It is very concerning that there are no services at certain times of the day for these students. It is very concerning that the 192 does not have services after about six o’clock, seven o’clock in the evening and there are no services at all on weekends. So the one new bus service that the officers proudly told me about doesn’t run on Saturday to take—the purpose of it, I was told, was to take the retirement village community at Yeronga up to Fairfield Shopping Centre. But if they want to shop on Saturday or Sunday, they still can’t because there is no bus service.

It is just shocking how poorly this has been organised. It is distressing to see the reduction of services and Council’s attempt to cut the ward connections, east-west connections that are so critically valuable. People who live in Yeronga or Fairfield and Yeerongpilly and Tennyson, those residents have doctors, hairdressers, shops, children go to schools, they have all their services in Indooroopilly because that’s where the buses go. Now Council’s taking that away, they’ll have to stand on the side of Fairfield Road in the rain or the heat, basically to swap buses to get them over to Indooroopilly. They don’t know what those connections will look like, will it be an hour, will it be half an hour, we don’t know.

There are also residents on Annerley Road who are being disadvantaged by these changes and the truncations and redirections of bus services through Annerley. So Council has not got this right. It’s pretty clear to me, based on the feedback from the officers who came to my office, that they’re not interested in the changes. So I sadly think the fix is in. They very clearly told me that changing or, for example, getting the bus service back to Indooroopilly was outside of the scope of the project. Looking at extra services on weekends was outside of the scope of the project.

So if they’ve made up their minds, this is going to be a very poor outcome for Council. My residents are in good faith putting forward their views, they are contributing to the bus network review, as I will be. But I can say now Council has failed to listen to our community about extending the 196 bus route into Yeronga. That’s what we have campaigned for, for a decade that I have been here. There have been multiple petitions in this place to do that and Council has indicated it would look at extending the 196 bus service in the last petition we did a few years ago and has failed to do so⎯just didn’t do it.

It is very disappointing to see the adverse outcomes that Council has designed as part of their new network review. When Council proudly says that 91% of residents get the same or a similar service and 10% will be worse off, that’s a bad outcome for the community and the LNP need to pull their heads in.

Chair: Any further debate?

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Thanks, Chair, I rise to speak on the bus network review. I’m going to be looking forward to seeing the results of the submissions and the feedback from the public that come through. I think some residents are rightly disappointed that it’s not a more holistic review. There are lots of parts of the city that aren’t really seeing much change at all, but I do understand the justifications for why the Council is focusing primarily on some of those southern bus routes that will be replaced by Metro vehicles running along the busway. I also have some sympathy with the Council Administration in that if they want to be improving services, they ideally would be getting a bit more funding in from the State Government. I think there’s probably a fair bit of responsibility on the shoulders of the Transport Minister and Queensland Labor for not adequately funding Brisbane’s public transport network.

I will just reiterate for the record that I would really like to see the 192 service operating on weekends and weeknights and I thank Councillor MURPHY for at least getting us some costings so that we understand the sorts of figures we’re talking about. Councillor JOHNSTON, in case you’re interested, based on the new route that’s proposed for the 192, at a minimum it would cost about an extra $600,000 for the service to run until 9pm on weekdays and half-hourly on Saturdays and Sundays, 7am to 7pm. So we’re talking about $600,000, potentially a little bit more with the incidental costs, but let’s say $600,000, $700,000 in order for the 192—that’s per year, in order for the 192 to run a bit later on weekdays.

We don’t know what the revenue is from ticket revenue, this is a new route or an extension to the route, so it’s hard to say exactly how much take-up there’d be particularly from the Tennyson Ward. But it’s not a huge amount of money and I would think that either the Council or the State Government could cough up an extra $600,000 to ensure that a big chunk of their inner southside has a bus service that runs at night and on weekends. Even Highgate Hill in my ward, which you’d think is pretty close to the inner city, it’s actually very poorly served by buses and on weekends there’s not much on offer. In fact even the stretch of Montague Road where all the new high‑density development has gone in, there’s a major Woolworths shopping centre down there and a precinct with close to 1,000 residents and they don’t have a bus that runs on weekends. The Blue CityGlider stops quite a distance from that shopping centre.

I guess there’s a few missed opportunities here in this stage of the review and I’m hopeful that the Administration will take a bit of feedback on board about some of these things that can be improved. But the core concern really for me is getting some improvements to the 192 service so that it runs on weekends and weeknights as well. I don’t necessarily accept the principle that residents should—that we should have to cut some services in other precincts in order to improve the 192, because we’ve had so many additional residents move into my ward.

Just West End alone has had a population increase of something like 7,000 or 8,000 residents in the last couple of years and then the suburb of South Brisbane next to West End has had something like another 10,000. So the population of the 4101 postcode all up is growing by more than 20,000 people in the last few years and even though there’s 20,000 more people, there hasn’t been any significant improvement to public transport other than putting larger blue buses on the Blue CityGlider network. I do acknowledge that and I’m grateful that we’ve got those larger buses on the Blue CityGlider network, but you’d think that if an area’s getting another 20,000 residents crammed into it, that alone would be enough case to justify improvements to public transport without having to cut existing services.

So I’m not necessarily pointing the finger directly at the Council Administration, but the Council is the one that approved all these developments in my ward without a clear plan for how those residents would move around. So I get why the Council is pointing the finger at the State Government and saying well, it’s up to the State Government to increase funding for the public transport network so that we can add services rather than robbing Peter to pay Paul, but the Council’s the one that’s put all these people here. The Council’s the one that’s approved all these new apartments in areas where the local community said the public transport infrastructure wasn’t sufficient and the facilities couldn’t cope.

So the Council told residents that there would be enough adequate facilities and services to accommodate this growing population. The Council told residents that there would be a new CityCat stop on the western side of West End. That hasn’t come to pass, so we’ve had lots more residents moving into the area, lots more businesses as well, much more demand for weekend services in particular and weeknight services. There are more bars and restaurants that people are trying to visit, but more importantly there are bars and restaurants where hospitality workers are working and trying to get home late at night and those people should be catered for.

As a general theme, I notice that the new service times and routes operating now as in the bus network review still seem to be weighted a little too heavily towards 9am to 5pm workers and a conventional, very traditional understanding of when people do and don’t want to catch the bus. I think probably one of the demographics or sections that might have been overlooked a little bit in this bus network review are those younger workers who do work late at night or on weekends.

Part of the problem there is that when the Council’s deciding where services are needed and where are the gaps that most need to be filled, the Council and the State Government are looking predominantly at existing usage patterns. So they look at where people are travelling to currently based on *go* card data and based on that existing demand they say well, we need a new route here, or we need to fill this gap there. But if you only look at existing demand patterns you miss out on all the unmet needs of people who aren’t currently catching a bus because they don’t have a good option, but who really would like to catch a bus if one was available.

Through you, Chair, to Councillor MURPHY, I just hope that you’ll keep that general feedback in mind as you receive the submissions and remember that there are a lot of people now, particularly younger people who to be honest are probably the least likely to engage with the Council engagement processes, but there are a lot of people who work late nights or who work on weekends who should be able to catch a bus to and from work, just like a 9am to 5pm office worker. The fact that those people work on weekends or weeknights shouldn’t mean that they’re less deserving of access to public transport. So I do acknowledge it’s a balancing act, I do acknowledge that the Council officers are trying to do the best they can with the limited resources on the table.

But I also note that the Council has been trying to—has been willing to put a little bit of extra funding in, in order to ensure that some residents are not left worse off and the Council, I think, is right to do that. If the Council wants to win the public case and win enough support for these reforms to go through, it might be strategic to put in a little bit of extra funding towards something like the 192 service, so all those residents who live along that route can get to work, or can move around on the weekends, or can get to the local shops on a Saturday morning.

Like I said, I’ll have a lot more to say once I’ve been able to see the feedback summary reports and talk to more residents about this. I think a lot of people are still getting their heads around it and I think a lot of people probably don’t quite understand yet exactly what the ramifications are. I just do hope that the Council Administration is sincere about taking feedback on board and making changes and that it won’t be a situation where the decisions have already been made and this whole consultation process is really just a notification process. I think that would be disappointing and I hope that Councillor MURPHY is sincere when he says that the Council genuinely is interested in feedback and will make changes in response to feedback where appropriate. Thanks.

Chair: Thank you.

Further speakers?

Councillor CUMMING.

Councillor CUMMING: Yes, thanks, Mr Chair. Mr Chair, as some of the earlier speakers said, the Administration’s been saying for a long time the Metro would mean improved services for the suburbs. Well there’s no improvements proposed in this network review for the Wynnum Manly Ward, in fact there’s been no changes at all. I’ve believed for some time that a bus service from Manly West into the city would be viable, would start in Wynnum Manly Ward and then go through the Manly West part of Doboy Ward, along streets like Manly Road and Radford Road and Wanda Road. Many of the services to the city from Wynnum Manly are hourly services at best during much of the day and even a regular half-hour service would greatly increase patronage, even if no bus service was offered.

A more regular service to Carindale and Cannon Hill for a lot of the young people that work at those shopping centres or want to go shopping there would be very much appreciated as well. As it is at present, it’s very difficult for people to get to work at Carindale or at Cannon Hill. There could be substantial improvements made there if the service was run more regularly. This is a disappointing review for the Wynnum Manly Ward. Unfortunately, residents in Manly West are so used to such a poor service, I’m not sure how many of them will put in submissions unfortunately. But I’ll be urging them to put in submissions and letting them know about the review.

Chair: Thank you.

Further speakers? Any further speakers?

Councillor MURPHY—

Sorry, Councillor STRUNK, go for it.

Councillor STRUNK: I am tiny. Okay, I’d like to rise to speak in regards to the review. I have three routes that have been impacted, some substantially and others not too much. But anyway, as we were going through it, I think I will start off with one of the routes and that was route 122, which there have been some positive changes to this route in some respects. First of all, the routes actually, the new routes actually going to not have to worry about the Coopers Plains railway crossing⎯they’re doing work around that⎯which is positive. Also this route will actually now go to the Richlands train station. But that just is only going to make up for what we lost in the last review some years back, where we lost one of the routes to the Richlands train station.

I know I’ve talked about this, acknowledge them at every opportunity, but as my colleague, Councillor CUMMING, has said from the Wynnum Ward, Metro was supposed to actually improve things in the suburbs. That’s what we were told at the very beginning of the process. When we heard that of course Metro was going to create some disruptions within the bus network, but that was going to be improved into the suburbs by releasing a number of buses that were occupying the space that the Metro buses were going to take over from. I said right at the beginning that I didn’t think the Forest Lake Ward was going to benefit much at all from that and I didn’t think that most of my residents were ever going to probably—unless they do it for an experience—ride the Metro, at least on a regular basis anyway.

So when we received the changes here, then I had a look at that and said well, what’s in it for us for the $1.7 billion that we’re spending on the Metro? The 122, as I say, the two benefits there are not having to go through the Coopers Plains crossing and that that route will now intersect with the Richlands train station. But the problem is that there’s a village within the Inala suburb which is known basically as the cosmic streets and/or the stars. A lot of our seniors live in these streets and use the buses on a regular basis. What’s happened with this particular route is that the stops in Centaurus Street, Bootes Street, Virgo, Eridanus, Mira and Poinsettia Streets will be closed off from this particular route.

When I sat down with officers to get the briefing, they said well, they should be able to walk to another stop close to their house to still be able to use the 122, but they may have to walk over 400 metres away. Again, a lot of these residents have mobility issues and in the heat of the summer in Inala, in some cases they may not even have air conditioning in their houses, I don’t know, but all I know is that it’s a very hot walk to a bus stop if you’re having to walk 400 metres. So that’s definitely not an improvement. So that was route 122.

Now if we have a look at 110, it will now terminate at the PA (Princess Alexandra Hospital). It used to go into the city, but it used to stop at stops in Queen Street station, Cultural Centre station and I’m sure that the Cultural Centre of course is going to be probably a destination for a lot of my residents. South Bank bus station of course and the Mater Hill station and the Woolloongabba station. So it’s going to be a broken trip. So they get to the PA, then they’ve got to get off and get on to the Metro, if they want to go any further of course.

It’s a broken trip and again, mobility issues, a lot of people do have mobility issues and they may have walking frames, but they may not even need a walking frame but they have a cane and/or other issues when it comes to walking. So a broken trip is something that they would not necessarily look forward to. Yes, it’ll be a faster trip in the end by a few minutes probably and a more frequent trip, as we’ve heard, but again broken trips do not advantage especially seniors. As a matter of fact, I would think that some of them probably wouldn’t want to undertake the trip because of that fact, that they can’t get on their bus in their suburb and then get off at where they want to go. But as I say, the increase in frequency of course is welcomed.

The final one was the 460, the Heathwood to City express, but this no longer of course will get you to the Cultural Centre. Again, the Cultural Centre is one of those iconic places in Brisbane that people do travel to probably a few times a year at least to undertake the entertainment area, South Bank and other areas. Other entertainment areas in that area, that they would be able to again hop on the bus in their suburb and then get dropped off to where they need to go and that will no longer happen on the 460. So those are the three routes, I just wanted to put it on the record that I’m not happy, especially with those people that are going to be disadvantaged in those Inala streets who are no longer going to be able to use the bus stop, in some cases right outside their house. Thank you, Chair.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor STRUNK.

Further debate?

Councillor MURPHY.

Councillor MURPHY: Thanks very much, Chair and I thank all Councillors, except Councillor JOHNSTON, for their contribution to the debate on this item. Because I think it’s important that we have Councillors engage in this process in a meaningful, grownup way and Councillor STRUNK, Councillor CUMMING and Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN have done that today. Let’s start with Councillor STRUNK, I take your point, Councillor STRUNK, around some of the routes that were removed in the—it was actually the 2013 review started by the State, handed over to Council.

We actually removed a number of services that weren’t performing, that were connecting into the rail station and what we actually found was that patronage improved as a result of removal of some of those routes. Because sometimes in an area network legibility needs to be improved through a reduction of the amount of routes and then what you get is people are able to understand and read the network better. So we actually had an improvement in patronage as a result of some of those routes that were removed. But this goes for Councillor CUMMING as well. All of this review, this new network is in context of zero growth funding from the State Government in the last seven and a bit years of Premier Palaszczuk’s reign and control over transport in this city. Now we understand the financial issues that the State—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, you were listened to in silence.

Councillor MURPHY: We understand the financial issues that the State is going through, but the reality is that this is the biggest investment that Council has made in public transport ever, ever, Chair. So what are we seeing? We’re seeing our investment in public transport jump by 84% to $183 million by 2025-26. Now the State Government cannot say that, they cannot say that. There has been zero growth funding from the State Government in public transport and I would suggest, Councillor STRUNK and I’m suggesting this respectfully to you, that if you do want more services in your electorate then it is your responsibility to talk to your former boss, the Premier, the person who’s in charge of the State and ask her to fund the Transport department and Translink to be able to deliver additional growth funding for services.

Because what you see from this review and some of you have identified that, other Councillors on this side have identified that, is that Council is trying to do more with less in many respects. We are trying to get more trips on a network without breaking the bank and signing up Council for decades of dealing with the State’s lack of growth funding. Still we get 160,000 additional trips on this network through this very smart redesign of the network, we get 54% of journeys that are faster and 33% that are the same or similar, not the 91% figure that Councillor JOHNSTON just pulled out of the air and made up. We have 13% of trips that are slower, Chair, 13%—

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Claim to have been misrepresented.

Chair: Noted.

Councillor MURPHY: Well let’s talk about misrepresentation then, Chair, because Councillor JOHNSTON did some disgusting misrepresentation of the officers who came out to brief her on the new network. She said—and I quote—the fix is in and that there was a political direction on this network review. The reality is—and the officers would testify to this—that they have been allowed to conduct this review with—I will say in collaboration with—Translink at arm’s length from the political process and to do a transport planner’s network review. We have not sought to intervene in this network review and I would suggest, Chair, that that is why so far it is being accepted by the Minister, it’s being accepted by Translink and I would think it’s being more broadly accepted by the residents of the City of Brisbane, the travelling public who we are in this place to serve.

So those were outrageous comments and Councillor JOHNSTON, you said you look forward to participating in this review, well if that’s how you’re going to participate in this review then I don’t look forward to your contributions any further. I do look forward to the contributions of your constituents, they’re the ones that we serve here, they’re the ones that we look out for each and every day. We’ll be looking for the submissions that they make and enhancing services for them. Trust me, there are plenty of enhancements that are happening in the Tennyson Ward as a result of this network review.

Now Councillor SRI, just finally, in addressing your points and you have engaged, I think, meaningfully in the network review process. As I said to you in Committee and as I’ve said many times on the Brisbane new bus network, all of this, all of these changes are in context of zero growth funding from the State. We are having to do more with less and I think the officers have done a tremendous job at that and I will leave it at that, Chair.

Chair: Thank you.

Councillor JOHNSTON, your misrepresentation?

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, Councillor MURPHY just flat-out lied about me when he claimed that I had misled people and been untruthful about how many people would be affected negatively by the bus review. It’s in a colour-printed presentation provided by Council officers, very clearly stating that 91% of people get the same or a similar service and almost 10% will be worse off. He’s the *(Comments removed at the request of the CEO, in accordance with the AP068 Production of Council Minutes Policy approved by Council on 8 August 2012)*.

Chair: Councillors, we now move to the vote on this report.

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

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

Councillor Ryan Murphy (Civic Cabinet Chair) and Councillors Jared Cassidy, Steven Huang, David McLachlan and Jonathan Sriranganathan.

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE:**

Councillor Angela Owen (Deputy Chair).

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – BRISBANE’S NEW BUS NETWORK

**211/2022-23**

1. The Manager, Strategy and Network Services, Transport for Brisbane, and the Governance and Strategy Integration Manager, Metro Governance, Major Projects, City Projects Office, Brisbane Infrastructure, attended the meeting to provide an update on *Brisbane’s New Bus Network*. They provided the information below.

2. Brisbane’s inner city busways and bus stops are currently experiencing congestion, and Council is planning for more people to utilise public transport in the future. Brisbane’s bus network is currently over-reliant on direct bus journeys from the suburbs to the CBD. If this continues, it will add pressure to busy, congested corridors, thereby impacting the entire network. The Committee was shown a diagram highlighting key corridors, stations and network constraint points.

3. The new bus network will be guided by the following seven network design principles.

- Congestion busting: tackling inner-busway congestion to increase reliability and on‑time trips.

- Future capacity: providing capacity for growth, including future Brisbane Metro extensions to Chermside, Brisbane Airport, Carindale and Springwood.

- Simple and convenient: simplifying the CBD network and distributing buses more evenly across the city to get customers to where they want to go and improve convenience.

- More connections: delivering services in the suburbs to meet transport needs and demand by increasing the frequency of services and improving suburban connections to key destinations.

- Smarter network: embracing new technology to provide a bus network that is appealing and useful for all public transport users.

- Easier to use: simplifying existing route structures that are complex and confusing with the aim of making them easier for customers to use.

- More travel choices: enhancing the customer experience by providing convenient connections to other services, with high-quality interchanges, particularly with Cross River Rail (CRR).

4. Council’s new bus network will introduce two new Brisbane Metro lines, reduce bottlenecks and congestion, and increase connections with other public transport modes including CRR.

5. Stage 1 of Brisbane Metro proposes changes to parts of the bus network in the inner city and south‑eastern corridor. Two new Metro services, M1 and M2, will form the core of the network. Brisbane Metro will evolve Brisbane’s bus network from a direct-to-the-CBD model to a hybrid network connecting services from the suburbs.

6. A number of changes are proposed to evolve the network, including three new routes, servicing new roads, new all-day services, enhancing suburban connections to key destinations, redesigning 12 suburban routes to connect with Brisbane Metro, dividing routes to make them more reliable, combining 13 routes for greater efficiency and removing two routes.

7. Changes are planned to reduce inner-busway congestion and deliver more reliable services, including amending several south-eastern routes in the Metro catchment area to feed into the M1 and M2 routes, altering the configuration of services terminating at the Queen Street and Cultural Centre bus stations, and amending the routes of services coming into the city from western and south-eastern routes.

8. These changes will provide significant scope for future growth, including on the busy West End‑Teneriffe corridor. King George Square platforms will be reconfigured to cater for Metro vehicles, provide scope for additional services, and provide flexibility to deploy higher capacity vehicles across the network. It will remain the hub for high‑frequency services to the four principal regional activity centres: Garden City, Carindale, Chermside and Indooroopilly.

9. The establishment of the Cultural Centre station revolutionised travel across Brisbane by expanding opportunities for people to transfer north-south and through same-platform transfers. Currently approximately 30% of our passengers transfer between services, which is very high for bus-to-bus transfers. To minimise the impact of future changes, transfers will be distributed across all the inner city busway stations.

10. A number of proposed changes the bus network will increase simplicity and convenience for commuters. These include consolidation of services on surface streets, focusing on stopping pattens on pedestrian spines, changes to specific stops in the CBD for many routes, and better alignment of routes and specific CBD stops for morning and afternoon peak Rocket services.

11. The new bus network will improve suburban connections to key destinations, and includes Metro lines, universities, rail stations and CBD locations. Enhanced connections, additional services and station expansions will have the capacity to connect an extra 55,000 students to Griffith University, University of Queensland and Queensland University of Technology each weekday.

