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## PRESENT:

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

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **LNP Councillors (and Wards)**  | **ALP Councillors (and Wards)** |
| Krista ADAMS (Holland Park) (Deputy Mayor)Greg ADERMANN (Pullenvale)Adam ALLAN (Northgate)Lisa ATWOOD (Doboy)Fiona CUNNINGHAM (Coorparoo)Tracy DAVIS (McDowall)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)Peter CUMMING (Wynnum Manly)Steve GRIFFITHS (Moorooka)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.

 Are there any apologies?

## APOLOGY:

**462/2022-23**

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

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY.

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

Chair: Confirmation of minutes, please.

## MINUTES:

**463/2022-23**

The Minutes of the 4703 meeting of Council held on 7 March 2023, 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: Councillors, the next item on the agenda is Question Time.

## QUESTION TIME:

Chair: Are there any questions of the Administration or a Chair?

 Councillor LANDERS.

**Question 1**

Councillor LANDERS: My Chair is to the LORD MAYOR—my question is to the LORD MAYOR, sorry. Thank you, Chair.

 LORD MAYOR, last week, the Transport Minister Mark Bailey announced that the State Government would be using North West Transport Corridor to accommodate a heavy rail route. Can you update the Chamber on the history of this project and Council’s involvement?

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor LANDERS, and I know that you and other Councillors on this side care passionately about the north-western suburbs and passionately about improving transport connections in the north-western suburbs. It is something that we have been raising as an issue for a number of years, and it dates back to around 2019 when we were sick of seeing inaction from the State Government, despite the fact that they had identified a corridor many, many years ago, but then done nothing about it.

So we decided, as we often do on major transport infrastructure, to lead the charge, just like this Council has done when it comes to projects like Brisbane Metro, which is a State responsibility, but we led the charge on, just like it was with the major tunnel infrastructure that was built in our city. Once again, normally a State responsibility, but we led the charge. We, again, led the charge when it comes to solutions for the north-western suburbs. Brisbane is growing quicker than any other city. The State Government cannot afford to sit here and not do anything for the north-west of Brisbane.

Now, if you look at the map of Brisbane and you see where the major transport infrastructure sits, there are very clear assets and infrastructure for the eastern suburbs, when you consider the entire gateway motorway connection, for the southern suburbs and also in the western corridor, as well, but there is a gaping hole of State Government infrastructure in the north-western suburbs. This needs to change, and so we led the charge and we were successful in obtaining Federal funding to do a study and prepare a business case for the north‑western transport network.

Now, there’s been a lot of misinformation floating around about this particular one, and I wanted to put some facts on the record. First of all, the claim was that Council progressed with the study without inviting the State to participate in this study. False claim, absolute false claim. So, Mr Chair, I table a letter from, indeed, yourself as the former Infrastructure Chair to Minister Mark Bailey dated 26 November 2019. This letter invites Minister Bailey and the State Government to participate in the work that we were doing, so that offer was clearly made.

Now, when this was raised with Minister Bailey last week, he did not remember this letter being sent. Despite this, he actually responded to that same letter. Admittedly, he responded eight months later.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Eight months later. It’s a good thing you weren’t sitting by waiting for that response, Mr Chair. It’s a good thing that you were passionate about this issue and got on with it. In that response, Minister Bailey notes that he has been invited and that State representatives have been invited to be involved. He says, and I quote, ‘this particular section is particularly interesting. I appreciate BCC’s (Brisbane City Council) need to investigate transport operations within your jurisdiction’, but then he goes on to say, ‘I’m going to do my own study’. So, no thanks, we won’t be involved, I’ll do my own study. That was in July 2020. Now, what have we heard from Minister Bailey since?

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Absolute crickets.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Nothing has happened, and, in fact, all went very quiet despite the fact that we presented our work to Infrastructure Australia (IA) last year, and despite the fact that Infrastructure Australia has been working with us, various different other work has been done between the Federal Government and the Council, we’ve also talked with other council areas around us, as well, in this process. Yet last week, Minister Bailey pops his head up and has a crack at this study. He criticises this study and basically pokes fun at the fact that we didn’t rule out above-ground options.

That’s effectively what he was doing last week. He was basically poking fun at the fact that we had too quickly ruled out above-ground transport solutions. We make no apologies for doing that, because not only is it common sense to go underground with major transport infrastructure. It’s what the community asked for, it is what the community asked for. So, we’ve been very clear, there needs to be better transport infrastructure in the north-western suburbs, but it needs to go underground, and whether that’s road tunnels, rail tunnels, whether it is a new solution for Brisbane Metro, underground options need to be on the table.

Chair: LORD MAYOR, your time has expired.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you.

Chair: Further questions?

 Councillor CASSIDY.

**Question 2**

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair. My question is to the LORD MAYOR.