12. The new bus network will be easier to use, as peak service paths in the CBD will be simplified to provide consistent routes in both morning and afternoon peak periods. Suburban route paths will be simplified in several suburbs to reduce complexity and enhance frequency.

13. The new bus network will integrate with CRR and provide very high-frequency services through the South Bank precinct to connect to inner city destinations. The strategy is to provide bus passengers with the opportunity to transfer from through-routed buses to CRR trains when the overall travel time is competitive.

14. Other network benefits include decongesting inner city busways, improved CBD services, increasing the numbers of, and access to, high-frequency services for customers and embracing the emergence of alternative transport technologies to expand the catchment of Metro services.

15. The Committee was shown a timeline of network changes from 2021 to 2024 and beyond. Major stages include network development in 2021-22, pre-consultation and community engagement from mid-2022, community consultation on the new network from October 2022, finalisation of the network design in 2023, implementation of the network changes in 2024, and planning for future Metro lines and network changes beyond 2024.

16. Over 30 community engagement and information sessions will be held across Brisbane between 10 October to 14 December 2022. They will take place at the Brisbane Metro Information Centre, key network locations and busway stations, and in community libraries and halls. Customers can also access an interactive map, an online survey and play the Brisbane Metro game to learn more about the future of the network, and the reasons behind the proposed changes. Council has also published the draft *Brisbane’s New Bus Network* to support consultation with the community and key stakeholders.

17. The new bus network proposal is underpinned by extensive research and the application of learnings from other network change programs interstate and overseas. Strong data analysis will ensure sensitivity to customers’ existing travel patterns and improvements to customers’ journeys and connections. Council has made an unprecedented investment in community and stakeholder engagement to explain the proposed changes and seek community input. Making these changes will ensure the ability of the network to respond to future growth and demands on the public transport network.

18. Following a number of questions from the Committee, the Civic Cabinet Chair thanked the Manager, Strategy and Network Services, and the Governance and Strategy Integration Manager for their informative update.

19. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

Chair: Councillor WINES, Infrastructure Committee report please.

### INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE

Councillor Andrew WINES, Civic Cabinet Chair of the Infrastructure Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Peter MATIC, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 25 October 2022, be adopted.

Chair: Councillor WINES.

Councillor WINES: Mr Chair, last week the Committee saw a presentation on Norris Road, Bracken Ridge and as many Councillors would know I’m a great fan of that project, a great fan of Norris Road. I think people have heard me speak at length about it and I will allow those earlier comments to stand on their own.

Chair: Thank you.

Any further debate?

Councillor LANDERS.

Councillor LANDERS: Chair, I rise to talk about the project at Norris Road. As you know, it’s been a few weeks now since the lights have been turned on at Pritchard Place and we are getting fantastic feedback. I know before this project took place we had a huge consultation on Stage 1 and at that consultation there were many people who said that they would like to see these lights go in at Pritchard Place. On the weekend at a Halloween event, I had one of our locals, well known locals, Sharkie, say to me that he was just so happy that we were able to find the funds to do that.

We were able to complete Stage 2 because we did get this Stage 1 project done on time and under budget and we were able to move down and put the lights in at Pritchard Place. The school principal and parents have found that school pick-up is so much easier and it has taken pressure off other local streets in the area that parents were forced to try and use. So now they are using that Pritchard Place and the traffic is flowing through and we have a much safer environment.

Also included in that project were the turning lanes at Wirupa and Gawain Road and of course the bus lanes. That has opened Norris Road up right through that people are able to drive through and not have to wait for cars to turn or for the buses to leave. So, it is absolutely fantastic and I do really want to thank—of course I thank the contractors for the job that was fantastic, but also I particularly want to thank residents in the area that have obviously had a few late nights and what have you with the works taking place. I really do want to say to them thank you so much. They all acknowledge the importance of this project and are just so happy that we have been able to complete it now. So, I thank Councillor WINES as well, thank you.

Chair: Thank you.

Any further debate? No further debate?

Councillor WINES?

We’ll now move to the vote on this report.

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

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

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

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE:**

Councillor Steve Griffiths.

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – NORRIS ROAD UPGRADE – STAGE 2

**212/2022-23**

1. The Program Director Civil and Transport, Project Management Civil, Project Management, City Projects Office, Brisbane Infrastructure, attended the meeting to provide an update on the Norris Road upgrade – Stage 2 (the upgrade). He provided the information below.

2. Norris Road is located between Bracken Ridge Road and Telegraph Road, Bracken Ridge and is classified as a Suburban road in Council’s road hierarchy as per *Brisbane City Plan 2014*. The volume of traffic along Norris Road varies between 9,000 and 15,000 vehicles per day. Heavy vehicle traffic accounts for approximately three per cent of the total traffic volume. Norris Road services 15 local bus routes, is classified as a primary cycle route in Council’s draft Active Transport Network Plan and is a Principal Cycle route in the Queensland Government’s Principal Cycle Network Plan.

3. The upgrade is expected to deliver reduced congestion and improve travel time reliability on Norris Road. Without the upgrade, 2031 base traffic modelling has predicted delays of up to 15 minutes, with traffic queuing during peak times between 95 and 361 metres. Removal of the zebra crossing on Norris Road is expected to significantly improve the traffic flow through the corridor. The project plan also includes the installation of a signalised pedestrian crossing and new traffic lights. This is expected to improve accessibility and safety for the road corridor, which experienced 29 crashes between 2013 to 2018.

4. Construction commenced in May 2022 and was completed in October 2022. The upgrade was fully funded by the Australian Government as part of the Urban Congestion Fund and delivered by Council under the Better Roads for Brisbane program.

5. The Committee was shown images of the completed upgrades, which includes:

- a new traffic island, shared path and footpath for pedestrians

- right turn road markings into Gawain Road

- new landscaping on both sides of Norris Road and at the entrance to Pritchard Place

- a new bus stop

- modified kerb and new pram ramp.

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

7. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

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

### CITY PLANNING AND SUBURBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE

Councillor Adam ALLAN, Civic Cabinet Chair of the City Planning and Suburban Renewal Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Sandy LANDERS that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 25 October 2022, be adopted.

Chair: Councillor ALLAN.

Councillor ALLAN: Thank you, Mr Chair. Before I update the Chamber on the two items that were considered by the Committee, I wanted to acknowledge the Council officers from Design Brisbane. The team recently won the Asia Pacific Place Leaders Award for small projects, under $200,000, for the Outdoor Gallery *Sunny Side Up* exhibition. As part of this exhibition there was also a diversified engagement program that included, for the first time, a citywide augmented reality art treasure hunt. This initiative was in response to the pandemic and drew people back into the city centre safely, while providing a transformational opportunity for emerging artists.

Now moving on to the Committee report, item A was the Committee presentation on the recently completed Coorparoo Village Precinct Project in Councillor CUNNINGHAM’s ward. Our Village Precinct Projects look to create liveable places for the local community and visitors to enjoy while improving amenity and accessibility. This one has certainly revitalised the Coorparoo Junction neighbourhood shopping precinct along Old Cleveland Road and Cavendish Road, Coorparoo.

As part of the project the public was also invited to submit ideas and feedback. This played a key role in shaping the project scope, as many of these ideas and feedback submitted were included in the final design. This included garden beds, landscape seating and vertical gardens, large shade trees and building murals, pavement paint and public art. The project also saw upgrades to the pavement to improve pedestrian accessibility and safety, as well as new street furniture, including customer seating and bike racks.

But the highlight of the project is the conversion of Tarlina Lane into a shared zone, including new pedestrian lighting and a reduction in the speed limit. Local artist, Chantal Fraser, also undertook a creative workshop with the local schoolchildren to develop themes for surface treatment works on the lane. The Tarlina Lane Festival was held on Sunday 16 October 2022 to celebrate the completion of the project. Along with local businesses, there were food vendors, live music and entertainment and I understand, Councillor CUNNINGHAM, the event was a big hit with the locals and extended well into the evening.

Item B was a petition objecting to Council’s approval of a development application (DA) for a multistorey dwelling house at 15 Byron Street, Bulimba. The development application was assessed against City Plan in accordance with the Planning Act, before being approved by Council’s delegate on 6 December 2021 subject to conditions. Now on 5 January 2022 the applicant exercised their rights under the Act and lodged an appeal against the conditions of the approval in the Planning and Environment (P&E) Court. The recommendation proposes that the petitioners be advised as the appeal is still before the P&E Court, the final outcome sits with the Court. The local Councillor supports the recommendation. I’ll leave further debate to the Chamber.

Chair: Is there any further debate?

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, I rise to speak on item A, the Village Precinct Projects that have been undertaken. A few years ago, without any notice to Council, the LNP changed the name of its program which had previously been called a SCIP, Suburban Centre Improvement Project, to a Village Precinct Project. Those people waiting in the queue for a SCIP basically got dudded and the LNP funded projects in their ward and I think there was one in Inala in the first batch as well. As a result of this Village Precinct Project, this report says there actually have been 17 projects delivered, but there are more listed on the website, so I’m not quite sure how true that is.

But of the 10 that are listed in paragraph 2, there is only one in a non-LNP ward. Nine of the 10 projects to be delivered in this four-year period are in LNP wards. Now that is just appalling behaviour. The other 12 that are listed on the Council website, that aren’t mentioned in this report, nine of those are in LNP wards and three are in Labor wards. So overwhelmingly the LNP is only delivering projects in its own wards and so far that’s 18, so almost every ward at least in the LNP Administration has had a Village Precinct Project. Meanwhile, the Graceville Fiveways looks like a bomb’s gone off in it. Annerley Junction, which we have petitioned over and over and over again to have an upgrade has been ignored by Brisbane City Council. Projects in LNP wards are being prioritised above places like Annerley that desperately need support.

I just want to place on the record again for those watching at home and I’ve been watching today, that Councillor MACKAY, while male Councillors are speaking, sits facing forward in the Chamber. Every time I speak—

Councillor MACKAY: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor MACKAY.

Councillor MACKAY: For a start, I feel bullied when Councillor JOHNSTON does that and I’m allowed to sit in the Chamber how I wish. Whatever I do has nothing to do with gender.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor MACKAY.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: No, Councillor MACKAY, it’s not a valid point of order.

Councillor JOHNSTON, you have the floor, but please stick to the report before us please.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Well I’m so sorry, but this has been going on for some period of time. I’ve watched the other Councillors in the room here today and while they’ve been speaking he sits facing forward. He’s doing this very deliberately. Not only is it rude, he then stands up, makes a point of order—

Councillor MATIC: Point of order, Mr Chairman.

Councillor JOHNSTON: —that’s not a point of order—

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor MATIC.

Councillor JOHNSTON: —claiming I’m bullying him when he is acting in a childish way—

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor MATIC.

Councillor JOHNSTON: —that has been noticed by members of the public.

Councillor MATIC: Could I speak? Mr Chairman, Councillor JOHNSTON is imputing motive and making a derogatory statement about Councillor MACKAY. It is absolutely unsuitable meeting conduct. There is nothing that she said that can be proven and she has no facts to prove otherwise. But she is happy to make a—and I ask that it be noted as unsuitable meeting conduct.

Chair: Councillor MATIC, thank you for your point of order.

Councillor JOHNSTON, can I bring you back to the report before us please, which has nothing to do with the behaviour alleged or otherwise of Councillors in this place.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Other than of course the recording of the meeting, which is made every week, Councillor MATIC and will prove exactly what I’m saying. I’ve been watching now for a few weeks.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, to the report please.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, it’s interesting, isn’t it, I’m the one in trouble even though the LNP Councillors are the ones engaging in bad behalf.

Councillor WINES: Point of order, Mr Chair. If the Councillor has no further comments—

Chair: Excuse me, just before I call you, Councillor WINES, yes, you have a point of order?

Councillor WINES: My point of order is obviously relevance. If the Councillor has no further relevant comments, perhaps we could proceed with the balance of the meeting.

Chair: Thank you.

I have called you to the motion matter before us on a few occasions now, Councillor JOHNSTON. I urge you to do so.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Of course, we wouldn’t want to acknowledge the misogyny of the Councillor for Walter Taylor Ward, of course and his very rude behaviour towards me.

Chair: No, Councillor—

Councillor JOHNSTON: I would have thought perhaps that that might be something you’d want to address.

Councillor WINES: Point of order, Mr Chair.

Chair: Point of order.

Councillor WINES: That’s outrageous.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON—

Councillor WINES: I seek that the Councillor withdraw that outrageous statement, it’s obviously not true and an appalling thing to say about another person. Please, Mr Chair, can I seek that she withdraw that?

Chair: Councillor, will you withdraw those comments please?

Councillor JOHNSTON: For weeks, if not months, Councillor MACKAY turns his back whenever I speak in this Chamber. He does not do it to male Councillors on this side of the Chamber. It’s been observed—

Councillor MACKAY: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor MACKAY.

Councillor JOHNSTON: —by residents who’ve brought it to my attention watching it and it is appalling behaviour.

Chair: Councillor—

Councillor MACKAY: It’s not your turn. Chair, I just want to put on the record again I feel unsafe when Councillor JOHNSTON bullies me in this Chamber.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, you’ve been asked to withdraw comments that you made. Will you withdraw?

Councillor JOHNSTON: It’s been noticed by members of the public—

Chair: Councillor, that’s not—

Councillor JOHNSTON: —I’ve observed it, it is appalling. He’s doing it right now, like this is appalling behaviour and I don’t know why he’s doing it to me and not male Councillors—

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON—

Councillor JOHNSTON: —and that is the problem.

|  |
| --- |
| **Order – Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON**  The Chair then advised Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON that as she had continued to fail to comply with his request for remedial action for her unsuitable meeting conduct, in accordance with section 21(8) of the *Meetings Local Law 2001*, an order reprimanding her for her conduct was being issued. |

Chair: Have you finished your debate? Yes?

Councillor JOHNSTON: So I get an inappropriate conduct warning but the misogyny of the Councillor for Walter Taylor is not addressed.

Councillor HOWARD: Point of order, Mr Chair.

Councillor JOHNSTON: I’m sorry, what exactly have I been—

Councillor HOWARD: Point of order, Mr Chair.

Councillor JOHNSTON: What exactly have I been warned for and noted in the minutes for? Not withdrawing?

Chair: For failure—

Councillor JOHNSTON: Is that—

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, on several occasions I asked you to take remedial action for your unsuitable meeting conduct.

Councillor JOHNSTON: What unsuitable meeting conduct?

Chair: To withdraw the comments that you made.

Councillor JOHNSTON: So I’m sorry, if we don’t withdraw that is automatically inappropriate conduct, is that what you’re saying?

Chair: You have continued to defy my request for you to return to the matter before us. That was unsuitable—

Councillor JOHNSTON: But most Councillors don’t do that.

Chair: That was unsuitable meeting conduct.

Councillor JOHNSTON: I’m sorry, hang on a minute, other Councillors don’t withdraw and you don’t issue a warning for them.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Councillor—

Councillor JOHNSTON: I don’t have to.

Chair: Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN, you have a point of order.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Thanks, Chair. I did just want to clarify, are you suggesting that if you request a Councillor withdraw a statement and they decline to withdraw, that that is automatically unsuitable conduct? Because that’s a new thing, I think.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Excuse me, I’m asking the Chair—

Chair: I asked you to withdraw, Councillor JOHNSTON and you refused the request. That’s unsuitable meeting conduct.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Just on my point of order, sorry, I really want to get this right so I don’t muck up on the rules. It sounds like what you’re saying is if you ask a Councillor to withdraw a statement and they decline to do so, that you will then deem that unsuitable meeting conduct. That’s a departure from prior practice in this place. Is that what you’re saying?

Chair: The ruling, Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN, is that I’ve made a request for Councillor JOHNSTON to withdraw—

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: I’m not asking specifically about her matter. I’m—

Chair: Yes, let me complete—and the matter wasn’t withdrawn, that is unsuitable meeting conduct, yes.

Councillor JOHNSTON: What? Since when?

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Where are we?

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Yes, sorry, can I encourage you to seek some further advice on that? Because that would be a big departure from prior practice if every time a Councillor says that they’re offended and they want something withdrawn and then the Councillor who makes the statements declines to withdraw, that you then deem that unsuitable meeting conduct. That would really—

Chair: Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN, under the Meetings Local Law, I have decided that the conduct is of a serious nature and have made an order under section 21(8) directly. That is permitted under the Meetings Local Law.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Saying that Councillor MACKAY, who turns his back to me in the Chamber, is engaging in bad behaviour and I don’t withdraw—he’s called me a bully multiple times today, so is that going to be withdrawn, Mr Chairman?

Councillor WINES: Point of order.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Is that going to be withdrawn, Mr Chairman?

Chair: Point of order—

Councillor WINES: Can a courtesy that’s extended to Councillor JOHNSTON also be extended to me please?

Chair: Yes, Councillor WINES.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

|  |
| --- |
| At that point, 5.55pm, it was resolved on the motion of Councillor Andrew WINES, seconded by Councillor Steven TOOMEY, that the meeting adjourn for a period of 10 minutes to allow Councillors to calm themselves, so that the meeting can continue.  Council stood adjourned at 6.03pm. |

**UPON RESUMPTION:**

Chair: Thank you, Councillors.

Councillor JOHNSON, are you going to continue talking on this report?

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, but point of order.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Prior to the unnecessary shutdown of the Council meeting by Councillor WINES, he indicated that some Councillors in the Chamber were not calm, including myself. I find those comments offensive and ask that they be withdrawn.

Chair: Thank you. I didn’t hear your words. You said, he said?

Councillor JOHNSTON: Do I need to repeat myself, do I?

Chair: Sure.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Are you being deliberately rude as well?

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, that’s an unfit—

Councillor JOHNSTON: Prior to the unnecessary shutdown of the meeting, Councillor WINES said that Councillors, including myself, had not been calm in the meeting. I find these comments offensive and ask that they be withdrawn.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, if I can make an observation on the conduct of the meeting over the last half hour, it did get somewhat unruly. I am asking all Councillors to behave themselves, to adhere to the Councillor Code of Conduct and to refrain from calling each other names and to stick to the motions before us.

At the moment, we’re discussing the City Planning and Suburban Renewal Committee report. You had the floor. I ask you to return to that debate, please.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Mr Chairman, I have asked that an offensive comment to myself be withdrawn. You have ignored my request and you have warned me for not withdrawing at your request, yet you won’t even ask the Councillor to withdraw the offensive remark made about me and others in this place. Why are you doing that?

Chair: Thank you, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor WINES, Councillor JOHNSTON has taken offence at the implication or imputation that she was one of those Councillors in this place that wasn’t calm. Will you withdraw that comment?

Councillor WINES: Happily withdrawn.

Chair: Thank you.

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: I’m just going to put on the record that in any other workplace, if there was a meeting of colleagues and one of them permanently sat with their back to you when you spoke, those persons would no longer be employed. The fact that it’s being allowed, apparently that is suitable meeting behaviour. That is outrageous.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, please resume your seat.

Any further discussion/debate on this item?

Thank you, Councillor CUNNINGHAM.

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: Thanks, Mr Chair. I’m very happy to rise and speak on item A, the Village Precinct Project at Coorparoo. Many of you would know the area. It’s just near Coorparoo Square on the corner of Cavendish Road and Old Cleveland Road. In recent years, this village has become a hive of activity in Coorparoo. It’s a popular place for residents to gather at the weekends and after hours. It’s also a popular employment place, so there are a lot of people in this area at all times of the day.

I’ve noticed over the years though that the area around Coorparoo Square has started to look a bit daggy, so I was very pleased to have some investment in the streetscape here at Coorparoo. It’s also heavily used by students who attend Coorparoo State School. They access the school via Tarlina Lane, regularly either going on scooters or walking with their parents, but it’s a heavily accessed space.

I think the overarching achievement of the project has been about the increased walkability of the precinct. It’s a more pleasant place to visit. It’s easier to get around. Certainly, I’ve had lots of positive feedback about the garden beds and the new street trees. I have to say though I was initially a little sceptical when the officers came to talk to me about the new pavement on the street, Councillor ALLAN. I thought, how are we going to achieve this? This is actually a first in Brisbane, so I was really excited that the officers were able to work with students from the school and a local artist, Chantal Fraser, to come up with the design and the artwork for the street. It has completely transformed the laneway, and I get many parents saying to me that they have so much fun skipping down the laneway to school in the morning with their kids, and that puts a big smile on my face.

I really wanted to commend the officers and commend all the people in the Coorparoo community who came together to support this project. I think we’ve got a great outcome for the community. I’m very proud to support it. Thank you.

Chair: Further speakers? Any further speakers?

Councillor ALLAN? No?

We now move to the vote on this report.

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

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

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

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE:**

Councillors Lisa Atwood and Kara Cook.

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – COORPAROO VILLAGE PRECINCT PROJECT

**213/2022-23**

1. The Design Brisbane Manager, City Planning and Economic Development, City Planning and Sustainability, attended the meeting to provide an update on the Coorparoo Village Precinct Project. He provided the information below.

2. Since the commencement of the Village Precinct Projects (VPP) program in 2018, 17 projects have been delivered across Brisbane. Each has provided site-specific placemaking improvements to local suburban centres. The 2020 to 2024 VPP program includes:

- Completed projects

- Manly Harbour

- Ashgrove West

- Paddington

- Camp Hill

- Coorparoo

- Delivery by mid-2023

- Upper Mount Gravatt

- Milton

- Boondall

- Delivery in 2023-24 financial year

- Rosalie Village

- Mansfield.

3. The Design Brisbane Placemaking Team engages with project partners across Council, local Councillors, and the local community to develop project scopes and facilitate and deliver improvements to the social, economic, environmental, and design conditions for each project.

4. The Coorparoo VPP project site is located at the intersection of Old Cleveland and Cavendish Roads, Coorparoo, and commenced in May 2021 with completion in October 2022. The project had a budget of $1 million and was internally delivered by Design Brisbane, City Projects Office and City Standards. A broad study both inside and outside of the project site footprint was conducted to understand the context, constraints and site opportunities. The scope and related budget were focused around the areas with the greatest need for rejuvenation as well as safety improvements.

5. As part of the project engagement, the public was invited to submit ideas and feedback. This played a key role in shaping the project scope as many ideas and feedback submitted were included in the final design. Ideas and feedback included:

- garden beds on Old Cleveland and Cavendish Road

- landscape seating and vertical gardens

- large shade trees

- building murals, pavement paint and public art.

6. A number of deliverables were achieved for the project:

- pavement upgrades to improve pedestrian accessibility, amenity and safety

- upgraded kerb ramps and new tactile ground surface indicators

- new garden bed planting and street trees

- new street furniture including custom seating and bike racks

- conversion of Tarlina Lane into a shared zone

- new pedestrian lighting to Tarlina Lane

- surface treatment artwork along Tarlina Lane

- speed reduction to 40km per hour throughout the precinct.

7. Tarlina Lane from Cavendish Road to Coorparoo State School has been converted to a shared zone. Local artist, Chantal Fraser, delivered a creative workshop with school children to develop themes for surface treatment artwork on the lane. The visual and conceptual outcomes of the workshop informed the design of the mural, *New Bloom*.

8. Tarlina Lane Festival was held on Sunday 16 October 2022 to celebrate the completion of the project. Local businesses participated and there were four food vendors, live music and entertainment. Approximately 800 people attended with the event extending into the evening. Tarlina Lane can be activated both in the day and evening for event activation.

9. Following a number of questions from the Committee, the Civic Cabinet Chair thanked the Design Brisbane Manager for his informative presentation.

10. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

#### B PETITION – OBJECTING TO COUNCIL’S APPROVAL OF A DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION FOR A MULTI‑STOREY DWELLING HOUSE AT 15 BYRON STREET, BULIMBA

**137/220/594/121**

**214/2022-23**

11. A petition objecting to Council’s approval of a development application for a multistorey dwelling house at 15 Byron Street, Bulimba, was received during the Winter Recess 2022.

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

13. The petition contains 60 signatures.

14. On 20 August 2021, a development application was lodged over the site for a dwelling, including a basement car park, three levels of living areas and a rooftop terrace. The dwelling appears as 3 storeys when viewed from Byron Street.

15. The site is included within the Bulimba District neighbourhood plan (Bulimba North Precinct) and has an underlying Low-medium density residential (up to 3 storeys) zone. *Brisbane City Plan 2014* (City Plan) assessment benchmarks for the dwelling house included the Bulimba North Precinct of the Bulimba District neighbourhood plan, Low‑medium density residential zone code, Dwelling house code and the Traditional building character (design) overlay code.

16. The development application was assessed against City Plan and in accordance with the *Planning Act 2016* (the Act) before being approved by Council’s delegate on 6 December 2021, subject to conditions.

17. Adjoining the site to the north is the Brisbane River, to the east, a vacant allotment with a current development approval for a multiple dwelling and to the south, Byron Street. The Boatyard apartment building is located along the western boundary. It is noted that an existing shed on the site has a built to boundary wall for approximately 15 metres along the western boundary.

18. The development application was subject to code assessment and although not publicly advertised, four submissions (one supporting and three objecting) were received and carefully considered as part of the assessment of the application.

19. There are 26 units within the Boatyard apartment building. A town planning consultant lodged a submission objecting to the proposal on behalf of 13 unit owners (identified by unit number only) within the Boatyard apartments. The grounds of this submission included reference to height, the eastern boundary setback and land dedication along the Brisbane River.

20. On 5 January 2022, the applicant exercised their rights under the Act and lodged an appeal against the conditions of approval in the Planning and Environment Court (P&E Court) (Court reference 32/22). As the appeal is still before the P&E Court, the final outcome sits with the P&E Court.

21. Further information on the appeal can be found on the Queensland Courts’ website at www.courts.qld.gov.au and selecting ‘Search civil files’, followed by ‘Party search (eCourts)’ and searching the appeal reference number ‘32/22’.

Consultation

22. Councillor Kara Cook, Councillor for Morningside Ward, has been consulted and supports the recommendation.

Customer impact

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

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

25. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A**

**Draft Response**

**Petition Reference:** 137/220/594/121

Thank you for your petition objecting to Council’s approval of a development application for a multistorey dwelling house at 15 Byron Street, Bulimba (application reference A005809248) (the site).

On 20 August 2021, a development application was lodged over the site for a dwelling house including a basement car park, three levels of living areas and a rooftop terrace. The dwelling appears as 3 storeys when viewed from Byron Street.

The site is included within the Bulimba District neighbourhood plan (Bulimba North Precinct) and has an underlying Low-medium density residential (up to 3 storeys) zone. *Brisbane City Plan 2014* (City Plan) assessment benchmarks for the dwelling house included the Bulimba north precinct of the Bulimba District neighbourhood plan, Low-medium density residential zone code, Dwelling house code and the Traditional building character (design) overlay code.

The development application was assessed against City Plan and in accordance with the *Planning Act 2016* (the Act) before being approved by Council’s delegate on 6 December 2021, subject to conditions.

The development application was subject to code assessment and although not publicly advertised, four submissions (one supporting and three objecting) were received and carefully considered as part of the assessment of the application.

There are 26 units within the Boatyard apartment building. A town planning consultant lodged a submission objecting to the proposal on behalf of 13 unit owners (identified by unit number only) within the Boatyard apartments. The grounds of this submission included reference to height, the eastern boundary setback and land dedication along the Brisbane River.

On 5 January 2022, the applicant exercised their rights under the Act and lodged an appeal against the conditions of approval in the Planning and Environment Court (P&E Court) (Court reference 32/22). As the appeal is still before the P&E Court, the final outcome rests with the P&E Court.

Further information on the appeal can be found on the Queensland Courts’ website at www.courts.qld.gov.au and selecting ‘Search civil files’, followed by ‘Party search (eCourts)’ and searching the appeal reference number ‘32/22’.

Please let the other petitioners know of this information.

Should you have any further questions about the development application, please contact Mr Rory Kelly, Team Manager, Planning Services East, Development Services, City Planning and Sustainability, on (07) 3403 4975, or by email at Rory.Kelly@brisbane.qld.gov.au.

Alternatively, should you have any further questions about the appeal process, please call Mr Angelo D’Costa, Team Manager, Development Assurance and Outcomes, Development Services, on (07) 3178 5346.

Thank you for raising your concerns.

**ADOPTED**

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

### ENVIRONMENT, PARKS AND SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE

Councillor Tracy DAVIS, Civic Cabinet Chair of the Environment, Parks and Sustainability Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Sandy LANDERS, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 25 October 2022, be adopted.

Chair: Councillor DAVIS.

Councillor DAVIS: Thank you, Mr Chair. Last week’s presentation was on migratory shorebirds. We learnt that five million migratory birds comprising of 42 species fly along the East Asian-Australasian Flyway annually. These birds travel up to 26,000 kilometres and can travel up to 6,000 kilometres over three days non‑stop, sleeping while flying.

Interestingly, between September and April each year, 40,000 of the shorebirds call Moreton Bay home, with Boondall Wetlands, Bayside Parklands and Tinchi Tamba Wetlands also destinations favoured by the shorebirds.

Each year, approximately 11,000 students take part in the Boondall Environment Centre schools program with shorebird conservation a key message, teaching children behaviour change by picking up litter, keeping dogs on-leash and minimising shorebird disturbance. It was also noted that in 1993, Yatsu Higata tidal flats in Boondall Wetlands were declared Ramsar wetlands, and in 1998 a sister wetland agreement was signed between Brisbane City Council and Narashino City Council.

Mr Chair, we had two petitions. The first was requesting Council fund a comprehensive upgrade of the Brighton Foreshore. The petition noted that the new concept plan for the Brighton Foreshore considered elements of the parkland including pathways, green space, shade trees, lighting, picnic area amenities and park furniture. Consultation on this plan is due to start in early 2023. I acknowledge that the Federal Government has announced that it will provide $5 million towards delivery of this plan, and I look forward to learning when that funding will become available.

The second petition was in my own ward and requested that Council install a wildlife shelf in the culvert underneath Beckett Road at McDowall. This is a project that I have been working on with Council officers for some time. In order to ensure that the installation of the shelf would stand up during wet weather events, a range of investigations had to be undertaken, including hydraulic investigations.

Funds have now been allocated from the McDowall Suburban Enhancement Fund, and I am pleased that the plans are now underway to install a timber ledge through the culvert to provide safe passage for fauna between habitat on either side of the road. The ledge is expected to be completed by the end of financial year of course subject to weather and site conditions. I’ll leave further debate to the Chamber. Thank you, Mr Chair.

Chair: Thank you.

Further debate?

Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair. I rise to speak on the petition requesting Council fund a comprehensive upgrade of the Brighton Foreshore. Twelve long years we’ve had to wait to see this project come to fruition in my community. It was of course originally committed to in 2008 by Council, funded in the 2010‑11 budget and then temporarily put on hold by the LNP until the 2011 flood recovery works were completed.

That’s a familiar turn of phrase that we’re seeing for projects now, like the North Brisbane Bikeway and park upgrades and other community projects that have been temporarily so-called put on hold while flood recovery happens. But 12 years later, with the support of the community out there and our Federal Member for Lilley, Anika Wells, we have seen this $5 million commitment from the Federal Government which will fund this project.

It is sad that residents have to get a Council project and Council parkland funded by the Federal Labor Government to get something done. It’s a big suburb, Brighton, and this is a foreshore area that is frequented by people right across the northside of Brisbane. It’s a key destination on the northside of Brisbane. These people for the last 12 years have been paying their rates, have been seeing significant increases in those bills, the highest this year in a decade, but it takes the Federal Labor Government to come in and to pick up the pieces when this LNP Administration pours all of that money into inner city projects.

I am thrilled that we’re going to see this project come to fruition after 12 years of waiting for the LNP to do something about it, but all the thanks of course has to go to our Federal Member, Anika Wells, and the community out there who were never dissuaded after that decade. They continued to put the pressure on the LORD MAYOR, the three LNP Lord Mayors we’ve had in that time and this LNP Administration to say they demand good value for money from their rates. They’re getting it from their taxes now in this project. But I really do want to thank the community and the Federal Government for stumping up here where the LNP simply would not.

Chair: Thank you.

Any further debate?

Councillor CUMMING.

Councillor CUMMING: Very briefly about the shorebirds. A lot of them come to Wynnum Manly Ward and they’re very welcome. We had an area adjoining the Royal Queensland Yacht Squadron, which was originally designed to take dredge material from the harbour and put it in an area—and kept in that area. The birds adopted that as a nesting area and they’re doing very well there. Now it’s protected by State Government authorities, and anything that Royal Queensland wants to do they have to take into account the birds have to be looked after, which is a good thing.

There’s a lot of twitchers, I think they’re called, come to Wynnum Manly and look out at the birds along the esplanade area. The other thing, I want to put a question up. You’d probably have to talk to the birds to find the reason for this. They’re flying from Siberia quite often. I would have thought there’s climates in the northern hemisphere very similar to Brisbane’s climate. They’ve probably flown over an area about 5,000 kilometres short of where they ended up landing in Wynnum Manly that would have had a similar climate. So, I just want to find out from someone or find out from the birds if they can tell me why they fly so far. Thank you.

Chair: Do you want to respond to that, Councillor DAVIS?

Councillor DAVIS: All I can say is I’m unsure.

Chair: Is there any further debate, sorry, before you sum up? No?

Councillor DAVIS.

Councillor DAVIS: I thank the Councillor for his comments on the shorebirds. I don’t have any insight into that. I don’t have any birds that I can discuss that matter with, but what I can say, they’re clever little things, and anyone that can fly and sleep at the same time is pretty clever. Thank you very much, Mr Chair.

Chair: Thank you.

We now move to the vote on this report.

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

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

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

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE:**

Councillor Steve Griffiths.

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – MIGRATORY SHOREBIRDS

**215/2022-23**

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

2. Each year, up to five million migratory birds comprising of 42 species fly along the East Asian‑Australasian Flyway. Of these, 32 species visit Moreton Bay and other Council protected wetlands between September and April.

3. There are several ways Council helps care for shorebirds. This includes purchasing over 2,000 hectares of land covering Boondall Wetlands, Bayside Parklands and Tinchi Tamba Wetlands. Council has Interpretative Centres and holds community events, which improve visibility of these sites to showcase how Council cares for them.

4. Boondall Wetlands was declared Ramsar-protected in 1993, around the same time as the Yatsu Higata Wetlands in Japan. In 1998, Council and Narashino City Council, Japan, signed a Wetland Affiliation Agreement, to undertake activities that support the protection of migratory shorebirds as many of the birds that visit Japan also visit Brisbane. A fourth agreement was signed in 2017, which is still in place, and responds to increasing community concern regarding the conservation of wetlands and protection of migratory shorebirds. Council has commissioned several public artworks to celebrate our shorebird conservation efforts.

5. The Boondall Wetlands Environment Centre, which first opened in 1996 with a focus on migratory shorebirds, , was upgraded in 2019 to a state-of-the-art centre connecting people to the wetlands through technology and sensory experiences. Approximately 11,000 students take part in the environment centre school programs every year with a focus on shorebird conservation. Additionally, the programs highlight the importance of picking up litter, keeping your dog on a leash and minimising shorebird disturbance.

6. In September 2022, a shorebird activity station was installed at Nudgee Beach. Part of this display was a shorebird dining experience, designed to show the community how the migratory birds use this area for feeding and roosting and how off-leash dogs can create high levels of disturbance to these activities.

7. To reduce disturbance to shorebirds from off-leash dogs, Council has three designated foreshore dog off‑leash areas, located at:

- Sandgate

- Kedron Brook (Nudgee Beach)

- Manly

These locations were selected after extensive monitoring and surveys of shorebirds along the Brisbane foreshore to avoid significant shorebird habitat disturbance.

8. To support appropriate use of foreshore dog off-leash and on-leash areas, Council has implemented a number of engagement strategies, including:

- clear on-ground signage

- on-going compliance and education

- communication material, including a dog behaviour video.

9. In 2021-22, Compliance and Regulatory Services (CARS) conducted 24 patrols across Nudgee, Sandgate, Shorncilffe and Manly foreshores. During these patrols, CARS officers engaged in 517 educational interactions with members of the public, where general animal management advice was provided. Officers also gave 165 verbal enforcement warnings to members of the public where an offence was observed and issued 35 penalty infringement notices.

10. The Civic Cabinet Chair thanked the Parks and Natural Resources Manager for his informative presentation.

11. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

#### B PETITION – requesting Council fund a comprehensive upgrade of the Brighton Foreshore

**137/220/594/107**

**216/2022-23**

12. A petition, requesting Council fund a comprehensive upgrade of the Brighton Foreshore as initially planned in 2005, was presented to the meeting of Council held on 7 June 2022, by Councillor Jared Cassidy, and received.

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

14. The petition contained 557 signatures.

15. The petitioners note that sections of the Brighton Foreshore are narrow, dangerous and breaking apart, that there is a distinct lack of seating and picnic facilities and no toilets between the Sandgate Pool and Decker Park.

16. In 2004-08, Council delivered the Brisbane Foreshore Parklands Project, which included the development of a concept plan for the Brighton, Sandgate and Shorncliffe foreshore in the north and the Wynnum, Manly, and Lota foreshore in the east. After comprehensive community consultation for the northern foreshore, Council prioritised and delivered several work packages in Sandgate and Shorncliffe at a cost of $12 million. Given the large area of parkland on the northern foreshore, not all of it could be upgraded at that time.

17. In 2008, Council commenced planning for an upgrade at Decker Park, Brighton and Lota. Lota was completed in 2010, however, the 2011 flood event required the remaining budget to be diverted to the flood recovery effort.

18. Since then, there have been upgrades that work towards Council’s overall concept plan for the northern foreshore prepared in 2005, including at Decker Park and Arthur Davis Park, and upgraded lighting along sections of the promenade pathway. Council has also been funding the incremental replacement of the promenade pathway along the Brighton stretch of the foreshore with a new wider one as per the concept plan. Approximately $3 million has already been expended from Ninth Avenue to Fifteenth Avenue and from Eighteenth Avenue through Decker Park to the Ted Smout Memorial Bridge.

19. The Lord Mayor, Councillor Adrian Schrinner, has committed Council to undertake consultation and develop a new concept plan for the Brighton Foreshore. Given the amount of time passed since the 2005 concept plan was developed and the improvement works completed since that time, the community consultation process and revised concept plan will ensure that resident priorities are understood. The new concept plan will consider elements of the parkland including pathways, green space, shade trees, lighting, picnic facilities, amenities, and park furniture. Consultation is scheduled to commence in early 2023.

20. Since this commitment, the local Federal Member has announced they will support the delivery of a plan for the Brighton Foreshore to the value of $5 million. Once Council has completed consultation and thorough site investigations, the community’s priorities and the cost of implementing the new concept plan will be clearer. Council intends to then undertake further discussions with the Australian Government regarding a funding arrangement before proceeding with delivery.

Consultation

21. Councillor Jared Cassidy, Councillor for Deagon Ward, has been consulted and supports the recommendation.

Customer impact

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

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

24. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A**

**Draft Response**

**Petition Reference:** 137/220/594/107

Thank you for your petition requesting that Council fund a comprehensive upgrade of the Brighton Foreshore. Council acknowledges that there are sections of the Brighton Foreshore that would benefit from further improvement.

In 2004-08, Council delivered the Brisbane Foreshore Parklands Project, which included the development of a concept plan for the northern foreshore parklands. After comprehensive community consultation for the northern foreshore, Council prioritised and delivered several work packages in Sandgate and Shorncliffe at a cost of $12 million. Given the large area of parkland on the northern foreshore, not all of it could be upgraded at that time.

In 2008, Council commenced planning for an upgrade at Decker Park, Brighton. However, the 2011 flood event required the remaining budget be diverted to the flood recovery effort. Since then, there have been upgrades that work towards Council’s overall concept plan for the northern foreshore prepared in 2005, including at Decker Park and Arthur Davis Park, and upgraded lighting along sections of the promenade pathway. Council has also been funding the incremental replacement of the promenade pathway along the Brighton Foreshore with a new wider one as per the concept plan. Approximately $3 million has already been expended from Ninth Avenue to Fifteenth Avenue and from Eighteenth Avenue through Decker Park to the Ted Smout Memorial Bridge.

The Lord Mayor, Councillor Adrian Schrinner, has committed Council to undertake consultation and develop a new concept plan for the Brighton Foreshore. Given the amount of time passed since the 2005 concept plan was developed and the improvement works completed since that time, the community consultation process and revised concept plan will ensure that resident priorities are understood. The new concept plan will consider elements of the parkland including pathways, green space, shade trees, lighting, picnic facilities, amenities and park furniture. Consultation is scheduled to commence in early 2023.

Since this commitment, the local Federal Member has announced they will support the delivery of a plan for the Brighton Foreshore to the value of $5 million. Once Council has completed consultation and thorough site investigations, the community’s priorities and the cost of implementing the new concept plan will be clearer. Council intends to then undertake further discussions with the Australian Government regarding a funding arrangement, before proceeding with delivery.

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

Should you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact Mr Andrew Ensbey, Senior Program Officer, Major Projects and Asset Coordination, Natural Environment, Water and Sustainability, City Planning and Sustainability, on (07) 3403 4935.

Thank you for raising this matter.

**ADOPTED**

#### C PETITION – REQUESTING COUNCIL INSTALL A WILDLIFE SHELF IN THE CULVERT UNDERNEATH BECKETT ROAD, MCDOWALL

**137/220/594/123**

**217/2022-23**

25. A petition from residents, requesting Council install a wildlife shelf in the culvert underneath Beckett Road, McDowall, to protect native wildlife such as koalas, was received during the Winter Recess 2022.

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

27. The petition contained 428 signatures.

28. Council is aware that the bushland along Cabbage Tree Creek in Bridgeman Downs and McDowall supports a diversity of wildlife. Council takes the protection of all native wildlife seriously and has installed wildlife exclusion fencing and escape poles along this section of Beckett Road to prevent wildlife from accessing this busy road corridor. Council has also installed Wildlife Awareness Monitor signage (WAMs) and static signage along Becket Road to raise driver awareness and reduce speeds. The WAMs have seen, on average, reduced driver speed by 6 km/h.