 LORD MAYOR, your track record on major projects is appalling. Kingsford Smith Drive ran way over budget and was delayed a year and bankrupted a company. Metro’s blown out by $1 billion and is now delayed by over a year. Your inner city bridges are blown out by hundreds of millions of dollars, and three of the five have been cut—

Councillor OWEN: Point of order, Mr Chair.

Councillor CASSIDY: —or delayed indefinitely. Your latest proposal.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor OWEN.

Councillor OWEN: Thank you, Mr Chair.

 Mr Chair, the Meetings Local Laws are quite explicit in saying that a question should be asked succinctly and without debate. Could you please rule on that? Thank you.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Thank you, Councillor OWEN.

 In this circumstance, I won’t uphold your point of order, but I do point out that that is a Meetings Local Law requirement, Councillor CASSIDY, and you’ve made—

Councillor CASSIDY: That the question is asked in two minutes.

Chair: —so far a number of statements—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: —that don’t constitute a question, so I’m asking you to come to your question.

Councillor CASSIDY: Your latest proposal, LORD MAYOR, is a $14 billion toll tunnel in the north‑west that Infrastructure Australia has rejected. How could the people of Brisbane possibly trust you?

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Well, unlike the Labor Party, I actually have a track record of delivering infrastructure, and we actually build things on this side of the Chamber. There is no track record on that side. Now, we know that not one single person on this side in the Labor Party has ever actually been in Administration anywhere. Even those who have been around for a long time and served with Jim Soorley weren’t actually part of the Civic Cabinet at that time. So, not one person on that side in the Labor team has actually managed any projects or delivered anything.

When it comes to this side, we have led the charge right from the beginning when it was building the very first green bridge in Brisbane, the Eleanor Schonell Bridge between Dutton Park and St Lucia, and then the Clem7 tunnel, then we championed the Airportlink tunnel, and then we built the Go Between Bridge and then the Legacy Way tunnel. We championed the Brisbane Metro project which, as I pointed out before, was actually a State Government responsibility, but they had no plans and no interest in doing anything. So, we championed the Kingsford Smith Drive project, which has actually made it possible to have the Olympic Village in Hamilton Northshore. If that project wasn’t done, there would be no Olympic Village in Hamilton Northshore.

So, we go on and we propose solutions, we put forward solutions. Now, you only have to look at what’s happening in Sydney and Melbourne, where they are spending tens of billions of dollars on infrastructure, and the vast majority of it is underground, yet this Opposition laughs at any serious infrastructure proposals. They laugh, they don’t care about the north-western suburbs; they don’t care about the northside. They just laugh when solutions are put on the table. Now, infrastructure never gets cheaper if you wait, infrastructure is not cheaper to build if you wait.

Now, have a look at what happened with Cross River Rail. This was first promised 20 years ago by the Labor State Government, and because of all of their messing around the project, I can tell you it’s not a $5.4 billion project. I’ll be the one to break the news, it is not a $5.4 billion project. Any reasonable estimate is that it has already exceeded 10 billion and it is counting, any reasonable estimate would show you that. Now, I know this is all secret, and we haven’t heard the actual figure because of the secrecy of the State Government and Minister Bailey, but the reality is infrastructure doesn’t get cheaper if you delay.

Now, already the State Government has preserved a corridor decades ago and then done nothing. They lost any opportunity to build something at surface decades ago. The only option now is underground. Now, if Minister Bailey has an alternative solution, I’d like to hear it, but all we have heard him say—and he said this last week—is, and I quote, ‘the North West Transport Corridor’—let me give you his exact quote—he said, ‘look, the North West Transport Corridor will be an important access into the city, clearly there needs to be a rail solution through there at some point’. Now, did he say under there? Did he say over there? He said through there. What does through mean?

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Is through different to under or over? Yes, it is, it’s through. He said very clearly through there. Now, through where? The North West Transport Corridor, the sensitive bushland area which had been preserved by the State Government, but which they didn’t do anything with. The sensitive bushland area that has a number of critical species, both of animals and trees, which is home to koalas, a critical environmental corridor now, because of Labor’s lack of action. The only thing we’ve heard is that Minister Bailey wants to build something through there.

Now, no serious Transport Minister can stand up and have a straight face and think that bulldozing through sensitive bushland areas and homes is the right option in today’s age. No one can seriously think that. Cross River Rail is underground, the Airportlink tunnel was underground, significant parts of Metro are going underground, right beneath the street where we are now. Legacy Way tunnel was underground, Clem7 was underground. This is not hard to comprehend. If you want to build major infrastructure projects in a thriving modern city, you have to consider underground options.

Now, Labor may rule that out, but we are not going to stop thinking about the transport needs of the north-western suburbs. We need to keep—

Chair: LORD MAYOR, your time has expired.

LORD MAYOR: —pushing this because the city is growing.

Chair: Further questions?

 Councillor HUTTON.

**Question 3**

Councillor HUTTON: Thank you, Chair. My question is to the Chair of Economic Development and the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games Committee, Councillor ADAMS.

 DEPUTY MAYOR, last week, you updated the Chamber on the Schrinner Council’s plan to create thousands of homes within the Kurilpa precinct, which will also serve as a key site for the 2032 Games. Can you please update the Chamber on more details on this important project for the sustainable future of our Games and the city?

Chair: DEPUTY MAYOR.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair, and thank you, Councillor HUTTON. This is an incredibly important plan for so many reasons. Not only will this plan go a long way to alleviate some of the housing pressures currently experienced in Brisbane, but perhaps most importantly, it will set the tone of direction for the next chapter of our city’s evolution as an Olympic and Paralympic City, and as a global destination worthy of this title. We are leading into what will be the most important decade in Brisbane’s history. We have the momentum. The time is right to think strategically and ensure that opportunities like the Kurilpa precinct are leveraged to deliver the greatest possible legacy for our city and community.

When you look back at previous host cities like London and, in particular, Barcelona, urban renewal was arguably the biggest positive legacy achievement to come from their Games. With similar characteristics to Brisbane, what was once an industrial heavy city, Barcelona used the Olympic Games to ignite major transformations of the city’s economy, its urban landscape, global brand and identity. They used a similar model to us for the Games, where the venues and facilities were spread all around the city and the region, which became an integral part of their larger urban renewal plan. Barcelona grew new communities on the seafront and transformed former industrial sites—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Excuse me, Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN.

DEPUTY MAYOR: —into thriving innovation hubs. New transport systems connected the cities and regions, and the creation of superblocks models that is now mirrored right across the world as a way to reclaim public space and create walkable, green and vibrant lifestyle precincts. These are all inspiring achievements we can look to when we think about the possibilities for Brisbane over the next decade and beyond and the Kurilpa precinct ticks all the right boxes. It has a long history of industrial activity, but it’s naturally and gradually evolved as the city has grown. Technology has changed and major industry has relocated out towards the port and the fringes of the city. With around a third of the Kurilpa precinct still occupied by heavy industrial uses, such as a glass factory, concrete batching, and a milk factory, this area holds enormous potential for renewal and growth.

Just like Teneriffe and Newstead have been turned from industrial and commercial areas into some of Brisbane’s most popular places to live and visit, we are confident these changes will do similar for the Kurilpa precinct. Today, we’ve released the precinct investigation area map and identified the key focus areas for what will become Brisbane’s most sustainable precinct. Using the previous neighbourhood planning framework as a starting point, the precinct investigation area has picked up on locations that are most appropriate for renewal and growth, including the Kurilpa, Riverside North, and parts of Musgrave precinct. Unlocking CBD-style heights for residential buildings in this precinct will help meet demand, particularly, among younger people who we know are eager to live in this part of inner Brisbane.

We’ll be looking forward to encouraging a greater variety of housing types, including build-to-rent, keyworker accommodation, to make sure there’s a level of affordability for these residents. Universal housing standards will also be explored to ensure housing meets the needs of people at different ages and abilities over their lifetime. Of course, design excellence and green building principles for sustainable development will be the absolutely new basic standard—

*Councillor interjecting.*

DEPUTY MAYOR: —not only applying to buildings, but also, and perhaps more importantly, to the public realm and the places in between. The Kurilpa precinct has the potential to become the most walkable and sustainable precinct in Brisbane. Tree-lined boulevards, laneways, shady public plazas will connect these spaces and places and turn them into a subtropical haven. Building on the existing public and active transport networks will not only reduce car dependency in the precinct, but it will also rejuvenate this part of the city into a modern and vibrant destination.

We’ve known since the late 1800s, South Brisbane has been the location of those industrial uses, and we’ve seen the city grow and technology change and move these industries out, and people moving in to play and stay, as the centre of one of our most popular major district recreation parks, as well. We need to make sure that we plan it carefully, and at only 500 metres from the city centre, this is a perfect place, an exceptional public and active transport connectivity, to see the growth of this area for the decade to come and the decades beyond. It’s an exciting opportunity to design and shape what could be the most transformational plan in Brisbane’s history, and I look forward to keeping the Chamber updated.

Chair: Thank you.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair.

Chair: Further questions?

 Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN.

**Question 4**

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Thanks, Chair. My question is to the LORD MAYOR.

 LORD MAYOR, putting aside the debate about what building height limits are appropriate in different neighbourhoods and exactly how many more dwellings we need to zone for in the suburb of South Brisbane, it’s clear that the 4101 postcode will need additional schooling capacity over the coming decades, and currently, there are no sites identified for new public schools or primary schools within the inner southside catchment. Obviously, the State Government’s responsible for delivering schools, but your Administration is directly responsible for zoning for different land uses, including land for community purposes such as education.