29. Timber ledges installed along culverts and bridges provide a raised, dry passage that can be used by wildlife to safely move underneath roads. Council has been evaluating opportunities to install a wildlife movement solution (WMS) of this type at Beckett Road for some time. In recent years, the McDowall Ward Councillor has made strong representation to progress this project. Preliminary planning for the construction of the WMS was commenced in 2021, subject to funding.

30. Councillor Tracy Davis, Councillor for McDowall Ward, has allocated funds from the Suburban Enhancement Fund and plans are now underway to install a timber ledge through the culvert at Beckett Road to provide safe passage for fauna between the habitat either side of the road. Detailed quotes are now being obtained. The installation of the timber ledge is expected to be completed by end of the financial year, weather, availability of materials and labour, and site conditions permitting.

Funding

31. Funding is available from the Suburban Enhancement Fund for McDowall Ward for the installation of the timber ledge at Beckett Road culvert.

Consultation

32. Councillor Tracy Davis, Councillor for McDowall Ward, has been consulted and supports the recommendation.

Customer impact

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

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

35. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A**

**Draft Response**

**Petition Reference:** 137/220/594/123

Thank you for your petition requesting Council install a wildlife shelf in the culvert underneath Beckett Road, McDowall, to protect native wildlife such as koalas.

Council is aware that the bushland along Cabbage Tree Creek in Bridgeman Downs and McDowall supports a diversity of wildlife. Council takes the protection of all native wildlife seriously and has installed wildlife exclusion fencing and escape poles along this section of Beckett Road to prevent wildlife from accessing this busy road corridor. Council has also installed Wildlife Awareness Monitor signage (WAMs) and static signage along Beckett Road to raise driver awareness and reduce speeds. The WAMs have seen, on average, reduced driver speed by 6 km/h.

Timber ledges installed along culverts and bridges provide a raised, dry passage that can be used by wildlife to safely move underneath roads. Council has been evaluating opportunities to install a wildlife movement solution (WMS) of this type at Beckett Road for some time. In recent years, the McDowall Ward Councillor has made strong representation to progress this project. Preliminary planning for the construction of the WMS was commenced in 2021, subject to funding.

Councillor Tracy Davis, Councillor for McDowall Ward, has allocated funds from the Suburban Enhancement Fund and plans are now underway to install a timber ledge through the culvert at Beckett Road to provide safe passage for fauna between the habitat either side of the road. Detailed quotes are now being obtained. The installation of the timber ledge is expected to be completed by end of the financial year, weather, availability of materials and labour, and site conditions permitting.

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

Should you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact Ms Susan Dymock, Senior Program Officer Bushland Acquisition, Parks and Natural Resources, Natural Environment, Water and Sustainability, City Planning and Sustainability, on (07) 3403 9149.

Thank you for raising this matter.

**ADOPTED**

Chair: Councillor MARX, City Standards Committee report, please.

### CITY STANDARDS COMMITTEE

Councillor Kim MARX, Civic Cabinet Chair of the City Standards Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Steven TOOMEY, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 25 October 2022, be adopted.

Chair: Councillor MARX.

Councillor MARX: Thank you, Mr Chair. Every day Council works for schools and local communities to make our city a safe environment for schools, families and carers to travel, hence the reason we have our School Zone Safety program, on which we had a Committee presentation last week.

We were given an update from our compliance area about one of the proactive initiatives that we do around keeping children safe around schools. In term 3 this year, what we call the MET, so Mobile Enforcement Technology, was conducted as a trial in six schools that were identified through the complaints to the Council’s Contact Centre. This new technology allowed Council to reduce the amount of complaints received from 36 to just one for that term.

I am pleased to report that this technology will allow Council to expand our presence at schools across Brisbane, and the term 4 program list has been finalised with 52 schools to be proactively patrolled. Council will continue to seek feedback from each school that participates in the MET trial as the 2022‑23 program is formulated. I would like to thank the Committee members for their contribution to the discussion on this topic.

As a local Councillor, one of 26, this is one of the biggest that we have in our ward, dealing with trees and school traffic. It’s a fact of life that we all have to deal with, and I’m thankful for the officers for all the work they do in that space. The Committee also considered three petitions, which are items B, C and D in the Committee report. I’m happy to leave further debate to the Chamber.

Chair: Thank you.

Is there any further debate?

Councillor CUMMING.

Councillor CUMMING: Yes. Very briefly in relation to items C and D, the Opposition believe that the Administration could have done better on item C and that having the matter listed for an upgrade at some stage in the future could mean people are waiting for many years, five or 10 years, and meanwhile suffering the problems they suffer.

Likewise, in relation to item D, the reason for this one is if the area had had the ADAMS treatment, the Council would have bought it, but obviously there was no DEPUTY MAYOR whose majority was at threat to be dealt with there.

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

|  |
| --- |
| Councillor Peter CUMMING requested that Clause C, PETITION – REQUESTING THAT COUNCIL INSTALL ADDITIONAL STORMWATER GULLIES AT MEIN STREET, HENDRA, BETWEEN PAUL AND NOEL STREETS; and Clause D, PETITION – REQUESTING REVEGETATION AND REHABILITATION OF THE BIODIVERSITY AND KOALA HABITAT ZONE AT 27 BARNEHURST STREET, TARRAGINDI, be taken seriatim *en bloc* for voting purposes. |

Chair: Thank you.

Any further debate?

Councillor MARX.

Councillor MARX: Thank you, Mr Chair. Petition on item C, it was made clear at the Questions on Notice from last week, which were answered at this morning’s meeting, that the property in question in this particular street, none of the habitable floor space has been flooded. I would suggest that Council officers’ priorities are those houses that have habitable floor space being flooded.

As far as item D was concerned, or petition D, the comments that were made just now by the Councillor for Wynnum Manly are completely irrelevant to the petition that was presented at last week’s Committee meeting. Thank you, Mr Chair.

Chair: Thank you.

We now move to the vote on items A and B in the City Standards Committee report.

**Clauses A and B put**

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

Chair: Items C and D.

**Clauses C and D put**

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

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

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 15 - Councillors Greg ADERMANN, Adam ALLAN, Lisa ATWOOD, Fiona CUNNINGHAM, Tracy DAVIS, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Sarah HUTTON, Sandy LANDERS, Kim MARX, Peter MATIC, David McLACHLAN, Ryan MURPHY, Angela OWEN and Steven TOOMEY.

NOES: 6 - The Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Jared CASSIDY, and Councillors Kara COOK, Peter CUMMING, Charles STRUNK, Jonathan SRIRANGANATHAN and Nicole JOHNSTON.

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

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

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – SCHOOL ZONE SAFETY PROGRAM

**218/2022-23**

1. The Manager, Compliance and Regulatory Services, Lifestyle and Community Services, attended the meeting to provide an update on the School Zone Safety Program (the program). She provided the information below.

2. The program was launched in 2011 to provide a safe environment for students of all ages to travel to and from school. Benefits of the program include better management of school zones and a reduction in complaints to provide a better experience for members of school communities.

3. Dedicated liaison officers are assigned to schools participating in the program to create connections with parents and carers and assist with addressing school zone concerns that are specific to each school.

4. The number of schools patrolled each term is based on observed compliance behaviours by officers and the number of safety complaints received by Council from members of the public. A range of proactive strategies are used to encourage safety and compliance in school zones of concern.

5. Mobile Enforcement Technology (MET), including Vehicle Mounted Cameras (VMC), were trialled in Term 3 2022 to assist with patrols. Six schools took part in the trial, which significantly reduced the number of complaints received by Council. Community feedback on the trial from schools, parents and carers was received in Week 2 of Term 4 2022 and Council has commenced reviewing this data to inform the 2023 strategy.

6. Following a number of questions from the Committee, the Civic Cabinet Chair thanked the Compliance and Regulatory Services Manager for her informative presentation.

7. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

#### B PETITION – REQUESTING COUNCIL HOLD SUEZ WASTE MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTABLE FOR COLLECTING WASTE BINS BEFORE 5.30AM

**137/220/594/59**

**219/2022-23**

8. A petition requesting Council hold SUEZ Waste Management accountable for collecting waste bins before 5.30am, was received during the Summer Recess 2021-22.

9. The A/Executive Manager, City Standards, Brisbane Infrastructure, provided the following information.

10. The petition contains 20 signatures.

11. The petition states that waste truck noise and headlight glare from Council’s waste collection service, operated by SUEZ, causes community amenity concerns. Additionally, the petition raises that some residents may experience reduced access to collection services, as their bins are not presented prior to 5.30am. As Council’s collection guidelines occur on weekdays, between 5.30am to 5.30pm, the petition lists an earlier arrival time which contradicts SUEZ’s contractual requirement. The above points have been outlined by petitioners as a community disturbance ‘that is affecting the liveability of our suburbs’.

12. Council’s Waste and Resource Recovery Services branch have received a number of requests for later waste collection times due to concerns with residents being woken early in the morning by garbage truck servicing. As waste collection is categorised as an ‘essential service’ there are no legislated times garbage trucks are required to operate within. It is important to note that noise and light generated by waste collection trucks does not contravene any noise standards set out in the Queensland Government’s *Environmental Protection Act 1994*, nor does it constitute an environmental nuisance or environmental harm. Council actively tries to minimise waste collection noise by contracting SUEZ to conduct the suburban household waste collection service as per Council’s collection guidelines.

13. In past instances of early collection complaints prior to 5.30am, full Council investigations found that SUEZ trucks consistently have dash cam recordings of bin collections commencing at 5.30am. Council encourages individual households to report any instances of missed collections, where a review will be taken with SUEZ, to ensure consistency to contract agreements are maintained. Council’s waste collection service delivers a consistent ‘day of service’ to households. As such, residents are encouraged to place their bin out for collection the evening prior to their properties scheduled service day to prevent a missed collection, should operational needs change the timing of services on collection day.

14. When Council’s contractor, SUEZ, schedules their collection routes, they take into account efficiency, workplace health and safety, high-density pedestrian traffic, narrow streets, vehicle traffic and parking. To minimise traffic congestion and to maintain a consistent day of service for household catchments, early start times are necessary before roads are busy.

Consultation

15. Councillor Kim Marx, Civic Cabinet Chair, City Standards Committee has been consulted and supports the recommendation.

Councillor Jared Cassidy, Councillor for Deagon Ward has been consulted and supports the recommendation.

Customer impact

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

17. The A/Executive Manager recommended as follows and the Committee agreed, with Councillor Nicole Johnston dissenting.

18. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A**

**Draft Response**

**Petition Reference:** 137/220/594/59

Thank you for your petition requesting Council hold SUEZ Waste Management accountable for collecting waste bins before 5.30am.

Council acknowledges your concerns regarding waste truck noise and headlight glare and has conducted a review of waste service starting times across current scheduled routes to ensure that SUEZ, as our contracted service partner, is consistent in complying with Council requirements.

Additionally, Council has noted your comments about residents who may experience reduced access to collection services if their bins are not presented for collection prior to 5.30am. Council encourages individual households to report any instances of missed collections, where a review will be taken with SUEZ, to ensure consistency to contract agreements are maintained. In past instances of early collection complaints, prior to 5.30am, full Council investigations found that SUEZ trucks can consistently show dash cam recordings of collections commencing at 5.30am.

Council’s Waste and Resource Recovery Services branch have received a number of requests for later waste collection times due to concerns with residents being woken early in the morning by garbage truck servicing. As waste collection is categorised as an ‘essential service’ there are no legislated times garbage trucks are required to operate within. It is important to note that noise and light generated by waste collection trucks does not contravene any noise standards set out in the Queensland Government’s *Environmental Protection Act 1994*, nor does it constitute an environmental nuisance or environmental harm. Council actively tries to minimise waste collection noise by contracting SUEZ to conduct the suburban household waste collection service from 5.30am to 5.30pm on weekdays.

When Council’s contractor, SUEZ, schedules the collection routes, they take into account efficiency, workplace health and safety, high-density pedestrian traffic, narrow streets, vehicle traffic and parking. To minimise traffic congestion and to maintain a consistent day of service for household catchments, early start times are necessary to be conducted before roads are busy.

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

Should you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact Ms Caitlin Norrie, Collections Contracts Manager, Waste and Resource Recovery Services, City Standards, Brisbane Infrastructure, on (07) 3178 0703.

Thank you for raising this matter.

**ADOPTED**

#### C PETITION – REQUESTING THAT COUNCIL INSTALL ADDITIONAL STORMWATER GULLIES AT MEIN STREET, HENDRA, BETWEEN PAUL AND NOEL STREETS

**137/220/594/133**

**220/2022-23**

19. A petition requesting that Council install additional stormwater gullies at Mein Street, Hendra, between Paul and Noel Streets, was presented to the meeting of Council held on 2 August 2022, by Councillor David McLachlan and received.

20. The A/Executive Manager, City Standards, Brisbane Infrastructure, provided the following information.

21. The petition contains 20 signatures.

22. Council records indicate reports of flooding at No. 61 Mein Street go back to November 2014. Mein Street generally has a very flat grade and there is currently no piped stormwater drainage servicing the section of Mein Street between Noel and Paul Streets.

23. It is understood that several properties along this section of Mein Street, including the lead petitioner’s, experience yard and utility flooding during moderate/significant rain events, with nuisance ponding of stormwater visible along the street after minor rain events. Council is unaware of any instances of habitable areas being flooded at these properties.

24. The Program Planning and Integration Branch, Road Corridor team, inspected the section of Mein Street between Paul and Noel Streets on 17 August 2022, to assess whether there were any interim, minor engineering works that could be done to reduce the yard and utility flooding experienced by residents until funding for the proposed future drainage project can be secured. Council officers have concluded there are no appropriate interim works that can be undertaken to assist with stormwater drainage at this time. However, Council has listed a project for the installation of new stormwater drainage along this section of Mein Street, extending from the existing drainage infrastructure on Paul Street, for consideration in a future budget. Each June, all listed projects are prioritised and assessed against the overall needs of the city.

25. Council has listed for consideration to construct new stormwater drainage, extending from the existing drainage infrastructure on Paul Street, as part of Council’s Future Capital Works Program.

26. Each June, all listed projects are prioritised and assessed against the overall needs of the city. Those projects which address significant public safety issues, provide benefit to many residents in a local area, or address significant flooding to living areas are typically prioritised before those works that provide benefit to fewer residents, or where the flooding being experienced is primarily impacting yard and utility areas.

27. Council is unable to advise when the project will be listed, however acknowledges the concerns of the petitioners about flooding issues along Mein Street and their desire to have the works completed as quickly as possible.

Funding

28. Funding can be obtained through Council’s Future Capital Works Program.

Consultation

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

Customer impact

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

31. The A/Executive Manager recommended as follows and the Committee agreed, with Councillor Peter Cumming dissenting and Councillor Nicole Johnston abstaining.

32. **RECOMMENDATION:**

**THAT THE DRAFT RESPONSE, AS SET OUT IN ATTACHMENT A, BE SENT TO THE HEAD PETITIONER.**

**Attachment A**

**Draft Response**

**Petition Reference:** 137/220/594/133

Thank you for your petition requesting Council install additional stormwater gullies at Mein Street, Hendra between Paul and Noel Streets.

The Program Planning and Integration Branch, Road Corridor team, inspected the section of Mein Street between Paul and Noel Streets on 17 August 2022, to assess whether there were any interim, minor engineering works that could be done to reduce the yard and utility flooding experienced by residents until funding for the proposed future drainage project can be secured. Council officers have concluded there are no appropriate interim works that can be undertaken to assist with stormwater drainage at this time. However, Council has listed a project for the installation of new stormwater drainage along this section of Mein Street, extending from the existing drainage infrastructure on Paul Street, for consideration in a future budget.

Each June, all listed projects are prioritised and assessed against the overall needs of the city. Those projects which address significant public safety issues, provide benefit to many residents in a local area, or address significant flooding to living areas are typically prioritised before those works that provide benefit to fewer residents, or where the flooding being experienced is primarily impacting yard and utility areas.

Please let the other petitioners know of this information.

Should you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact Mr Chris Jameson, Principal Coordinator Civil, Civil Planning, Program Planning and Integration, City Standards, Brisbane Infrastructure, on (07) 3178 8729.

Thank you for raising this matter.

**ADOPTED**

#### D PETITION – REQUESTING REVEGETATION AND REHABILITATION OF THE BIODIVERSITY AND KOALA HABITAT ZONE AT 27 BARNEHURST STREET, TARRAGINDI

**137/220/594/138**

**221/2022-23**

33. A petition was presented to Council on 9 August 2022 requesting revegetation and protection of 27 Barnehurst Street, Tarragindi.

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

35. The petition contains 28 signatures.

36. Council’s *Natural Assets Local Law 2003* (NALL) aims to protect our natural assets including bushland areas, wetlands, waterway corridors and trees in urban areas. In accordance with the NALL, no person may interfere with, or remove, protected vegetation, unless it is strictly in accordance with a permit issued by Council.

37. Council received reports on 8 and 9 June 2022 about the potential impact to vegetation from demolition and excavation works at 27 Barnehurst Street, Tarragindi. At the time, records confirmed there was no NALL protected vegetation on the site.

38. An emergency Vegetation Protection Order (VPO) was issued to 27 Barnehurst Street on 10 June 2022 by Council delegates under the NALL. VPOs were then issued by Council delegates under the NALL to 29 Barnehurst Street on 14 June 2022, and to 25 and 33 Barnehurst Street on 16 June 2022.

39. The site area of 27 Barnehurst Street is 784 square metres and is located within the Low density residential zone in Council’s *Brisbane City Plan 2014* (City Plan). The site is also within the Heritage overlay (Toohey Forest Park and Heritage overlay adjoining subcategory), Bushfire overlay (Medium and High Hazard area) and Biodiversity areas overlay (High ecological significance subcategory and Matters of State Environmental significance). While there is no identified protected vegetation on the site under City Plan requirements, it is still subject to the VPOs made under the NALL, as identified above.

40. It is noted there are no development applications identified in Council records for 27 Barnehurst Street, Tarragindi. As the site area is less than 1000 square metres, a new dwelling house, limited to a maximum height of two-storeys or 9.5 metres, does not require a development application to be assessed against City Plan.

41. Building approval for the demolition of the existing dwelling at 27 Barnehurst Street, Tarragindi was issued for the site excavation and filling by a private building certifier on 1 March 2022. A separate building approval for a new dwelling, retaining walls and a swimming pool was issued on 15 June 2022 by a different private building certifier. It is noted that members of the public were concerned with the lawfulness of the works being undertaken at this site.

42. Council officers investigated these concerns and deemed works undertaken are compliant for construction of the house pad, including retaining walls and a swimming pool. Further, a development approval is not required from Council for the excavation and earthworks at this property at this time. An inspection of the site (27 Barnehurst Street, Tarragindi) on 27 June 2022 observed that site fencing had been installed. Any issues regarding the fencing, or other safety matters on site, are to be referred to Workplace Health and Safety Queensland on 13 74 68. Concerns related to signage requirements can be referred to the Queensland Building and Construction Commission by phoning 13 93 33.

43. Council officers inspected the impact to vegetation on 10 and 15 June 2022. During this time, officers engaged with workers on site and property owners and issued an oral compliance direction to cease further works within the dripline of the newly protected vegetation within the site. The property owners were advised to submit an Application to Carry Out Works on Protected Vegetation to Council to seek approval to continue works on the site in proximity to the protected vegetation. An application was submitted on 12 July 2022 and is currently being assessed. It is expected that a decision will be made before the end of October 2022.

44. A report that works had commenced at 27 Barnehurst Street without approval was received on 14 September 2022 and Council officers attended the same day. It was observed that works had occurred in the tree protection zone for trees located beside the adjoining fence line between 27 and 29 Barnehurst Street. A subsequent inspection occurred on 15 September 2022 which resulted in an Oral Compliance Direction issued to the property owner of 27 Barnehurst Street to stop workings within the tree protection zone for a suspected breach of the NALL. This matter is under investigation.

45. In response to your request for the revegetation of significant vegetation on this site, inspections by Council officers on 27 June, 4 July and 27 July 2022 determined that the vegetation that was removed from 27 Barnehurst Street, prior to the issuing of VPOs had been removed lawfully and therefore no breach of the NALL occurred. As a result, Council has no power or authority to request the owners of 27 Barnehurst Street to reinstate lost vegetation.

Consultation

46. Councillor Krista Adams, Councillor for Holland Park, has been consulted and supports the recommendation.

Customer impact

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

48. The Divisional Manager recommended as follows and the Committee agreed, with Councillors Peter Cumming and Nicole Johnston abstaining.

49. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A**

**Draft Response**

**Petition Reference:** 137/220/594/138 and 137/220/594/122

Thank you for your petition about the works occurring at 27 Barnehurst Street, Tarragindi, and to request revegetation and protection of the site.

Council’s *Natural Assets Local Law 2003* (NALL) aims to protect our natural assets including bushland areas, wetlands, waterway corridors and trees in urban areas. In accordance with the NALL, no person may interfere with, or remove, protected vegetation, unless it is strictly in accordance with a permit issued by Council.

Council received reports on 8 and 9 June 2022 about the potential impact to vegetation from demolition and excavation works at 27 Barnehurst Street, Tarragindi. At the time, records confirmed there was no NALL protected vegetation on the site.