My question to you is, if you want tens of thousands more people to live in South Brisbane, in addition to the tens of thousands who are already going to be moving in based on existing zoning, where will you find the flood-free land for additional primary and high schools, and what steps are you taking to plan for this need?

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Well, this is a question that Jackie Trad would be able to answer if she was still the Member for that area—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —if we didn’t have a Green MP (Member of Parliament) for the local area that can deliver nothing and oppose everything, we would actually have a Member that actually delivers new schools, because that’s what Jackie Trad did. We’ve all seen the evidence there at Dutton Park. She actually built a new school. So, I think the real question is, what is the State Government going to do when it comes to delivering new schools now that Jackie Trad is not there in that local area to stand up for the area?

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: My question was very clearly about what is the Council doing to identify land for the new schools, which is a Council responsibility.

Chair: Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN, I don’t uphold your point of order. The LORD MAYOR is relevant to the question.

LORD MAYOR: Well, apparently we’re responsible for new schools now, according to Councillor SRI. Look, the State Government, if they—

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Claim to be misrepresented.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Okay, noted.

LORD MAYOR: What I can tell you is this, as a local Councillor in the past and working on a number of iterations of the plan for Rochedale, it was actually the State Government that decided whether they need new schools in a place like Rochedale. Guess what they decided? They didn’t need new schools. They actually wanted to cram more people into the existing schools without providing—

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —any new facilities or infrastructure. Now, that is their decision, just like it’ll be their decision in the Kurilpa precinct. We stand ready and willing to work with the State Government to identify what they see as the needs for the area, but I don’t hold a lot of hope given that Jackie Trad is no longer there and they’ve got a Member that really can’t deliver anything and just opposes everything. So, I think the people of Kurilpa should be concerned about the lack of real representation that they have at the State level. We knew this wouldn’t happen if Jackie Trad was there because she built new schools. We saw the Labor Government building not only a new school at Dutton Park, but also in Fortitude Valley, as well, so they can deliver it if they want to. They’ve demonstrated they can. Let’s see what they do when it comes to Kurilpa.

Chair: I’ll take your claim of misrepresentation.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Thanks, Chair.

 The LORD MAYOR said that I was saying that it was the Council’s responsibility to deliver new schools, which is not what I said. I said it’s the Council’s responsibility to zone appropriately—to set aside land for educational purposes.

Chair: Further questions?

Councillor ATWOOD.

**Question 5**

Councillor ATWOOD: Thank you, Chair. My question is to the Chair of the Finance and City Governance Committee, Councillor CUNNINGHAM.

 Councillor CUNNINGHAM, last week, we heard another Labor lie, this time from Councillor COOK, when it comes to the representation of women on boards. Can you please update the Chamber on how mischievous Labor’s only female Councillor is?

Chair: Councillor CUNNINGHAM.

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: Thank you, Mr Chair, and I thank you, Councillor ATWOOD, for the question. Councillor ATWOOD, Mr Chair, is of course one of the 10 proud female LNP Councillors making up 50% of Team Schrinner in this Chamber. The sisterhood is very real in the LNP in this place and I’m proud to be part of it, Mr Chair. When it comes to our Civic Cabinet, we go one step further though. Women outnumber—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: As I was saying, Mr Chair, women outnumber men on the LORD MAYOR’s Civic Cabinet with 55% representation, so when we talk about a gender‑balanced cabinet, we’re actually underestimating the female contribution. Female representation in the current State Cabinet, for the record, is 44% as a comparison. It doesn’t stop with the political leadership of the Council, though, when it comes to these strong female leaders. Brisbane City Council as an organisation is also leading the way. As the LORD MAYOR and Councillor MURPHY announced last week, we look forward to welcoming our new head of Transport for Brisbane in coming weeks. This means that we will see half of Brisbane City Council’s six divisions led by women and half by men.

Our commitment to elevating women also extends to our wholly-owned companies. Our City of Brisbane Investment Corporation is led by a duo of talented women in the roles of CEO and Chair of the Board. The same can be said for the Brisbane Powerhouse. We also have female CEOs for the Brisbane Sustainability Agency and the Museum of Brisbane. Across Council’s active subsidiary companies, women make up half of all the board positions. We don’t need politically-motivated motions to get results, Mr Chair. Our internal employee group, BrisWomen Alliance, supports and champions women in leadership and other underrepresented paths, such as science, technology, engineering, mathematics, and women in technical disciplines such as trades.