An emergency Vegetation Protection Order (VPO) was issued to 27 Barnehurst Street on 10 June 2022 by Council delegates under the NALL. VPOs were then issued by Council delegates under the NALL to 29 Barnehurst Street on 14 June 2022, and to 25 and 33 Barnehurst Street on 16 June 2022.

The site area of 27 Barnehurst Street is 784 square metres and is located within the Low density residential zone in Council’s *Brisbane City Plan 2014* (City Plan). The site is also within the Heritage overlay (Toohey Forest Park and Heritage overlay adjoining subcategory), Bushfire overlay (Medium and High Hazard area) and Biodiversity areas overlay (High ecological significance subcategory and Matters of State Environmental significance). While there is no identified protected vegetation on the site under City Plan requirements, it is still subject to the VPOs made under the NALL, as identified above.

It is noted there are no development applications identified in Council records for 27 Barnehurst Street, Tarragindi. As the site area is less than 1000 square metres, a new dwelling house, limited to a maximum height of two-storeys or 9.5 metres, does not require a development application to be assessed against City Plan.

Building approval for the demolition of the existing dwelling at 27 Barnehurst Street, Tarragindi was issued for the site excavation and filling by a private building certifier on 1 March 2022. A separate building approval for a new dwelling, retaining walls and a swimming pool was issued on 15 June 2022 by a different private building certifier. It is noted that members of the public were concerned with the lawfulness of the works being undertaken at this site.

Council officers investigated these concerns and deemed works undertaken are compliant for construction of the house pad, including retaining walls and a swimming pool. Further, a development approval is not required from Council for the excavation and earthworks at this property at this time. An inspection of the site (27 Barnehurst Street, Tarragindi) on 27 June 2022 observed that site fencing had been installed. Any issues regarding the fencing, or other safety matters on site, are to be referred to Workplace Health and Safety Queensland on 13 74 68. Concerns related to signage requirements can be referred to the Queensland Building and Construction Commission by phoning 13 93 33.

Council officers inspected the impact to vegetation on 10 and 15 June 2022. During this time, officers engaged with workers on site and property owners and issued an oral compliance direction to cease further works within the dripline of the newly protected vegetation within the site. The property owners were advised to submit an Application to Carry Out Works on Protected Vegetation to Council to seek approval to continue works on the site in proximity to the protected vegetation. An application was submitted on 12 July 2022 and is currently being assessed. It is expected that a decision will be made before the end of October 2022.

A report that works had commenced at 27 Barnehurst Street without approval was received on 14 September 2022 and Council officers attended the same day. It was observed that works had occurred in the tree protection zone for trees located beside the adjoining fence line between 27 and 29 Barnehurst Street. A subsequent inspection occurred on 15 September 2022 which resulted in an Oral Compliance Direction issued to the property owner of 27 Barnehurst Street to stop workings within the tree protection zone for a suspected breach of the NALL. This matter is under investigation.

In response to your request for the revegetation of significant vegetation on this site, inspections by Council officers on 27 June, 4 July and 27 July 2022 determined that the vegetation that was removed from 27 Barnehurst Street, prior to the issuing of VPOs had been removed lawfully and therefore no breach of the NALL occurred. As a result, Council has no power or authority to request the owners of 27 Barnehurst Street to reinstate lost vegetation.

Please let the other petitioners know of this information.

Should you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact Bill Manners, Principal Policy and Legislation Officer, Natural Environment, Strategic Regulation, Systems and Analytics, Compliance and Regulatory Services, Lifestyle and Community Services, on (07) 3403 5181.

Thank you for raising this matter.

**ADOPTED**

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

### COMMUNITY, ARTS AND NIGHTTIME ECONOMY COMMITTEE

Councillor Vicki HOWARD, Civic Cabinet Chair of the Community, Arts and Nighttime Economy Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Sandy LANDERS, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 25 October 2022, be adopted.

Chair: Councillor HOWARD.

Councillor HOWARD: Thank you, Mr Chair. Just before moving to the report, I would like to congratulate Enoggera Ward on being the successful winner of the sixth Councillor Croquet Cup, which was held on the weekend between the Windsor and the Merthyr Croquet Club. I managed to win it the first year and last year, but I’m afraid that my opponents, which Mr Chair you were one of them one year, do a little better than us at some of the fields. But can I just thank both the Windsor and the Merthyr Croquet Clubs. We have a great time. They are so proud to show off their facilities. We really enjoyed the day and get stuck into it, so that was great.

I’d also like to recognise that the LORD MAYOR and Councillor MACKAY are attending a civic reception for the Queensland Show Choir, who are celebrating 150 years. That had to be postponed due to Her Majesty’s passing, and so it’s fantastic that both the LORD MAYOR and Councillor MACKAY are there at the moment, wishing them well. I would also like to—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, please.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, enough.

Councillor HOWARD: I would also like to update the Chamber on the successes of some of our programming as it relates to the Queensland Seniors Month, which ran throughout October. Across Brisbane, Council programmed nearly 160 events that celebrated seniors and highlighted the valuable contribution they make to our community.

Activities included guided walks in our gardens and history and gallery tours, concerts and live entertainment, crafts, outdoor activities and special intergenerational activities for Grandparents Day on 30 October 2022. This is in addition to the hundreds of other programs and events we delivered throughout the year, including our GOLD program, GOLD ‘n’ kids, library classes, the Lord Mayor’s Seniors Christmas Parties and the Lord Mayor City Hall concerts and the 50 Plus Centre.

I’m pleased to announce that as part of Seniors Month, Council is taking the pledge to join the EveryAGE Counts Coalition to highlight the issue of ageism against older Australians. This coalition is a group of other local governments and organisations around Australia who are positively influencing the way we all think about ageing and older people to ensure that people of all ages can contribute and participate in our communities socially, economically and as full citizens.

As a member of EveryAGE Counts and through *A City for Everyone: Inclusive Brisbane Plan 2019-2029*, Council will continue to actively work towards social inclusion outcomes to ensure Brisbane is a city where there are opportunities for all. In recognition of the way Council already works towards the inclusion of older people and to highlight Council’s commitment to influencing the way the community thinks about ageing, I commit Council to following the EveryAGE Counts pledge, which is, ‘we stand for a world without ageism where all people of all ages are valued and respected and their contributions are acknowledged. We commit to speak out and take action to ensure older people can participate on equal terms with others in all aspects of life.’

Mr Chair, turning to the Committee presentation, which was on the Brisbane Living Heritage, we were joined by the Chair of the Brisbane Living Heritage, Jen Garcia, who provided us with a background and an update on all the fantastic work that Brisbane Living Heritage does to promote right across Brisbane and the many organisations that are part of Brisbane Living Heritage. We truly appreciate all of the work they do. We continue to support them. I will leave debate for the Chamber.

Chair: Thank you.

Is there any further debate? No further debate? Thank you.

We now move to the vote on this report.

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

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

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

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE:**

Councillor Steve Griffiths.

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – BRISBANE LIVING HERITAGE

**222/2022-23**

1. The Chair of Brisbane Living Heritage attended the meeting to provide an update. She provided the information below.

2. Brisbane Living Heritage (BLH) was created in 2001 as a Council initiative to connect Brisbane’s small museums and heritage places within a larger network which was formed based on approved membership. Council provides BLH with a significant amount of its funding.

3. Thepurpose of BLH is to connect museums, heritage places and organisations, support their work and highlight stories of Brisbane’s heritage. Their vision is to create local places centered on Brisbane’s heritage and the stories of its people, providing experiences for both residents and visitors to our city. BLH believe that Brisbane’s heritage organisations form a dynamic network which has lead to a re-brand for BLH with a focus on digital connectivity.

4. BLH offers three types of memberships:

- Institutional - for organisations based within Brisbane’s Local Government Area (LGA) and are open to the public

- Associate - for organisations located either inside or outside Brisbane’s LGA, but are not open to the public

- Individual - individuals who wish to support the objectives of BLH.

5. BLH has over 90 members, including large organisations such as Queensland Museum, Brisbane Powerhouse and Museum of Brisbane through to volunteer-run organisations such as Queensland Women’s Historical Association, Miegunyah House Museum.

6. In partnership with the University of Queensland School of Business and KDPR (a locally based public relations and marketing communications agency), BLH have developed the “Brisbane Living Heritage App” to better connect with both residents and visitors to Brisbane. It has also seen increases in both hits and followers across all their social media channels. Other community engagement events include the Brisbane In Focus photo competition, walking tours, training and education.

7. To prepare for Brisbane hosting the 2032 Olympic & Paralympic games, BLH are striving to connect with both the performing arts and tourism sectors, in order to share the stories of our heritage and history. Current research data from Tourism Australia confirms culture and heritage experiences are one of the lead attractors generating new visitors to Australia. The future focus for BLH will be:

- building capacity

- supporting membership through training and education

- augmenting funding streams

- offering experiences that connect to the wider public

- building meaningful partnerships.

8. Following a number of questions from the Committee, the Civic Cabinet Chair thanked the Brisbane Living Heritage Chair for her informative presentation.

9. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

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

### FINANCE AND CITY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

Councillor Fiona CUNNINGHAM, Civic Cabinet Chair of the Finance and City Governance Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Steven HUANG, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 25 October 2022, be adopted.

Chair: Councillor CUNNINGHAM.

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: Thanks, Mr Chair. Just briefly, our presentation was the Net Borrowings Report for the September quarter, which included an economic update from the Corporate Treasurer as is usual for our first meeting of the session.

We obviously live in challenging times on a number of fronts, and global growth forecasts are being downgraded amid uncertainty around the risk of a global recession. As we have seen for some time now, inflation is our major concern, reaching an average of over 10% across the OECD (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development), and central banks all over the world are rapidly tightening monetary policy. We also had the presentation of the Bank and Investment reports to Committee from August and September. I’ll leave the rest to the Chamber.

Chair: Is there any debate? No debate?

We now move to the vote on this report.

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

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

Councillor Fiona Cunningham (Civic Cabinet Chair), Councillor Steven Huang (Deputy Chair), and Councillors Lisa Atwood, Angela Owen, Jonathan Sriranganathan and Charles Strunk.

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION AND REPORT – NET BORROWINGS ‑ CASH INVESTMENTS AND FUNDING – SEPTEMBER 2022

**223/2022-23**

1. The Corporate Treasurer, Financial Analysis and Treasury Management, Corporate Finance, Organisational Services, attended the meeting to present a report to the Committee on Council’s net borrowings for September 2022. The report details the corporate cash holdings invested and the status of Council’s funding activities.

2. The report provided a market and economic review, and a summary of the following issues in relation to Council’s investments, including:

- cash position

- review of cash activity

- earnings on investments

- funding capability

- borrowings

- facility performance

- leases.

3. Following a number of questions from the Committee, the Civic Cabinet Chair thanked the Corporate Treasurer for her informative presentation.

4. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

#### B COMMITTEE REPORT – BANK AND INVESTMENT REPORT ‑ AUGUST 2022

**134/695/317/1228-002**

**224/2022-23**

5. The A/Chief Financial Officer, Corporate Finance, Organisational Services, provided a monthly summary of Council’s petty cash, bank account and cash investment position as at 26 August 2022.

6. Page 1 of the report (submitted on file) outlines Council’s cash and investments with financial counter parties as recorded in Council’s financial systems.

7. The increase of cash and investments of $160 million in August was consistent with Council’s usual business cycle activities during the period and largely due to:

- Receipts:

- $55 million receipts of flood resilient home buy back grant

- receipts of residential rates.

* Partially offset by:

- invoice payments for CAPEX projects.

8. Explanation of the significant items include:

- Cash at Bank in Australian Dollars:

- transactional banking account with Commonwealth Bank of Australia (CBA) ‑ this is Council’s operational bank account for receipts and payments for day‑to-day transactions in Australian Dollars

- the variance between the balance as per the General Ledger and the balance as per bank statements relates to timing differences in recognition.

- Swiss Francs Bank Account - AUD equivalent:

- AUD equivalent of Swiss Francs (CHF) held in a CBA account which is solely used for Brisbane Metro project hedge settlements and invoice payments in Swiss Francs.

- Cash investments:

- Council is currently holding large cash balances, with an additional $130 million placed on longer-term investments in August (with maturities up to six months) for a total of $300 million. Cash balance of $466 million is held in at call accounts

- the variance between the balance as per the General Ledger and the balance as per the investment statements relates to the accrued interests and fees which have not yet been processed to the bank statement.

- Queensland Investment Corporation (QIC) Investment:

- the QIC investment account is set up to provide asset backing for Council’s self‑managed insurance fund (SMIF).

9. Page 2 of the report (submitted on file) outlines the cash investments as recorded in the financial counter parties’ statements and provides a high-level explanation of variance between Council financial systems records and the financial counter party statements.

10. The variance for the period is due to accruals of interest and fees not yet recorded in the bank statements and timing of transactions processed. These are normal variances due to timing of transactions and information received.

11. Page 3 of the report (submitted on file) includes amounts held by Council in trust as well as petty cash balances. The trust amounts are largely associated with monies held for infrastructure development commitments.

12. Trust balances are lower, due to payments being larger than receipts during the month. These are normal fluctuations of the funds from month to month.

13. Page 4 of the report (submitted on file) includes a reconciliation of the CBA bank account between Council’s financial records and the CBA statement. The majority of unreconciled bank transactions at the end of the period have since been reconciled.

14. In addition, the Swiss bank account movements during the period are disclosed.

15. Page 5 of the report (submitted on file) details the movement in trust balances and the reconciliation with trust ledger and statements.

16. The variance between the trust ledger and the investment balance is due to timing of transfers processed to ensure the required funds are held outside of Council’s transactional bank account. These are normal variances and fluctuate from month to month.

17. Page 6 of the report (submitted on file) details the petty cash balances and movement during the month.

18. All relevant General Ledger accounts were reconciled and analysed.

19. **RECOMMENDATION:**

**THAT THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THE REPORT**, as submitted on file, **BE NOTED.**

**ADOPTED**

#### C COMMITTEE REPORT – BANK AND INVESTMENT REPORT ‑ SEPTEMBER 2022

**134/695/317/1228-002**

**225/2022-23**

20. The A/Chief Financial Officer, Corporate Finance, Organisational Services, provided a monthly summary of Council’s petty cash, bank account and cash investment position as at 23 September 2022.

21. Page 1 of the report (submitted on file) outlines Council’s cash and investments with financial counter parties as recorded in Council’s financial systems.

22. The decrease of cash and investments of $125 million in September was consistent with Council’s usual business cycle activities during the period and largely due to:

- Receipts:

- $15 million CBIC Dividend

* Payments:

- $46 million QTC Debt service payment

- $41.9 million Capex outflows (major projects)

- $7.9 million Bus and CityCat leases

23. Explanation of the significant items include:

- Cash at Bank in Australian Dollars:

- transactional banking account with Commonwealth Bank of Australia (CBA) ‑ this is Council’s operational bank account for receipts and payments for day‑to-day transactions in Australian Dollars

- the variance between the balance as per the General Ledger and the balance as per bank statements relates to timing differences in recognition.

- Swiss Francs Bank Account - AUD equivalent:

- AUD equivalent of Swiss Francs (CHF) held in a CBA account which is solely used for Brisbane Metro project hedge settlements and invoice payments in Swiss Francs.

- Cash investments:

- Council is currently holding large cash balances, with a total of $300 million placed in longer-term investments (with maturities up to six months). Cash balance of $340 million is held in at call accounts

- the variance between the balance as per the General Ledger and the balance as per the investment statements relates to the accrued interests and fees which have not yet been processed to the bank statement.

- Queensland Investment Corporation (QIC) Investment:

- the QIC investment account is set up to provide asset backing for Council’s self‑managed insurance Fund (SMIF).

24. Page 2 of the report (submitted on file) outlines the cash investments as recorded in the financial counter parties’ statements and provides a high-level explanation of variance between Council financial systems records and the financial counter party statements.

25. The variance for the period is due to accruals of interest and fees not yet recorded in the bank statements and timing of transactions processed. These are normal variances due to timing of transactions and information received.

26. Page 3 of the report (submitted on file) includes amounts held by Council in trust as well as petty cash balances. The trust amounts are largely associated with monies held for infrastructure development commitments.

27. Trust balances are higher, due to payments being lesser than receipts during the month. These are normal fluctuations of the funds from month to month.

28. Page 4 of the report (submitted on file) includes a reconciliation of the CBA bank account between Council’s financial records and the CBA statement. The majority of unreconciled bank transactions at the end of the period have since been reconciled.

29. In addition, the Swiss bank account movements during the period are disclosed.

30. Page 5 of the report (submitted on file) details the movement in trust balances and the reconciliation with trust ledger and statements.

31. The variance between the trust ledger and the investment balance is due to timing of transfers processed to ensure the required funds are held outside of Council’s transactional bank account. These are normal variances and fluctuate from month to month.

32. Page 6 of the report (submitted on file) details the petty cash balances and movement during the month.

33. All relevant General Ledger accounts were reconciled and analysed.

34. **RECOMMENDATION:**

**THAT THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THE REPORT**, as submitted on file, **BE NOTED.**

**ADOPTED**

## PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS:

Chair: Councillors, are there any petitions?

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Thanks, Chair. I’ve got a petition to protect low-cost housing and historic buildings and reject the development of 210 Gladstone Road, Dutton Park.

Chair: Thank you.

Any further petitions? No further petitions.

May I have a motion, please?

**226/2022-23**

It was resolved on the motion of Councillor Sandy LANDERS, seconded by Councillor Charles STRUNK, that the petition as presented be received and referred to the Committee concerned for consideration and report.

The petition was summarised as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **File No.** | **Councillor** | **Topic** |
| 137/220/594/162 | Jonathan Sriranganathan | Requesting Council protect low-cost housing and historic buildings, and reject the redevelopment of 210 Gladstone Road, Dutton Park (A006082835). |

## GENERAL BUSINESS:

Chair: Councillors, General Business.

Are there any statements required as a result of an Office of the Independent Assessor (OIA) or Councillor Ethics Committee order? None standing.

Are there any matters of General Business?

Councillor MARX.

Councillor MARX: Thank you, Mr Chair. Two very brief items of General Business. One is about birthdays and one is about park namings. To start with, I want to mention briefly the park naming that took place last week in this Chamber, the Richard Martin Place, a gentleman that was born in Melbourne and worked as a junior clerk before enlisting in the army in 1941. Apparently, shortly after he enlisted he then transferred to the Royal Australian Airforce, a decision that the RSL (Returned and Services League) President mentioned at the opening day that continued to mystify him forever. He never understood how Dick made that decision.

But anyway, he joined the RSL back in 1980 and undertook numerous active roles within the board of management over many years. He was then appointed a life member of the RSL. In 2005, he received the RSL’s highest and most prestigious national award, the Meritorious Service Medal, and Dick continued to serve diligently as the Assistant Treasurer of the subbranch up until the time of his death.

There were a couple of things I wanted to mention about this particularly. One was we had one of the Council officers who is in charge of the signs and lines out there at the ROC that I mentioned earlier this evening. He was one of the guys that is part of this whole process when we as Councillors ask for a park naming and then the history panel and everything like that—but he’d never been to a ceremony where the sign was installed. So, he was rapt. Not only was he acknowledged by myself and the RSL President, but he then got to see just how important his work is to the community as a whole and how much it means to them.

The other special thing about Dick that I want to mention is that before his passing he did the Ode on numerous occasions, and before he passed it was recorded. So, there’s now a recording of him saying the Ode that is used at every memorial service since. I know his daughter Karen is not only proud but obviously very upset, but gets very emotional when she hears her dad’s voice again twice a year after he’s passed away.

The only other thing is I also wanted to take the opportunity to wish my husband a Happy Birthday for today and my brother-in-law a Happy Birthday, because they’re both born on the same day a year apart. Thank you.

Chair: Further General Business?

Councillor STRUNK.

Councillor STRUNK: Thank you, Chair. I want to speak about a couple of events that have happened in my ward over the last few weeks. Last weekend, we had the Blue Fin Fishing Club’s 66th annual dinner and trophy presentation. It was attended by about 180 members and went off very well. If you ever want to see a display of fish or a buffet of fish, I’ll tell you, just look at my Facebook page.

They first start off with filling up a tinnie with shellfish and then they just keep going. They’ve been doing this for years and years. It was the trophies that were awarded to many members of the fishing club, from very young—we have one young lad who is about six or seven. He won the biggest trophy. I think the trophy was actually bigger than he was. But the trophies cover all types of fishing that you could do, whether it be deep-sea or estuary and everything in between.

Steve Somatis the President, who has been President for a couple of years now, took over from another president who was a long-serving president. He’s kept the club buoyant, and Peter Purins, who played basketball for Australia, is the Club Manager. He’s been there for a number of years now and he does a terrific job. It’s one of the most understated clubs in Brisbane in a lot of ways. A lot of people don’t know it’s there. But honestly, anyone who ever walks into it will always come back, because they do a terrific job. It just looks like a small or a medium-sized leagues club. It’s well-appointed and well patronised as well.