Last week, the BrisWomen Alliance hosted a series of International Women’s Day events across our field and office-based workplaces. As part of these activities, a number of female staff shared their stories. I won’t name them individually, but I would like to take a moment to read some of their words that they shared for International Women’s Day. A senior engineer in Council said that, ‘she has always felt supported by her colleagues and managers to challenge herself and provide opportunities for career development in the male-dominated fields of civil and geotechnical engineering and construction’. Another shared that her hope for future generations is that, ‘women will not have to face discrimination because of an aspect of themselves that they cannot change’.

At Council, we offer a safe and supportive work environment where our employees have access to flexible working arrangements, generous leave entitlements, inclusive of parental leave options. This LORD MAYOR, Mr Chair, is also championing women in business, and introduced a new grant program specifically to support greater gender diversity in our business community. Brisbane is one of the most progressive, small-business-friendly cities in Australia, and we want to support people with great ideas no matter of their background, their age, or their gender. Our DEPUTY MAYOR, Krista ADAMS, has been working closely with the LORD MAYOR on this important initiative.

Part of our responsibility as being the most small-business-friendly city in Australia is making sure that female business owners have the tools and the support that they need to grow, evolve and thrive. Eight-one per cent of all the businesses supported by grants this year are wholly owned by women, and that’s fantastic to see. When we talk about embracing equity, what better example could there be than providing a step up for these female entrepreneurs of our city? That’s the difference, Mr Chair, between our approach and the approach of those opposite. The Opposition measure their success through virtue signalling and political stunts, but Team Schrinner is firmly focused on the outcomes. We’re focused on removing the biases and rewarding meritorious people which are representative of our society.

When it comes to the views of those opposite, they may say that they support women, but we are actually walking the talk when it comes to truly embracing equity, and we won’t be receiving a lecture from that team with just one female representative.

Chair: Thank you.

Further questions?

Councillor CASSIDY.

**Question 6**

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair. My question is to the LORD MAYOR.

 LORD MAYOR, whether you like it or not, you will forever be known as the LNP Mayor who cut kerbside collection, a vital service for Brisbane residents. The LNP laugh about that. Will you commit to never cutting kerbside collection again, LORD MAYOR?

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Absolutely, and I’m absolutely proud that we are able to bring back kerbside collection earlier than anticipated, because Councillor CASSIDY likes to talk about cuts to services, which is just part of his political spin, but what happened here was a pause on services. I announced that that pause would be for a period of two years while we dealt with the challenges of the pandemic and the significant extra costs of the pandemic. We are able to bring it back after just one year, so a year earlier than anticipated, and so we are very proud of our ability and record of bringing back that service earlier.

So, we will continue to offer this service, and if Councillor CASSIDY has taken the time to read the Council documents today, he will in fact see that we are locking in a new contract for kerbside collection, a contract that not only has a four-year period, but also an option for a further extension. So I can absolutely say we are committed to kerbside collection. I would ask simply the same question of Labor, because we know that their commitment when it comes to basic services has been lagging. Their commitment even to guarantee that the red-top bin will be collected every week is lagging, and so I think the real question should be to Labor.

Our record is clear. We had to pause the service. We brought it back early. We are committed to it, and not only are we bringing it back or did we bring it back, we’re investing more in it than ever before. Thank you, Mr Chair.

Chair: Further questions?

Councillor MACKAY.

**Question 7**

Councillor MACKAY: Thank you, Chair. My question is to the Chair of the Environment, Parks and Sustainability Committee, Councillor DAVIS.

 Councillor DAVIS. Recently we heard the Councillor for Deagon serve up some absolute porkies about the state of public barbecues in Brisbane. Can you please set the record straight on the Schrinner Council’s investment in barbecues in Brisbane parks?

Chair: Councillor DAVIS.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor DAVIS: Well, thank you, Mr Chair, and through you. I’d like to thank Councillor MACKAY for the question. I’ve heard, Councillor MACKAY, that you are quite the proficient in the art of a great Australian barbecue. To Councillor MACKAY’s question, Mr Chair, this is something that needs correcting the record on, because Councillor CASSIDY has come into this Chamber and cooked up some absolute tripe, this time about there being fewer barbecues now than there were in 1973. Once again, we see how Councillor CASSIDY and the Labor Party are more interested in political spin than with the facts, because when confronted with the facts, Mr Chair, Councillor CASSIDY’s strategy hits a bit of a snag.

There are, in fact, 734 barbecues and over 1,000 cooking plates in our parks across the city, and this number is going up, not down. In 2014, there were 552 barbecues. In 2019, there were 677. Now, there’s 734. That is 182 new barbecues installed in Brisbane parks in under 10 years. In fact, there are now 612 electric barbecues, more than there were of any type 10 years ago. Mr Chair, even my grandson in Prep knows that 734 is a bigger number than 552. It is basic arithmetic. It is incredible that those opposite think that they can run a $3.4 billion budget. I wouldn’t trust them with a basic sausage sizzle.