I want to move on to another—which happened a couple of weekends ago. We’ve got a new market in Forest Lake. They were just kicked off by our Wasps junior rugby union club on a Friday night. Who would have thought, late afternoon on a Friday, a market. But I tell you what, it was well attended. It was the first one, actually. There were food trucks there and many other stalls. The ward also had a stall there. We found that the worm farms are very popular, so we gave a number of the worm farms away to those that were wanting to do a bit of recycling.

The Forest Lake State High School students were performing, and there were other musicians as well there. They’re going to be held on a monthly basis. The next one is on 11 November. If you happen to be driving by or driving through Forest Lake on Friday 11 November, stop in and say hello and see if there’s something there that you can maybe buy as a Christmas present.

Finally, the Diwali celebrations here in King George Square just out here last week were well attended. It was honestly elbow room, elbow room. Great food, great entertainment. All levels of government, whether it be Council—there were three Councillors there; there were many State Members and Federal Members that were there as well—such is the respect that we all have for our Indian community right around Brisbane.

I want to thank FICQ (Federation of Indian Communities of Queensland) again. The last couple of years were a bit tough of course with COVID-19, but GOPIO (Global Organisation of People of Indian Origin) keeps fundraising for this event, and it’s a signature event really in Brisbane. I hope it continues on for the next number of decades as well. Thank you, Chair.

Chair: Thank you.

Any further General Business?

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON I rise to speak about inappropriate behaviour. There are three instances of what I consider to be disturbing and inappropriate behaviour that have been exhibited towards me by Councillor MACKAY over the last few years. I have not talked about them publicly despite multiple requests by the media to do so. I am going to put them on the record today, because his behaviour is disturbing me and it needs to be publicly on the record.

Firstly, just a few weeks after he started as a Councillor, he wrote me a foul and unfounded letter making allegations about a Facebook post that is in the public sphere. His allegations were so concerning I referred them to the CEO. The outcome of that was that the staff member of Councillor MACKAY’s was counselled about what behaviour to engage in on Facebook. His letter is still shocking to me this day. He’d been a Councillor for approximately three weeks. It was deliberately designed to make false allegations about me.

Secondly, a few years ago while I was walking to the car park downstairs and I was walking out with a number of other Councillors, with three other Councillors I passed Councillor MARX and Councillor MACKAY and walked to my car. When I loaded my belongings into my car, I didn’t notice but Councillor CASSIDY noticed Councillor MACKAY taking photos of me in the car park downstairs in King George Square.

I found that to be extremely upsetting and very disturbing. It is not safe or appropriate behaviour towards a female colleague late at night in a car park, and I am forever thankful to Councillor CASSIDY for calling him out on this. Despite these actions by Councillor MACKAY, he then blamed us again for his behaviour, which was just outrageous and appalling. It is not appropriate to take photos of a colleague in a car park. They were unwanted photos. They were inappropriate, and it still is disturbing to me today that that matter was never dealt with.

Finally today—and this has been going on for weeks if not months—Councillor MACKAY deliberately turns his chair and sits with his back to me when I speak in this Chamber. To most people, this may be a small, immature action, but to me, this is part of an ongoing pattern of behaviour by Councillor MACKAY towards me that is disturbing, weird and inappropriate.

I note that when I put this matter on the record earlier today, two things happened, three in fact. One, I was warned, and my behaviour has been noted in the minutes, for calling out the rude and misogynistic behaviour of Councillor MACKAY and his actions towards me in this Council Chamber. Two, Councillor WINES stood up and claimed that Councillors weren’t calm in the Chamber, when there clearly was, there was disagreement but certainly not unrest, and made allegations which are trying to imply, as the LNP has been doing for many years—Councillor ADAMS has repeatedly done it this year and other Councillors—that I am engaging in poor behaviour.

Thirdly, Councillor MACKAY stood up and repeatedly called me a bully tonight. I have done nothing to Councillor MACKAY, and the outcome of tonight’s behaviour by Councillor MACKAY is that I have been warned by the Chair, Councillor David McLACHLAN, and I have been noted in the Council minutes. What the LNP then do with that, like Councillor WINES has done, is make a complaint to the OIA about me.

This is inappropriate behaviour by Councillor James MACKAY. I am offended, offended in the extreme, about the photos that happened a few years ago, and the fact that Council—it still troubles me today. So, when I stand up in this place and I say, this behaviour is unusual, it is disturbing and I don’t appreciate it, it is because he has a track record and a pattern of engaging in disturbing and unusual behaviour towards me.

I am putting it on the record today. I will not accept any kind of reprimand from Councillor McLACHLAN regarding this matter, because what has been going on for the last few years has been incredibly distressing to me, inappropriate, and the fact that someone like Councillor HOWARD has to stand up in here and make excuses for Councillor MACKAY not being present—his computer and all his stuff is here, so he was clearly intending to come back and has been shepherded away—it is not appropriate that the LNP Councillors in this place continue to cover up this behaviour when the inappropriate behaviour being engaged in is being done by a member of the LNP towards me.

Chair: Any further General Business?

Councillor ATWOOD.

Councillor ATWOOD: I wanted to rise quickly to thank my local Lions Club, the Camp Hill Carindale Lions for an amazing effort over the weekend.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor ATWOOD: Thank you. We held Spooktacular Saturday at the Murarrie Recreation Reserve, and about 3,500 residents from the eastern suburbs came to the reserve all dressed up. It was so wonderful to see the kids and their energy. We had some great comments since. I think the parents were very happy. They organised Revel Brewing with their craft beers down there, and we had a few parents commenting, thank you for thinking about us. No worries, parents.

But I just wanted to put on the record how grateful I am they organised such a wonderful event for our community, and I look forward to organising that in 2023 with them once again. Thank you.

Chair: Is there any further General Business?

Councillor CUMMING.

Councillor CUMMING: I’ll be very quick again. Thanks for that. It prompted me to talk about the Halloween Festival in Wynnum this year. First time it’s been held. In previous years, it’s been held in Manly and it became a very big event. The Manly Chamber of Commerce, who organised the event over the years, decided this year that they’re going for a Christmas lights competition in the Manly Bay Harbour, which I think will be a great event. It will be a real Christmas attraction for locals and for visitors to the area.

The Wynnum Chambers said, what about we take over the Halloween? I said, a great idea. I don’t know if the Manly people were that much in favour of it. It went very well. It was very well organised. Credit to them for a first year to attract so many people. I don’t know how many people. There were thousands there. There was a great march and a lot of people hung around. We had lots of food vans and everything which were extremely busy. Local shops, a lot of them stayed open. They were extremely busy.

It was a great event for Wynnum Manly. It was funded primarily by two grants that we hadn’t used in recent years from Council, totalling around $10,000. The overheads are considerable for this type of event. Congratulations to the Wynnum Chamber, which is only fairly newly formed in the last year or two, for organising such a great event at such short notice. Thank you.

Chair: Further speakers, General Business?

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Thanks. It’s times like this I really wish we hadn’t started 90 minutes late, hey. Just wanted to speak briefly on the Victoria Park Draft Master Plan and in particular about the fact that this Master Plan still includes a huge amount of car parking. Quite a few residents have raised concerns with me about the Master Plan. I’m obviously very excited about the golf course becoming public parkland. I think that’s a really good step forward for the city and I think there’s a lot of good stuff in the Master Plan.

I’ve made a submission. I just did want to highlight again though. That when you look at this Master Plan, this Draft Master Plan. Almost the entire north‑west corner of the park has been set aside for car parking. There’s a huge amount of car parking within the public park. I understand that the Council Administration wants to ensure the people from across the city will be able to travel in and enjoy Victoria Park, I get that.

But the reality is that even if you put 2,000 or 3,000 car parks in this park, it would never be enough for all the people who want to visit this amazing public park over the coming years. There’s going to be so much demand to visit this place. I can say with confidence, having seen how South Bank works in my ward, the vast majority of people who travel to South Bank Parklands are not driving there. They’re travelling by public transport in one mode or another.

The same is true, or should be true for Barrambin or Victoria Park. Because it’s on a busway, there’s multiple bus stations that serve different sides of the park. On the south-east corner of the park, near the Centenary Pool, it’s also a reasonably short walk to the Exhibition Ground and Fortitude Valley train stations. So there’s actually pretty good public transport—mass transit options—around the edge of the parks.

The great sadness I have is that the Council seems to be keen on putting a lot more parking, even more parking than is currently in the park, on to that site. Which will (a) take away a lot of useful public green space. We’re talking about millions and millions of dollars’ worth of inner city public green space that the Council just wants to use for car storage. (b) It’s going to generate a lot more traffic into the surrounding precincts.

So I think there’s close to 1,000 car parks in the Draft Master Plan. That’s thousands of—well, over the course of a day, with multiple people coming and going from the park, that’s going to be thousands of additional motor vehicles movements. Around the hospital precinct, around the major arterials that surround this park. This is a very, very busy area. Any Councillor who looks at how that area functions in busy periods—not just on the peak periods in the evenings but also on the weekends. Can see that introducing more car movements into that precinct is going to cause a lot of congestion.

But perhaps even more relevantly is that this car parking is not actually going to be used by people who are visiting the park. It’s going to be used by people who are going to the hospital just over the road. The Council hasn’t, at least in the Master Planning documents, hasn’t presented any clear information explaining why it won’t just be turned into hospital overflow car parking. So I’m not dogmatic about this. I acknowledge that there’s value in having some car parking in Victoria Park/Barrambin. I just think there’s way, way too much.

What I want to emphasise with the Administration is that car parks are really expensive to build as compared to the other things you might use that green space for. If the Administration’s intent on proceeding with the multistorey car park, that’s going to be a multimillion-dollar project. Just to store some cars in the park. When the Council’s own Transport strategy says that it’s supposed to be encouraging public transport, particularly to access inner city destinations like this one.

The other thing that I find quite sad about the preponderance of parking in the park is that it’s closing off opportunities to expand the—I think it’s the Murray Spinaze, I might have got the pronunciation wrong, but the Murray Spinaze Bushland area in the northern end of the park. That’s mapped as ecologically significant habitat, it’s on the Biodiversity overlay as being meriting protection.

There’s a really great opportunity with this vision to expand that bushland area, to significantly expand it. Plant out more trees, create a stronger, more cohesive wildlife corridor along that northern section of the park. But what the Council is proposing is to expand the car parking so that there’ll be—looking at the plan—a multistorey car park right next to that ecologically significant bushland. That’s not a good use of limited space.

I note some residents have also raised concerns about the positioning of the pump track and the skatepark and I do tend to agree with those concerns about the location. I disagree with the residents when they say we don’t need a pump track and skatepark in the park. I think it would be great to have those facilities. But I think the location that the Council has proposed is wrong. One of the reasons it’s wrong is that it’s very close to that bushland area. Again, rather than putting in a pump track and skatepark there. I think it would be better to put—to set aside that area for expanded bushland.

The other reason I think it’s wrong is that the Council wants to put another 15-bay car park right up in the top north-west corner, exclusively for the pump track. So there’s a lot of extra money and a lot of extra space just going for those 15 parking bays. I say to Councillor DAVIS and to the other relevant Chairs. For inner city residents, if your kid is going to use the local pump track to ride their bike around, you’re not driving them there.

It might be different out in the suburbs. But in an inner city area like Herston, for example, where traffic is so bad on weekdays and is pretty shocking on weekends too. Parents aren’t going to say oh, let’s drive 500 metres or a kilometre to get to this pump track. They’re going to say hey, let’s walk or ride. That’s how people from the local area are going to travel to use those local facilities.

To be honest I think people from further afield who want to use a pump track are going to go to some of the other excellent, suburban facilities. Rather than driving all the way into the inner city for their kids to ride around a pump track. So I think the Council officers are wrong to say that they need parking to cater for the pump track. I think the predominant use case for that facility is from the local area and that the locals will be able to walk, ride or catch public transport to those facilities.

Just in terms of the skatepark. I’ve made these comments in my submission as well. But I wanted to reiterate that I really think the skatepark should go on the south-eastern side of the park, down near the Centenary Pool. That would put the skatepark much closer to New Farm and Fortitude Valley. Those are young neighbourhoods with a lot of teenagers and young adults that aren’t currently served by a skatepark. If you put it down in that side, it will be further away from residential properties. So you’ll be able to have a proper, decently-sized skatepark.

Whereas the current facility, it’s called a multipurpose facility with skateable elements, I think. It’s not a proper skatepark anyway and it’s right across from some residential homes. So the Council is inviting conflict with nearby residents and attracting more opposition to the Master Plan overall. But it’s not even delivering a high-quality skatepark.

So to the relevant Chairs and Councillors, I do encourage you do have a read of the submission I’ve sent through. At the very least, please scale back the car parking. We need more canopy cover in the inner city, we need more space for trees and wildlife. We’ve got the Metro, we’ve got all these great public transport services surrounding the park. We don’t need people to be driving to this park.

We don’t generally expect the majority of people to drive to South Bank Parklands or to Roma Street Parklands. We expect people to get public transport and the same should be true for Victoria Park. So let’s save that money, let’s not spend it on bitumen, let’s put it towards actual green space improvements instead. Thanks.

Chair: Thank you.

Any further speakers in General Business?

Councillor TOOMEY.

Councillor TOOMEY: Thank you, Chair. I would just quickly like to rise and just say a few words about the Blackwood Street Halloween Festival. I want to extend my thanks to the LORD MAYOR and Councillor HOWARD for helping fund this event. It’s not in my ward, it’s in Councillor WINES’ ward and regulars there are Councillor DAVIS and Councillor WINES.

I was invited to attend this year and quite frankly, I am really glad that I did. The whole team was on theme. We were almost a whole baseball team there on our own. We were representing *A League of Their Own* and I’d have to say the whole festival was absolutely outstanding.

I’d like to thank the volunteers, the Rotary volunteers who actually put on the day. The bands were outstanding, the displays and the kids. So many happy kids running around that street, wouldn’t you agree Councillor DAVIS?

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor TOOMEY: That were just overjoyed with the whole festival. It was great to see the community out and about. I want to thank Councillor DAVIS and Councillor WINES for the invitation and hope to do it again next year. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you.

Any further speakers for General Business? No, all right.

## CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADJOURNED MOTION:

Chair: Councillors we now move on to the adjourned motion. It was moved by Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN, seconded by Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN would you like to move your motion please?

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: I think I’ve already moved the motion, Chair.

Chair: You have but for the benefit of the room.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: All right. I move that Brisbane City Council resolves to start the process of amending City Plan and other relevant documents in order to limit all new residential, mixed use, industrial and commercial development proposals on land that is mapped under Brisbane River Flood planning areas 1, 2A, 2B and 3 within the Flood Overlay. These changes should be drafted so as not to limit development applications that seek to renovate or raise existing buildings in order to improve flood resilience.

Chair: Okay, that’s already been seconded.

Okay, your debate.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Thanks. I’m just watching the time.

Chair: Yes, no we’ll start that at zero again.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Yes, cool. I don’t think it would come as a surprise to many Councillors in this Chamber that I’m concerned that Brisbane City Council continues to approve so many developments on land that’s highly vulnerable to flooding. Just after the February 2022 floods we saw a new development application lodged at 10 Kurilpa Street. This is a site that was under five and a half metres of water at the end of February. The lower part of the site is only about 40 centimetres above sea level. So it’s very, very flood prone. The developers have proposed to put in 78 apartments with two levels of basement car parking on this site.

So it’s mapped as part of the Flood planning areas 2A and 2B. But Brisbane City Council’s current assessment processes do not even require a flood risk assessment. That’s sort of the lowest bar really. A flood risk assessment should say hey, during a flood, your entire apartment is going to be surrounded by flood waters. What do you do? But we’re not even requiring that. The development assessment process also isn’t requiring the developers to provide any kind of civil engineering, hydrological analysis. To ensure that the building won’t be negatively impacted by that five and a half metres of flooding.

So some Councillors will be familiar with the concerns about hydrostatic pressure. Where even if the water—if there’s no obvious ingress point for water into a building or a basement car park. If there’s enough water pressure building up outside, that can burst through the walls and we can have subterranean flooding. We’ve seen that with a couple of apartment developments in my area back in February.

But Brisbane City Council is not even requiring the developer to prove or to demonstrate in any way, that their building will be able to resist that flood water pressure. When we know that the building went under five and a half metres of flooding just back in February. What the Council has said—or it seems to be the case, based on the notes from the pre-lodgement meeting—is that because the driveway of the development is above the predicted flood levels, they don’t need to do any other kind of flood risk assessment. They don’t need to do any kind of hydrological modelling.

So here we have an example of a recently lodged development application, where it’s been lodged after the most recent floods. That has no flood mitigation planning at all. So there’s no limits being placed on this thing, other than to say hey, your driveway needs to be above the flood level. It’s very concerning to me that the Council is being so *blasé* about this stuff.

The motion I brought to the Chamber today is seeking to prevent developments of that kind continually being approved in this city. The original motion that I brought forward said Brisbane City Council resolves to prevent all new residential developments, et cetera. The Council Administration took issue with that term prevent. I think their legal advice was wrong. I think the Council does have enough power to prevent developments in these areas. But we just have to get a little bit creative about how we do it.

One of the ways we can prevent development on extremely flood-prone land, is simply to buy that land for parkland. So rezone it in the City Plan as future parkland, identify it on the LGIP (Local Government Infrastructure Plan), if necessary. Designate it for green space or for community facilities, acquire it. That way we can stop private development occurring on those sites. So it actually is well within the power of this City Council to prevent development.

I think the lawyers that Councillor McLACHLAN or his team got advice from are wrong. I welcome the opportunity to chat to them if they’re interested. I think their legal interpretation of how the planning regulations interact with City Plan and the Council’s powers is completely off. But nevertheless, we’re here now discussing whether the Council should limit new development.

The Mayor’s comments earlier, he was correct in one respect. In that there are some very weak limits placed on some kinds of residential development in particular. But there are almost no limits placed on industrial and commercial and mixed-use developments. Particularly within Flood Planning Area 3 of the Flood overlay. So there are some slightly tighter limits on Flood planning areas 1 and 2. But there’s virtually no limitations placed on what can be delivered and built in Flood Planning Area 3, which is a pretty significant chunk of the floodplain.

So supporting this motion would, essentially, amount to an acknowledgement that we need to tighten things up. Supporting this motion is not to say that we’re doing enough and that the status quo is sufficient. Because there are no functional limits on a lot of development on the floodplain.

The codes, in terms of the Flood overlay code, are very permissive. They don’t even require developers to avoid or design around risk. They just require developers to minimise risk. So there’s an acknowledgement there that there will be still some significant risk from flooding. Or some risk of a level of significance that’s worth mentioning.

So basically the very weak limits that we have in place are nowhere near sufficient to reduce the risk of flooding currently. But on top of all that, we have to remember that global warming means that flooding risks will become more severe and more frequent. That’s what the scientists are telling us, that’s what the experts are saying. Flooding will get worse in Brisbane over coming decades. So in that context, if we recognise that flooding’s going to get worse than it is now. How can we, in good conscience, continue to allow more development on flood-prone land? It is utter madness.

Now the obvious response from the LNP Administration and indeed from perhaps some people in the Labor Party at the State level. Is that if we prevent development in these areas, if we don’t allow any new development on Flood planning areas 1, 2 and 3. Where are all the houses we need going to go?

The reality—and I’ve spent the time looking at this, I’ve done my homework, I’ve looked at the yield potentials and the density levels across the city. The reality is that there are hundreds of thousands of potential dwellings that can be delivered according to current zoning in the City Plan. Without building a single new dwelling on flood-prone land.

So you can drive along most of the major corridors in the city. Corridors like Ipswich Road, Gympie Road and Lutwyche Road, even parts of Sandgate Road around Nundah. There are many, many, many sites that have already been zoned for high-density development. In some cases townhouses, in some cases mixed use, in some cases high-rise. There are hundreds of sites across our city that are not vulnerable to flooding, that are already zoned for high‑density development. But where developers are not currently building.

Why aren’t the developers building there? Why, if this land is zoned for high‑density development don’t they want to build on the main road, near the public transport, near the shops and facilities? The answer is that they’re building on the cheap crappy land down at the bottom of the hill.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: It is cheaper and more profitable for developers to buy the old warehouse down near the creek or down hear the river and build there. Rather than building on the high ground. Because the high ground is more expensive and also sometimes because the high ground has been subdivided more. So there are more small parcels and it’s a little bit more complex to amalgamate a site that you can develop on.

So the problem we have is that basically the Council is allowing new development everywhere. It’s allowing new development on the high ground, on the main roads, near the shops and it’s allowing new development down on the flood-prone land. Because the Council allows new development everywhere, developers build on the cheap land that’s flood prone and they don’t have to deal with the cost long term.

They don’t have to deal with the escalating flood insurance costs. They don’t have to deal with the clean-up cost, they don’t have to deal with the building maintenance cost and all the difficulties that body corporates and residents have in navigating those processes. The developers, they make their money and then they piss off and they leave the residents and the future administration of the city to deal with the mess.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: That’s what our Council is allowing right now. But instead, if we were to prevent or strictly limit development on those flood-prone areas, the developers would have a stronger incentive. Because they wouldn’t have any alternatives, to build in the places that we actually want them to build, up on the high ground. It’s a matter of common sense.

So it is a lie when Councillors stand up, or when politicians stand up and say oh, if we stop them building on the floodplain, they won’t be able to—where will all the houses go? There won’t be enough room for housing. There’s plenty of room for housing. Look at the zoning maps, look at the neighbourhood plans. We have already—this Council Administration has already rezoned entire neighbourhoods and precincts for high-density development.

There is ample land available for new development in this city without building a single, additional dwelling down on the floodplain. The same is true for commercial and industrial developments. I think this city has been particularly negligent in saying oh, look, we’ll be a little bit tighter about dwellings. But if it’s a non-habitable area or if it’s a shop or whatever, that’s fine down on the floodplain. That’s silly. Shops still experience damage from flooding.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order*.*

Chair: Point of order, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Earlier this afternoon on several occasions, Councillor MACKAY called me a bully and I would ask that that is withdrawn. I find it offensive.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, that’s not an appropriate point of order at this point.

Is it really?

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Okay. Councillor MACKAY, offence has been taken at words you used in regard to Councillor JOHNSTON earlier in the evening.

Will you withdraw those words?

Councillor MACKAY: Chair, this puts me in a very difficult position. I’ve made my position clear on multiple times. That I don’t appreciate the way that I’m treated and I’ve made it pretty clear that I felt bullied and unsafe in my workplace. It’s 2022.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor MACKAY: Now Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN’s laughing at me.

Councillor HOWARD: Point of order*.*

Chair: Point of order to you Councillor HOWARD.

Councillor HOWARD: Mr Chair, earlier in the evening, in the day, Councillor JOHNSTON used the word misogynous. I take great offence to that word and I ask that she withdraw it.

Chair: Okay.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Firstly, Mr Chairman, I have made a point of order and you are required under the Meetings Local Law—

Chair: Yes.

Councillor JOHNSTON: —to address that point of order.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: Councillor MACKAY has refused to withdraw and I presume you will not take the appropriate action to warn him and note his behaviour for failing to withdraw at your direction in the minutes, as you did to me earlier today.

Chair: Councillor thank you.

Councillor MACKAY, I ask you to withdraw words. If you are choosing not to, that will be noted in the meeting minutes.

Councillor MACKAY: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor MACKAY.

Councillor MACKAY: I appreciate that. I can’t withdraw those comments, so I ask that you treat me the same way that you treated Councillor JOHNSTON before.

|  |
| --- |
| **Order – Councillor James MACKAY**  The Chair then advised Councillor James MACKAY that as he had continued to fail to comply with his request for remedial action for his unsuitable meeting conduct, in accordance with section 21(8) of the *Meetings Local Law 2001*, an order reprimanding him for his conduct was being issued. |

Chair: Councillor HOWARD—

Councillor JOHNSTON, Councillor HOWARD raised an issue of concern about language you used as well. Councillor HOWARD has taken offence to those words. Will you withdraw those words?

Councillor JOHNSTON: No, I will not.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Okay, yes. So Councillor—

*Councillor interjecting.*

|  |
| --- |
| **Order – Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON**  The Chair then advised Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON that as she had continued to fail to comply with his request for remedial action for her unsuitable meeting conduct, in accordance with section 21(8) of the *Meetings Local Law 2001*, an order reprimanding her for her conduct was being issued. |

Chair: Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN, you have—

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Fifty-two seconds.

Chair: —left for your debate.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Yes, back to the serious issue of flooding in our city and the fact that we are creating a severe and increasing risk for residents and future generations to deal with. The motion, I think, is relatively straightforward and speaks for itself. I do note that the motion isn’t intended to limit development applications that would improve flood resilience for existing properties.

But I think even the Prime Minister of Australia has now said that we’ve got to stop building on floodplains. It is clear to me that the Council could be doing more to limit development on the floodplain. So I urge all Councillors to support this motion. I think it would be a great shame and a great error of this city continued to allow development on such low-lying land.

Chair: Further debate?

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, I rise to speak on the motion that’s been put forward today. When I first started at Council in 2008, Council did restrict building in known flood-prone areas. It’s only when Campbell Newman came in in about 2009 that changes were made and Brisbane City Council started allowing development in flood‑prone areas.

As a result of the LNP’s city planning scheme, and it’s their planning scheme, they pushed City Plan through in 2014 and many other changes. There has been misery heaped on the people of Brisbane, where development has happened in flood‑prone areas. In my ward many parts of the residential community are in known flood‑prone areas, near Oxley Creek, near the Brisbane River, or certainly in overland flow areas.

Council’s response to development in flood‑prone areas has been completely inadequate. They allow development to happen. They allow fill to be placed on blocks, causing misery to adjoining land owners when the water runs off on to their blocks. Council will do nothing to assist those residents who are on lower blocks.

In addition, Council refuses to enforce its own planning scheme. The planning scheme specifically says that vulnerable uses should have direct vehicle access where they’re in flood‑prone areas. It also states that critical venues should have routes for evacuation. Now, in my ward Council has allowed multiple stages of a retirement village and a nursing home, after 2011, knowing that there is no road access. The road has a one-in-20-year flood impact. So the road goes under and there is no evacuation point for the vulnerable residents of the nursing home or the retirement village to escape,

The City Plan also goes on to say that there should be easily discernible evacuation routes for residents, that should not require an undue burden upon emergency services. Now the 400-plus residents of the retirement village and the nursing home in Yeronga had to wait two days for the army and the police to come and evacuate them by boat. Elderly people stuck with no power, needing evacuation.

All of this has occurred because the LNP Administration approved a retirement village being built in a flood‑prone area with no road access and very limited access generally in the event of a flood. Now the retirement village is located in an area that is zoned 2A, 2B and 3. It is inappropriate that Council continues to allow vulnerable uses such as this to be built in known flood–prone areas.

Unfortunately Brisbane City Council is indicating that it is continuing to do this, even in its most recent industrial strategy, where it is now seemingly going to allow mixed-use development in known flooding areas, also in Yeronga. I fear that they will never learn the lessons from the expense and the disruption that happens in Brisbane when flooding occurs. It is distressing to see it happening time, after time, after time to residents in Brisbane.

No longer is the way the LNP administering City Plan appropriate for this city. There must be a different approach. There are parts of this city that should never have been built on and certainly Council is not alone in the problematic way in which it is dealing with development on flood‑prone land. In my ward it is often being done by the State Government as well. For example, at the Yeerongpilly TOD (Transit Oriented Development) site called Yeerongpilly Green.

In my ward as well, just to give you another example. The Tennyson Reach development, which Council approved back in 2007 before I was a Councillor but was built after I became a Councillor. It was supposed to be above the flood line. It flooded very badly in 2011, including into the habitable areas. In 2022, the basements flooded yet again.

Also in my ward, the redevelopment of the RSPCA (Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals) site, which our community overwhelmingly opposed. Hundreds and hundreds of residents opposed the redevelopment of that site. I opposed it for three reasons, traffic, flooding and over-development on the site. In February this year the site flooded. The alleged waterproof basement was not waterproof and everybody lost their stored items, their cars and their belongings in the basements.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: This has become an ongoing problem because Council is allowing sub-ground level basements to be built in flood‑prone areas. The residents believe, because Council has approved the development, that they will be safe from flooding. That is clearly not the case. It is clear to me that Council needs a change.

The motion that Councillor SRI has put forward certainly recognises that people who already live in these areas that flood, should be allowed to raise their houses where possible and to redesign their houses where possible. Certainly I would hope that buy back is an option for many of these people. The LORD MAYOR seems to be proud of the fact that three houses in Oxley have been bought back, two in Fairfield and two in Sherwood. That is seven houses out of about 3,000 in my ward that flooded. Probably half of those were pretty catastrophic with habitable floor. So seven out of 1,500 is not a good strike rate.

If these houses are not going to be bought back by any level of government—and I note that this Council has refused to fund any kind of buy back this year. This Council is still refusing to fund the Home Resilient program for applications in my ward. Again, that seems to be limited to a few wards and it’s not available to the whole city, despite former Chief Justice Paul de Jersey’s recommendations that it is so.

So we’re left with a Council that continues to approve development in flood‑prone areas. Yes, Council requires your habitable floor level to be above the 2011 flood line in my ward. But your house is then stranded for up to a week with no power. You can’t get in and out. There is no road access.

I don’t think Council understands, or Councillors particularly who don’t live in these areas, understand the sheer impact and distress that it causes to residents, to their homes. I’ve got so many residents who are living upstairs and they can’t use downstairs. I’ve got people living in awful, awful conditions in my ward at the moment. I don’t want to see this type of inappropriate development on floodplains continuing.

Now Brisbane City Council require—they say they can mitigate the impacts of flooding by requiring an engineer to verify that there is appropriate flood immunity that can be achieved. That’s one of the criteria for development. Council does not independently verify this information. They simply accept the advice of the developers and their paid experts, to provide that information. As a result we are then left with residents who live in high-rise, like at Tennyson Reach, who have to take legal action against the developer and the experts when flooding does occur. This is also not a good way to run the city.

Brisbane City Council seems to think that it has no responsibility in this area. It has no obligation to ensure that people can live safely in their community. Not at extraordinary cost, not having to go to court to protect themselves from flood nuisance or nuisance from flooding that Council has approved.

The only other thing I’d mention now is that it is becoming unaffordable for residents to insure their homes in parts of my ward. Residents have told me that they were paying $10,000 a year for insurance last year. Their newest quote is for $14,000 a year for insurance. Now these are not fancy homes. Brisbane City Council must accept responsibility and change the way that they assess and allow development in known flood‑prone areas.

Failure to act will continue to cause distress, expense and unnecessary pain to residents who live in flood‑prone areas. Council should not be allowing development in some parts of this city.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON your time has expired.

Further speakers?

Councillor ALLAN.

Councillor ALLAN: Thank you, Mr Chair. Under the Queensland Government legislation, specifically the *Planning Act 2016* and the *Planning Regulation 2017*, Council cannot prohibit development in flood‑prone areas. However, the City Plan 2014 Flood overlay code ensures that any development in areas, such as those that were inundated in the 2022 floods, incorporates appropriate mitigation measures.

All development applications within an identified level of flood risk are assessed by Council’s hydraulic engineers and assessment teams to ensure appropriate restrictions apply to the relevant flood risk.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor ALLAN: Where development is permitted within mapped flood‑prone areas, requirements such as minimum floor levels and/or under crofts and/or flood resilient materials may be imposed as a condition of approval. Brisbane City Council City Plan 2014 currently includes provisions relating to flood mitigation and protection for development within flood‑prone areas of the city. Importantly Council’s City Plan online identifies those areas likely to experience flooding from different sources, including Brisbane River, creek or waterway and overland flow and applies a risk-based approach.

So to summarise, we already have, and are using, mechanisms within City Plan and relevant documents to adapt to changing conditions such as flooding. So there is no requirement to start, rather we will continue with the options and mechanisms that are already available to us.

We have an ability to condition developments and limit development in flood‑prone areas and are already doing this. We continue to operate under City Plan, based on the best available flood data, research, engineering and hydraulic advice. But managing development in Brisbane is about managing, not prohibiting or unreasonably limiting it. As I have stated earlier, only the State can prohibit development.

**MOTION FOR AMENDMENT TO MOTION:**

|  |
| --- |
| **227/2022-23**  It was moved by Councillor Adam ALLAN, seconded by Councillor Sandy LANDERS, that the motion be **amended** as follows:  *after the words ‘resolves to’ add ‘in accordance with the requirements of State Government legislation’; and*  *remove the word ‘start’ and insert the word ‘continue’.*  The amended motion would read:  *Brisbane City Council resolves to, in accordance with the requirements of State Government legislation, continue the process of amending City Plan and other relevant documents in order to limit all new residential, mixed use, industrial and commercial development proposals on land that is mapped under Brisbane River Flood planning areas 1, 2a, 2b and 3 within the ‘Flood’ Overlay.*  *These changes should be drafted so as not to limit development applications that seek to renovate or raise existing buildings in order to improve flood resilience.* |

Chair: I don’t believe that changes the substantive original motion. It’s just an amendment that seems to me to acknowledge that the limit that Councillor SRI wants to impose or suggests—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: —is in accord with the requirements of State Government legislation. To the amendment.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Before I speak to the amendment, I do have a point of order. Which is that I do think this fundamentally changes the intent of the motion. Because the intent of the motion is to introduce something new. It uses the word start. It says we want to add additional requirements. Whereas this motion changes that to continue and is proposing to—it’s implying that nothing needs to change.

So I think it is substantively different. I know they’ve only changed one or two words. But it has substantially changed the meaning. So do you need to seek advice on that?

Chair: No, I’ve made a ruling, thank you.

We’ll vote on the new motion.

All in favour of—

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Wait, I’ll speak to the amendment then.

Chair: Yes, sure.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Yes, are you speaking to it? Because you’ve just moved it.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: So we now—sorry, has the amendment been seconded?

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: It has been seconded. Okay, so that is the new, amended motion. Do you want me to read it again or is it as I just read it?

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor ALLAN, do you want to speak to the amended motion?

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: No, no, we’re speaking to the—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: We haven’t accepted the amendment.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Okay, so we’re—yes, we’re debating the amendment to the motion, yes.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Yes.

Chair: Yes.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: We’re debating whether to amend.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Yes.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Okay, thanks, Chair. Look, I must say I was a little bit heartbroken then to hear Councillor ALLAN describe what the city has been doing over the last few years as adequate. Or suggest that we’re already imposing sufficient limits. Councillor ALLAN I appeal to you, through the Chair, to your good heart. I know you’ve got a good heart in there. I know you want to do the right thing for the future of this city.

What I’m telling you, as someone who has paid a lot of attention to the kinds of developments that are getting approved, and has paid a lot of attention to how flooding impacts my ward. I’m telling you, honestly, that what the Council is doing at the moment is not good enough. The limits you are imposing are far too weak. I don’t think you are really imposing limits.

I’ve seen what you guys have approved over the past few years. It’s setting residents up for harm. We had a whole bunch of developments approved in the last few years around West End that the developer said were flood resilient. The developer said don’t worry, it’s fine. We’ve got water pumps in the basements, we’ve got escape routes mapped.

Guess what? The water pumps stopped working as soon as the power went out and the escape routes were vulnerable to flooding themselves. So people couldn’t follow the escape routes that the developers had provided. Thousands of residents had lost belongings and possessions that were stored in basement car parks. They lost cars that were stored in basement car parks. These were buildings that were built after 2011 in accordance with the Council’s latest standards. I’m not talking about old houses that were built before 1974, I’m talking about new build apartments that this Administration has approved in the last few years that proved to be extremely vulnerable to flooding and were severely negatively impacted. So, to bring an amendment to this motion that implies that what the Council is doing is sufficient, that says, oh, yes, we’re already applying limits, don’t worry, is detached from reality.

It is delusional. Councillor ALLAN, I just implore you to listen to common sense here. This is not about party politics; this is not about trying to score points off the LNP. I’m raising this issue because I’m deeply concerned about the future of our city. I’m concerned for the welfare of the people who will end up living in these areas.

The stories I heard of people with impaired mobility who were trapped in their apartments who couldn’t get down the stairwells because the lifts were off, people who lost really cherished possessions, people who had to live in poorly ventilated apartments for several days without air conditioning, without any kind of air flow because the apartments have been designed without balconies and openable windows, little concrete hot boxes, people living in really uncomfortable and I would argue unsafe conditions because of what your Administration has approved.

There were mountains of garbage—actually, no, I’ll rephrase that, I don’t want to use hyperbole. They weren’t mountains, they were hills. There were big hills of garbage infested with rodents, infested with rats, because the Council garbage trucks couldn’t get into the basement loading dock areas where the garbage is collected. The Council Administration’s response was to put out eight to 10 wheelie bins to collect the food waste from about 4,000 apartments. Ten wheelie bins for 4,000 apartments. Probably not enough.

We had a serious health and safety issue in West End as a result of new apartments that had lost power, that had had their basements flooded, that had had access routes to and from the buildings cut and what you seem to be saying is that that’s all fine, that that’s all acceptable, that you don’t have to change anything about the way you’ve been limiting development on the floodplain because what you’ve been doing over the last few years is sufficient. That to me is terrifying. I know there’s a little bit of an irony here because I live on a houseboat and I’m saying I don’t want people living on the floodplain, but at least a boat floats, right? These apartments don’t float.

The people in these homes are cut off, they don’t have solar power, they don’t have rainwater collection, they don’t have resilient off-grid systems to survive prolonged periods of inundation. People are still traumatised from this stuff. It’s what, November now, I still have people—every time there’s a storm predicted, people get nervous because they know that the building they live in is not flood resilient. They know that the building they live in is not able to withstand flooding.

So, when Councillor ALLAN stands up and says oh, we’re already requiring developers to have safeguards, we’re already requiring hydrological assessments, I say quite clearly, Councillor ALLAN is lying. It is a barefaced lie and I know it is a lie because I’ve read the documents and I’ve seen what’s been built and it’s not safe. It’s not good enough. This is not about luxury tokenistic stuff; this is not about nice-to-have features. This is about the fundamental question of whether these buildings are safe to inhabit during flooding, about whether they can withstand serious natural disasters in a context where we know there’s going to be more flooding in the future.

The evidence on the ground is very clear that we’re not ready for this. So, I don’t know who’s advising you, Councillor ALLAN. I assume you’ve come to these conclusions based on the advice of city planning experts, of urban planners, of engineers who are telling you that what’s happening is good enough. I assume that’s what’s going on here. But they’re wrong. They’re wrong and I’ve seen how bad the flooding impacts are. I’m just so frustrated and so deeply troubled that the Council Administration seems incapable of acknowledging this basic truth, that flooding is impacting developments and housing areas that have been approved under the latest standards.

So, yes, it’s easy for the Council to say, oh, there are some old homes and they haven’t been raised and they’ve been flood affected and that’s a shame but don’t worry, we’ve got more rigorous standards now. What I’m saying to you is that I represent an area where people have been living in new builds, apartments that are only a few years old, that have been built according to those supposedly more rigorous standards and they’re still not flood resilient. It’s really basic stuff.

There was one apartment where the developer’s flood risk response—they have what they call flood planks and you’re meant—someone, it’s not clear who, someone is meant to put the flood planks across the driveway entrances to stop the floodwater running down the driveway. There’s no clear responsibility for whether that’s the building manager or the body corporate or some random resident, but someone apparently is meant to install or temporarily put these flood planks across the driveway to stop the water going into the basement car park and flooding hundreds of cars.

Guess where the flood planks were stored? Down in the basement. The basement flooded from the sewerage drain manhole popping open long before the water was at street level. So, the basement was already filling up with sewerage before anyone had a chance to get the flood planks out, and this is in a new build. So, Councillor ALLAN, I know my original motion is not going to get up today but please, just do me one favour, go back and look at the assessment report for 10 Kurilpa Street. It is manifestly inadequate.

This is a development application that’s been lodged after the February 2022 floods where the Council is still not requiring proper hydrological assessments, where the Council is still not requiring a flood risk assessment, where they’re allowing 78 apartments and two levels of basement car parking on a site that is 40 centimetres above sea level and that was under 5.5 metres of water just at the start of this year. It is madness. For this Council to just say, oh, we’ll just continue with what we’re doing is deranged. I don’t know how much more evidence the Council needs.

We’ve seen the insurance bills, we’ve seen the damage costs, we’ve seen how costly these floods are. The evidence is there in the Council’s own budgets. The costs rise the more people we introduce into these low-lying areas. The more development you put on the floodplain, the more vulnerability you create, the more Council assets there are that get damaged and that need to be cleaned. It just gets worse and worse and you’re making it worse and worse by approving more of these developments. So, I implore you to listen to common sense and make some changes. That’s all I’m asking.

I haven’t suggested that Council should ban or prevent development on Flood planning areas 4 and 5. Those are the areas that do flood a bit in really severe circumstances but they’re not as vulnerable to flooding. I’m talking about the areas that are most vulnerable to flooding, Flood planning areas 1 to 3. Those are the areas where the water gets deep, where the water runs fast, where the water is so strong that it can punch a hole in the side of a building. These are the areas where we should not be putting new buildings. We should be setting them aside as public parkland, as sports fields, as grassy open spaces that can soak up rainwater, rather than creating more vulnerability and introducing more risk to our city.

Chair: Further speakers on the amendment?

Councillor MATIC.

Councillor MATIC: Yes, thank you, Mr Chairman. I rise to speak in support of the amendment and I do so because this amendment is actually reflective of the reality of where the planning scheme is and where Council’s role is as opposed to the unreality of the previous motion, which is completely bereft of an understanding of the planning scheme, the relevance of the local government authority and the powers we have, the overriding power of the State Government, the State Planning Act—it goes on and on, Mr Chairman, and I wish to go through that, but to make this point as succinct as I can.

Firstly and foremost, Brisbane is built on a floodplain. We are a flood‑prone city. We have flooded in the past, we have flooded recently and we will flood in the future. That is the first thing that we need to understand. Councillors opposite who choose to ignore that reality and want us to undertake schemes that literally wipe out half the residential areas of this city are living in a fairy tale land. That is completely bereft of any understanding of how the law works or how the planning scheme works or equally so, what powers Council has in that particular space.