Mr Chair, Councillor CASSIDY’s claims are totally fried. I’m curious to know where he is getting his information from. Maybe he has a magic set of tongs that he waved around to tell him how many barbecues we had in our parks since 1973, because back in 1973, we didn’t have Excel spreadsheets, SAP datasets, nor our online Find a Barbecue tool. I certainly haven’t seen Councillor CASSIDY up there in Brisbane Square inspecting Council asset records from 50 years ago. He’s either misinformed or, more likely, he’s just made this up. What else has he made up? Well, it’s clear he hasn’t read the proposed policy amendment to the planning scheme for our desired standard of service in parks, which is what we got—which, in fact, is what got him all fired up in the first place.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor DAVIS: He seems to think that this minor administrative policy change will be the end of the great Australian barbecue tradition. It is ludicrous and it is wrong. What these amendments actually do is allow Council to consider other kinds of barbecues at sites where only woodfire barbecues are permitted under old and outdated standards. We still have 85 woodfire barbecues in our parks—in fact, I have one in my local park—but once those assets reach end-of-life, we will consider more modern solutions for replacing them. This is because we know residents far prefer the convenience of modern electric barbecues.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor DAVIS: No mess, no stinky smoke, and no splinters from lugging logs around just to enjoy a great Aussie tradition. Electric barbecues are safer, they’re cleaner, they’re greener, and they’re more practical. They are infinitely easier to use and maintain. It’s what residents want, and it’s as simple as that. I wonder if Labor’s—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, please. Stop—

Councillor DAVIS: —record can stand up to a bit of a grilling, Mr Chair.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor DAVIS: Since Councillor CASSIDY can apparently remember back to 1973, I’m surprised he doesn’t remember back to 2021 when Labor was complaining that we weren’t getting rid of woodfire barbecues fast enough. That’s right. Councillor STRUNK was in the media begging the LORD MAYOR to, and I quote, ‘bring these barbecues into the 21st century’. He said that many of the woodfire barbecues were so ancient, or because of fire bans, you could hardly use them anyway. He rightly pointed out modern electric barbecues were far preferred. I have great news for Councillor STRUNK, thanks to these policy amendments, we’ll be able to deliver even more electric barbecues across Brisbane parks.

So, what is exactly Labor’s position on this? Because they’ve flipped on it more times than I flip rissoles on my barbecue. Do they want more wood fire barbecues or less? Should we stop replacing them or should we do it faster? None of this would be surprising, Mr Chair, because I had a quick look at the records that we do have, and I can tell you that there are 46 barbecues in the Deagon Ward. Of these, only one, just one, can Councillor CASSIDY claim credit for supporting under the Deagon Suburban Enhancement Fund (SEF). For someone apparently so passionate about protecting this great Australian tradition—

Chair: Councillor DAVIS—

Councillor DAVIS: —I don’t think Councillor CASSIDY is giving residents—

Chair: —the flame on this question has expired.

Councillor DAVIS: —a fair shake of the sauce bottle.

Chair: Further questions?

Councillor CASSIDY.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY.

**Question 8**

Councillor CASSIDY: Oh, thanks very much, Chair. My question is to the LORD MAYOR.

 LORD MAYOR, on the other side of the Pine River, the Mayor of the Moreton Bay Regional Council, Peter Flannery, had this to say about housing, and this is his quote, ‘we know we have to contribute on this issue, not just point the finger at another level of government to resolve this problem’. Meanwhile, you said, and this is your quote, ‘we already do enough, it’s the State Government’s problem’. Now, while I don’t always agree with Mayor Flannery’s politics, it’s clear that from this quote and their region’s comprehensive housing strategy and support for social and affordable housing that they’re willing to do everything they can to ease housing pressures. LORD MAYOR, are you embarrassed to be constantly shown up by neighbouring Mayors?

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Well, it’s interesting. We saw Councillor CASSIDY criticising our sustainable growth strategy the other week before he had actually read the document. On the same day that we released our citywide housing strategy, Councillor CASSIDY was calling for a citywide housing strategy, not realising that there was more to the picture than just Kurilpa. Kurilpa is obviously part of the solution and a good part of it, but it was very much a thorough citywide strategy, but it was a sustainable one. If Councillor CASSIDY had have read the document, and I still am not convinced he has read the document, he would’ve seen this issue covered, quite importantly, because what we see here is a challenge when it comes to taxpayer-funded incentives for affordable housing. When I tell you what it is, you’ll instantly click about what the challenge is.