If you live on the premise that we live in a flood‑prone city, then our role is to mitigate and to manage. Can I say, Mr Chairman, that the work that Campbell Newman did—I heard some disparaging comments before about somehow this was all Campbell Newman’s fault. It was actually Campbell Newman that opened up all the flood mapping for residents for the first time in a long time. It was actually Campbell Newman that had the conversation about Brisbane being a flood‑prone city in the middle of a drought.

It was actually Campbell Newman that invested the money into the flood mapping that continues to evolve and develop on a level unparalleled by any other Council across this nation. It was this Administration that continues that strong work. Now, Mr Chairman, when we look at the issue that we are a flood‑prone city, what this Council has done since 2011 is absolutely amazing in the development that we’ve seen, what very little happened prior to 2011 and then what happened after 2011.

We had a Commission of Inquiry, Mr Chairman, run by the State Government, which went through all the planning schemes and which this Council implemented 100%. We saw significant improvements in the planning scheme and what officers required in conditions upon development applications. Councillor SRI has given you examples of stuff in his ward; I’ll give you examples of mine. The Milton down at Railway Terrace was the first TOD of its kind that was implemented and approved around 2010. It was pretty much in place when I came in in 2007.

Because of the way it was built, it was resilient in the flood. All the residents within that space were able to avoid flooding. The car park was raised at least four storeys above ground and the building itself was raised. The issue was Energex and the substations. So, is Councillor SRI trying to seriously tell us that because power is cut off to a precinct, that that whole precinct should not exist? That The Milton and all the apartments and everything on Railway Terrace should not be there?

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Will Councillor MATIC take a question?

Chair: Councillor MATIC, will you take a question?

Councillor MATIC: Sure.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: You understand that what I am saying is that if your flood risk plan requires flood pumps that require electricity and that depends on the electricity being connected, then your flood risk plan isn’t actually very resilient once the power goes out. Do you get what I’m saying?

Councillor MATIC: Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN, I completely understand what you’re saying but what you’re missing is that you’re seeking the utopia of flood management in that there is no flooding to a building ever under any circumstances, irrespective of what that flood is. That cannot happen in this city.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Point of order, Chair. Claim to be misrepresented.

Chair: Claim to be misrepresented noted.

Councillor MATIC: Council works under a planning scheme and powers it has granted by the State Government and the Planning Act to do what it does and it follows that through 100%. If there are more changes that you need, this is not the place. Go down to George Street and talk to them about what they deem to be inappropriate development. Go down there and tell them to block out half of your ward, half of my ward, pretty much all of Councillor HOWARD’s ward, half of Councillor JOHNSTON’s ward and most other Councillors here. Tell them to go and remove development in all of those areas.

Tell them to tell all the land owners down there, no, your land is now worth nothing and we’re just going to resume it. But go and tell them to then go to move to Moorooka. When you talk about developers wanting to build on places that the land is cheap, I think a lot of developers would disagree with you about riverside land being cheap. I think you would probably find that they paid a premium. Do you know why they paid a premium? Because that’s where residents wanted to live. They’re not going to build where residents don’t want to live.

What you’re trying to do is tell them and literally every Brisbane resident how to live their lives and where to live their lives. Now, that’s crazy. Let’s be blunt. That’s nuts if you think that anyone in this Council would support something like that or anyone in Brisbane would support something like that. Am I going to go tell all the residents of Rosalie Village, you’re out? Councillor SRI said you’ve got to go move to Moorooka. Really? Or, what, Ferny Grove? Did Ferny Grove flood?

No. So, let’s move to Ferny Grove. This is the point that you are missing which is fundamental to this discussion. All of us want to see better outcomes. All of us want to see improvements to the planning code. That’s what we’re doing. We’re constantly improving the code to deal with flooding as it occurs, to look at what options are available, to make sure that we condition our building developers and not only that, but the conditions that they put on their body corporates to manage those situations.

How far do you want Council’s power to stretch down to? To the body corporate, to police them to make sure that they do what they’re required to do? Again, this is a scheme that involves all of the parties’ involvement from State Government to Council and we are playing our part. We are doing our role moving forwards to make sure that we are dealing with this. To say that we are not, to say that Councillor officers are not checking those flood reports, are you joking? To those officers up there in the building that are listening to this right now, they are probably in a state of shock.

You’re telling them they’re not doing their jobs. Seriously? If you want to say that, you go right ahead, but the rest of us know what the truth is. Ultimately, if we want to see more improvements, then we need to lobby George Street because that’s what we do. We bring planning amendments into this Chamber all the time to make better outcomes because we’re lobbying George Street. Sometimes we drag them, kicking and screaming, to the table to make them to do so.

So, I suggest that you start to take this conversation to a higher level because if you want to see us wipe out half the residential areas of this entire city, if you want to see us tell residents where they need to live and where they must live, then do it down in George Street but don’t do it here because we’ll continue to do our jobs. We’ll continue to improve the flood mapping, we’ll continue the education, we’ll continue to make sure that residents are aware through the SMS program and get them registered for flood warning apps.

We’re going to continue to do the work we need to do to condition buildings appropriately in locations and we’ll continue to do the work we need to do to help this city moving forwards.

Chair: Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN, point of misrepresentation.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Yes, thanks, Chair. Councillor MATIC appeared to suggest that I was claiming that we can insulate all buildings from flooding and that’s definitely not what I said. I said that we shouldn’t be building new buildings on flood‑prone areas.

Chair: Thank you.

We can now move to the vote on the—unless anybody wants to speak? Anybody else want to speak?

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

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

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 16 - Councillors Greg ADERMANN, Adam ALLAN, Lisa ATWOOD, Fiona CUNNINGHAM, Tracy DAVIS, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Sarah HUTTON, Sandy LANDERS, James MACKAY, Kim MARX, Peter MATIC, David McLACHLAN, Ryan MURPHY, Angela OWEN and Steven TOOMEY.

NOES: 4 - The Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Jared CASSIDY, and Councillors Peter CUMMING, Charles STRUNK and Jonathan SRIRANGANATHAN.

Chair: Is there any debate on the new substantive motion?

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Thanks, Chair. I rise to speak on the amended motion and I wanted to quote from the Development Assessment report for 10 Kurilpa Street. This is on page 19 under the section Flooding, which is a very short section, 4.7.3, page 19 of the Development Assessment report for the development application for 10 Kurilpa Street, West End, on the corner of Bailey Street. I’m reading directly here. During the pre-lodgement meeting with Brisbane City Council on 11 February 2022, BCC identified that a flood risk assessment would only be required if the access to the site on Tondara Lane were to be relocated.

As the access remains in the same location on Tondara Lane, no flood risk assessment is proposed. So, what that means is that Council is saying as long as the driveway for the basement car parks is above the flood level, you don’t need to do any other checking at all about whether this building will be floodproof. You don’t need to make sure that there are no stormwater drains underneath where the water could seep in, you don’t need to make sure that the sewer lines will be properly sealed and won’t pop, you don’t need to make sure that the walls of the basement car park are resistant to hydrostatic pressure.

All that they require is the standard stormwater drainage assessment that all developments have to do. They are not requiring any further flood risk assessment. They’re not requiring any detailed hydrological assessments. This is in a development application in my ward; I’ve read the documentation, it’s impact assessable, it triggers other impact triggers but there’s nothing else being required of it in terms of flooding. It’s interesting, right, because that pre-lodgement meeting happened on 11 February just before the floods and you have to wonder whether they would have been a little bit stricter after the floods, but during the pre-lodgement meeting, the Council said no risk assessment needed and the developers proceeded on that basis.

Now we have this development application being decided by Council on a site that’s extremely prone to flooding. I heard what Councillor MATIC said and to be honest, I think you’re engaging a lot of hyperbole there. I don’t think you really listened to what I was saying because I’m not saying that we have to immediately relocate every home that’s been built on the floodplain. That’s not what I’ve said. I’m saying we should stop new development on the floodplain. I’m saying yes, you’re right, we do have to mitigate risk and yes, you’re right, we do have to accept the city is flooding.

I’m the one here saying that the city is very flood prone. But what I’m also saying is that we shouldn’t make the risk worse by housing more people down there and by putting more businesses down in the floodplain. It’s a matter of common sense that there is enough land that’s above the flood level, that there’s enough land on higher ground which we can develop on. You are completely wrong to say that it’s not Council’s place to tell people where they can and can’t live. We do that all the time. That’s how zoning works.

That’s how the City Plan works. It says, hey, this land’s good for parkland, this land’s good for industrial, this land’s an airport, don’t put houses next to it. That’s the whole purpose of Council’s urban planning framework, is to say where people can and can’t live and where different kinds of land uses should and shouldn’t be located. We already do that. It’s kind of the core point of city planning. We have done that in the past and said, hey, this area’s so flood prone we don’t want you to build there and we’ve acquired that land as parkland or we’ve prevented certain kinds of development or we’ve rezoned it as green space.

So, it’s not correct, Councillor MATIC, through you, Chair, to say that this is not the role of Council. Council already does this. I’m simply saying we don’t do it enough and we’re not doing it to a high enough standard. We have a responsibility not just to existing residents but to the future residents of this city to do a better job of ensuring that new development isn’t concentrated on sites that are prone to flooding. That’s a really important responsibility that we’ve been entrusted with as elected representatives and it certainly isn’t sufficient to pass the buck to the State or Federal Government because the State Government is relying on Council to do the nitty gritty detailed work of ensuring that development is appropriately located and appropriately designed.

I’m saying I can point to the evidence in my own ward; this Council Administration is not doing that. To Councillor MATIC’s point about whether Council officers are doing their job, I don’t know who writes the job descriptions and I don’t know exactly who writes the framework. All I’m saying is that we’re not as an Administration doing a very good job right now of preventing flood-vulnerable development. This assessment report on this particular DA is an excellent case in point but there are many more like it.

There are many sites across my ward that have been designed and developed in such a way that when the flood waters hit, the basement lifts get flooded, the basement car parks get flooded, all the storage gets flooded. The electrical circuitry, which has been located within the basements of these new developments, gets flooded and then has to be replaced. These are huge costs that are borne by body corporates and ultimately by the residents. The residents have to wear these costs because the Council let the developers build there and the residents don’t have a course of action against the developers because the Council’s the one that approved it.

The residents can’t sue Council because Council says, oh, it complies with all our rules, but the rules themselves aren’t stringent enough. I think it’s deeply disappointing that we’re not taking this issue more seriously and I say again that the risk of flooding is going to get worse, so even if you think what we’ve been doing over the last few years has been sufficient to date, it’s not sufficient to plan for future risk and the future increase in severity of flooding. I do think we need to start relocating more existing homes from flood‑prone areas and I think the flood buy back scheme is just the start of that, but what I’m talking about here is not even going that far.

I’m just saying don’t make it worse. Don’t put more new shops and warehouses and residential homes down on the low-lying land where the floodwaters are highest and fastest. You could put it on the slightly higher ground where the floodwaters come sometimes, just don’t put them in the really deep water. Don’t put the development on the land where people have to wade out in knee-deep water as soon as the river breaches its banks.

This is basic stuff and once again, I wanted to point out that even if you design the buildings so that the habitable rooms and the floor levels are above the flood level and even if you design the car parks so that the car parks have really good flood pumps on back-up generators with ingresses that are above the flood level so the water can’t get into the basement car park, even if you do all of that, the streets themselves still get flooded and when the streets are flooded, that means the buses can’t get through, it means the garbage trucks can’t get through, it means people can’t move around.

In the western side of West End, roughly 50% of people don’t own a car. They don’t drive as their main mode of transport. They rely predominantly on public transport. In the week following the floods, the Blue CityGlider service, the main bus route that services that corridor, simply wasn’t running. It wasn’t running because the road had been cut at a few points by floods and the driver’s toilet block had been flooded and there was some debris around so the buses couldn’t run and that meant that those thousands of residents had no way to move around.

They couldn’t even get down to the shops. They couldn’t get to work. I think this is an important point that I hope that at least the Labor Councillors will take on board, which is that even if you raise the homes above the flood level, even if you design the apartments so that the buildings themselves aren’t flood impacted, the impacts to the broader neighbourhood of flooding are still significant and disruptive. When you’re talking about high-density development, that impact is magnified tenfold. We were lucky with the February floods that they didn’t get a little bit higher because if they’d gone another two metres, we would have had 2,000 or 3,000 more residents in West End flooded.

All the buildings that were built after the 2011 floods, they’re required to be about one metre above the 2011 flood level, roughly speaking. So, if the floods go another metre above 2011, it’s a much more significant disruption and then we have that impact where, as the city’s trying to recover, people aren’t showing up to work. The people who are supposed to be driving the garbage trucks and the people who are supposed to be undertaking the planning and clean-up coordination, they’re not showing up to work to oversee and work on the recovery because their own homes have been flooded.

So, we were kind of lucky that it was only a fairly small proportion of the city that was affected in February but it could be a lot worse and that’s the lesson I want our city leaders to take away from the February floods, is that the disruptions are significant, even if the buildings themselves aren’t flooded, even if the residential homes aren’t flooded.

I realise I’m howling into the wind here, I realise that the Councillors in this Chamber aren’t necessarily going to make any significant changes, but I do hope that anyone reading these minutes or the historians down the track who look back and they’re like, why on earth did this Council continue to approve more development on the floodplain, I hope the future historians will at least be able to see that there were some people speaking up against that and some people exercising common sense.

Because I know that 100 years ago there were some Councillors and some people saying, hey, we shouldn’t build down in Rocklea and we shouldn’t build down on the low-lying parts of Fairfield, and those Councillors were ignored back then and now we’re having to buy back that land and deal with those problems created 50 and 100 years ago. So, let’s not be the ones who create problems for future Councillors to deal with 100 years from now.

Chair: Thank you.

Further speakers? Any further speakers?

Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair. I rise to speak on the now amended motion and have been listening along and understand the points that Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN has been making, both in moving his original motion—or seeking to—and then moving it today and trying to understand the position of the Administration. If Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN has done all the homework and has all of the information available to him—I don’t and we certainly don’t—in terms of the number of properties, the number of lots that would be affected by this. If we had more information available, we might be able to make a more informed decision around this.

If it was in the dozens and that could be easily replaced by dozens more somewhere else in terms of property and land, then it might be a different proposition but not knowing what the overall impact for this in flood areas 1, 2A, 2B and 3 across the city, particularly right in the middle of a housing crisis, it is difficult to make that decision on that front.

However, the amended motion certainly has weakened the original position that Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN brought to the Chamber here and is a position that this LNP Administration has now taken pretty solidly, and that’s that they’re doing everything right. That’s their view. Their City Plan, according to them, is infallible and it is already addressing all of these concerns. Well, it really isn’t and I didn’t listen to the LORD MAYOR on *ABC Radio* this morning but I noted what he said in response to a question maybe on his E&C where he gave that one single example of a house being built on stilts where he talks about the old Queenslander and said that’s the one example that he can give, therefore nothing is wrong.

Where you build a house that is flood resilient or a building that is flood resilient that doesn’t impact on the habitable areas, therefore everything is fine in Brisbane. Well, that must be the 0.000001 of cases around Brisbane. In areas that are affected by river flooding that Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN’s talking about but also places that are impacted by overland flow, creek flooding and as we’ve seen increasingly, flash flooding as a result of both of those in the outer suburbs of Brisbane, the approach we’ve seen from this Administration in the past has been that if you apply fill to a certain level and build a house on a slab, that house itself might be protected and these buildings that are being built in Kurilpa might be themselves protected but the impact they are having on the community on existing buildings, on public spaces, on services is mounting.

We know Brisbane’s built largely on a floodplain, 40% of this city of suburbs is built on a floodplain, but where you have an approach for the last decade or two decades where this Council says as long as you fill and you get that individual property out of the flood level, then that’s fine. The approach has not been to floodproof not only the individual property they’re talking about but also the broader neighbourhood. That hasn’t been the case and when we were in the budget information sessions, Councillor ALLAN said that that was something they would be looking at, but again, we see no concrete proposals from this Administration saying we’re going to look at changing how buildings and how houses will be required to be built.

We went from in June to October—how many months is that—five months has gone by and we would hope that he would have had a good, long, hard think about those proposals in those five months since the Council budget where a whole lot of supposedly funding’s going into amending City Plan to deal with the issues that came about as a result of inappropriate development pre-February 2022 floods. But what we’ve found out today, five months later, is that Councillor ALLAN is saying everything is fine, that City Plan already has all of the protections in place that addresses everything.

The LORD MAYOR today gave that one example of one house that was built in his former ward that was on stumps rather than a slab and therefore everything is okay. Everything’s not okay in Brisbane. I’m not sure our position is—I’m not sure if Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN’s original motion was the answer to that. Certainly, something worth considering but on the balance, not something that we would have supported tonight, but also, this amended motion which suggests that this Administration and its City Plan is infallible and it is answering all of the questions that the community continues to have around floodproofing their neighbourhoods on balance is also not something that we can support tonight.

Chair: Any further speakers? No further speakers?

We now move to the vote on the motion.

As there was no further debate, the Chair submitted the motion to the Chamber**,** and it was declared **carried** on the voices.

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

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 16 - Councillors Greg ADERMANN, Adam ALLAN, Lisa ATWOOD, Fiona CUNNINGHAM, Tracy DAVIS, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Sarah HUTTON, Sandy LANDERS, James MACKAY, Kim MARX, Peter MATIC, David McLACHLAN, Ryan MURPHY, Angela OWEN and Steven TOOMEY.

NOES: 1 - Councillor Jonathan SRIRANGANATHAN.

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

Chair: Thank you.

That concludes our business for this evening.

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 October 2022)**

**Q1.** When will the report be released on the Consideration of the Emergency Management Levies that Council paid Amelia Louise Wheatly the amount of $52,800 (payment reference 5300040707)?

**Q2.** How was advice given to Ward Offices in regards to the Brisbane City Council Green and Gold Community Day event held on 23rd July 2023?

## 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 25 October 2022)**

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

***A1.*** *$27,709 has been spent to date, with the remaining budget to be spent this financial year.*

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

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

***A2.*** *The Sun Safe Program is currently in the procurement phase, with shade sail installation beginning in the new calendar year.*

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

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

***A3.***

| ***Park Name*** | ***Suburb*** |
| --- | --- |
| *Akuna Street Park* | *Kenmore* |
| *Austin Uhlmann Park* | *Morningside* |
| *Barwin Street Park* | *Wakerley* |
| *Beckett Road Park* | *McDowall* |
| *Bliss Street Park (No. 39)* | *Gaythorne* |
| *Broula Park* | *Stafford Heights* |
| *Buckley Street Park* | *Carina Heights* |
| *Cannon Hill Bushland Reserve* | *Cannon Hill* |
| *Castamore Way Park* | *Richlands* |
| *Chester Park Reserve* | *Mount Gravatt East* |
| *Crawford Road Park* | *Wynnum West* |
| *Dianthus Street Park (South)* | *Wakerley* |
| *Doulton Street Park* | *Calamvale* |
| *Ed Kuepper Park* | *Oxley* |
| *Ekibin Park South* | *Annerley* |
| *Ferny Grove Picnic Ground Park* | *Ferny Grove* |
| *Fiddlewood Crescent Park* | *Bellbowrie* |
| *Fig Tree Pocket Riverside Reserve* | *Fig Tree Pocket* |
| *Garrett Park* | *Runcorn* |
| *Gordon Crescent* | *Wakerley* |
| *Greenhills Park* | *Alderley* |
| *Harry Kirby Park* | *Aspley* |
| *Heers Park* | *Manly West* |
| *Kings Park* | *Keperra* |
| *Kitchener Park* | *Wynnum West* |
| *Kuranda Street Park* | *Balmoral* |
| *Linacre Street Park* | *Durack* |
| *Moora Park* | *Shorncliffe* |
| *Narrung Street Park* | *Middle Park* |
| *Nixon Park* | *Oxley* |
| *Robert Hanley Park* | *Seven Hills* |
| *Robinson Park* | *Fairfield* |
| *Rotary Park* | *Heathwood* |
| *Sanananda Street Park* | *Darra* |
| *Spencer Park* | *Newmarket* |
| *Tryon Street Park* | *Upper Mt Gravatt* |

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

***A4.*** *166,501.*

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

***A5.*** *181,883. This represents 35% of Brisbane households.*

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

***A6.*** *1 x Darra Depot*

*1 x Morningside Depot*

*2 x Newmarket Depot*

*1 x Zillmere Depot.*

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

***A7.*** *The total sandbag count at Council depots on Friday 21 October 2022 was 121,900 sandbags. Additionally, Council recently distributed 39,650 sandbags across three super sandbag weekends in September and October.*

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

***A8.*** *Council is continuing to liaise with community groups and organisations which are interested in serving as ‘community-led’ community support centres. Council does not require an approval process for community-led evacuation centres. Instead, Council refers them to the Red Cross Guidelines for operating an Evacuation Centre.*

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

***A9.*** *The flood warning signs are currently being manufactured. As announced, all signs will be installed before the end of the year.*

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

***A10.*** *This question was addressed in the Council meeting of 13 September 2022.*

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

***A11.*** *0.*

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

***A12.*** *1 membership was purchased for $432.*

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

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

***A13. and A14.***

*These questions cannot be answered without the request of a specific timeframe.*

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

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

***A15.***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***How many printed*** | ***Total cost of printing*** | ***How many distributed*** |
| *4,010* | *$1,055* | *4,010* |
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