 At the moment, there is no legal mechanism that Council has available to it when incentives are provided for affordable housing to ensure that that housing stays affordable. Do you think this might be a bit of a problem? Do you think it might be okay to throw money into affordable housing when a developer can pocket that money and then sell that same housing on the private market shortly later? Do you think that might be an inappropriate use of ratepayer funds? Because that is the situation exactly that we are facing right now, and that’s why part of our strategy in the sustainable growth strategy is to advocate and work with the State Government to get legislative change, so that if an affordable place gets incentives for affordable housing, that it stays affordable.

This is why we’ve particularly supported build-to-rent housing, because we know that the ownership model of build-to-rent is longer term. This is not build-to-sell. This is not a developer building something and then trying to sell it off as quickly as possible. These are institutions and large organisations who want to retain ownership of this for the longer term, and that’s why we are putting incentives into build-to-rent. It’s also why we currently—and Councillor CASSIDY is obviously not aware of this, as well—we currently provide significant support and discounts for community organisations and not-for-profits that are building and holding onto affordable or social housing.

That includes organisations like Brisbane Housing Company, who retain ownership of these places on the long term. We support them already by providing infrastructure charges discounts of up to 75% and a 50% discount on their DA (development application) fees. We do that now. We have been doing it for years. We certainly didn’t need Councillor CASSIDY, who suddenly has taken an interest in this issue in recent times. We’ve been doing it for the long term. What Councillor CASSIDY is advocating is throwing money at a problem when there’s no way of ensuring that the housing that is generated stays affordable. That is highly irresponsible. That is a massive problem when it comes to the responsible use of ratepayer dollars.

We will certainly provide incentives where we can be sure that those incentives will deliver outcomes, and where those incentives, particularly when it comes to more or affordable housing, will be long lasting, where there’s longer ownership models such as community housing providers. We provide them with incentives right now. We are introducing incentives for build-to-rent so that we can provide more affordable housing on a longer term basis. What Councillor CASSIDY is calling for shows that he does not understand this complex issue. He has no idea about this complex issue. I would be embarrassed to ask a question like that without first having read the *Brisbane’s Sustainable Growth Strategy*.

Chair: Further questions?

Councillor TOOMEY.

**Question 9**

Councillor TOOMEY: Thanks, Chair. My question is to the Chair—oh, sorry, my question is to the Chair of the Transport Committee, Councillor MURPHY.

 This Council was a leader when it came to facilitating the introduction of e‑scooters in Australia. With the uptake of e-scooters continually increasing in Brisbane, can you please update the Chamber on the success of this new form of transport?

Chair: Councillor MURPHY.

Councillor MURPHY: Thank you, Mr Chair, and through you to Councillor TOOMEY for the question. As Councillor TOOMEY hinted at in his question, Brisbane was the first city in Australia to have an e-mobility strategy. In fact, we were one of the first cities in the world to have an e-mobility strategy. That’s evidence of just how committed this Schrinner Council is to reducing traffic congestion and to making transport more flexible and environmentally sustainable in our city. Remember five years ago, when it was this LORD MAYOR, Adrian SCHRINNER, who introduced the first public e-scooter hire scheme to Australia when he was the then Public and Active Transport Chair. Many people said he would fail, but he and the city’s scheme has succeeded beyond our wildest expectations, Mr Chair.

Just last month, we reached the incredible milestone of 10 million e-scooter trips since the trial started in November 2018. That’s right, Councillors, 10 million trips. Since 2018, the Blue CityGlider, which is, as you know, one of our city’s most popular bus routes, has carried almost exactly the same number of passengers, 10 million passengers. That goes to show just how embedded e-mobility has become in our city. Let’s not forget, when CityCycle ended in 2021, it had accumulated just four million trips across the 11 years that it operated. By comparison, our shared e-mobility scheme, there have been 3.4 million e-scooter trips last year alone and over 600,000 since 1 January this year.

As a matter of fact, Mr Chair, we’ve observed a steady increase in the use of e-scooters by Brisbane residents and visitors. Following the first trial in late 2018, numbers have showed a total of over 1.9 million and 2.4 million e‑scooter trips in 2019 and 2021 respectively. That represents an incredible increase of almost 44% since 2019. What if we could get a 44% increase in public transport use in three years, or what if we could get a 44% increase in cycling? That is an extremely impressive number, Mr Chair. No other mode of transport has grown in Brisbane as quickly as e-mobility, and it’s this side of the Chamber that has made that a reality.

With the expansion of e-mobility in our city, Council has continued to work with our operators to ensure the safe, responsible and practical implementation of our strategy. Council is also increasing accessibility by extending the shared e-scooter schemes into areas outside the CBD. After a 12-month trial, the bayside area now has a permanent e-scooter service available for residents and visitors to enjoy this beautiful part of Brisbane. We’re currently rolling out two other trials that aim in connecting residents to public transport hubs without the need for their car for short trips.

The First Mile Last Mile Trial aims to connect residents to Buranda, Greenslopes and Holland Park West busway stations. We’ve also started a trial in Bulimba and Hawthorne to connect residents to Morningside and Norman Park train stations and the Bulimba and Hawthorne ferry terminals. We also have a Safe Night precinct trial, which has been ongoing since December 2021, which runs in the CBD and Fortitude Valley areas from midnight until 5am on Friday and Saturday nights. Users are not able to unlock e-scooters to commence a trip during this time. Riders can, of course, end a trip in the Safe Night precinct zone with a speed limit of just 15 kilometres an hour.

Last week, we saw that the Jamieson Trauma Institute released a new report on e-scooter incidents. It’s important to remind the Chamber that their data concerns only private e-scooters and it shows more crashes are happening on the morning commute to work, about 36%, with about 58% of them occurring between Tuesday and Thursday. Several people who were surveyed said that they had their e-scooter modified to go above the 25 kilometre an hour speed limit, which of course only private e-scooters can do. Under our agreement with operators and following the State’s new regulations in November 2022, the shared e-scooters do not go above 12 kilometres an hour on footpaths through a geofencing technology, which we’ve implemented with Beam and Neuron.

Our trials and our e-mobility strategy, of course, only apply to shared e‑scooters, not the private ones. As much as Council works hard to improve safety for riders and pedestrians, we still need the State Government and the Federal Government to regulate the ever-growing problems with private e‑scooters. As we committed to in our strategy, Mr Chair, we’ve also provided another improvement to riders using our shared e-scooters which is, of course, CityLink Cycleway, which is the dedicated path which we set up for cyclists, but which ironically has been used far more by e-scooter users in our city. We are consistently working with our operators to enhance the scheme to provide more to see and do, more offerings for tourists in Brisbane when they visit here and, of course, alternative ways to get people out of cars—

Chair: Thank you, Councillor MURPHY.

Councillor MURPHY: —and into active transport.

Chair: Your time has expired.

 That ends Question Time for today.

 LORD MAYOR, Establishment and Coordination Committee (E&C) report of 6 March 2023, please.

## CONSIDERATION OF COMMITTEE REPORTS:

### ESTABLISHMENT AND COORDINATION COMMITTEE

The Right Honourable, the LORD MAYOR (Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER), Chair of the Establishment and Coordination Committee, moved, seconded by the DEPUTY MAYOR (Councillor Krista ADAMS), that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 6 March 2023, be adopted.

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Just before I move on to other issues, I wanted to just table the letter I referred to earlier, which was Minister Bailey’s response of 24 July 2020, where he declined to be involved in the north west transport network study and said he would do his own study.

Mr Chair, last night and tonight, all of our assets are lit up in yellow to support Endometriosis Awareness Month. The annual endo enlightenment campaign raises awareness of endometriosis and provides a public demonstration of hope and support for the one in nine women who suffer from this disease.

Tomorrow night, City Hall, Sandgate Town Hall will be lit up in blue, pink and purple to celebrate the Brisbane Cycling Festival. The cycling festival runs from 15 March through to 16 April. The Brisbane Showgrounds will be hosting a free pop-up event to welcome riders and spectators alike.

Also tomorrow night, the Story Bridge, Victoria Bridge and Reddacliff Place will be lit up in blue, white and red for the Brisbane French Film Festival. This is the largest foreign film festival in Queensland, it usually attracts more than 17,000 spectators with 40 films, 460 different screenings, masterclasses and panel discussions with industry professionals.

This Friday is officially St. Patrick’s Day, and even though we had the parade on the weekend, we’re again lighting the assets up in green. I would say, as well, that just last night at the Citizenship Ceremony we had here at City Hall, we had the coordinator of the St. Patrick’s Day Parade—was Fiona Hodges, who became an Australian citizen. After many years of coordinating the St. Patrick’s Day Parade, she did the right thing and became an Australian citizen, so it was cause for celebration.

On Saturday night, the Brisbane City Hall will be lit up in red to support what, Councillor LANDERS? Dance for Daniel, which is the major fundraising event for the Daniel Morcombe Foundation, I know which Councillor LANDERS and other Councillors in this place actively support.

Over the weekend, I was joined by Councillor LANDERS at the Carseldine Bunnings and, you know, it’s not like I need an excuse to go to Bunnings, but there was a good one this time and it wasn’t a wood‑fired sausage, Councillor DAVIS. It was, in fact, to let more residents know about our compost rebate program. This program, which we are very proud of and very committed to, has already been taken up by 11,500 residents across the city. This program is one that provides a rebate of up to $70 for residents to be reimbursed towards composting equipment or worm farms.

We’ve invested more than $790,000 in the program since it was first introduced, or since I first introduced it in 2020. One of the great things about it is that it’s not just available for property owners. It’s available to renters, as well, and so renters can get access to this program. It also—

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Will the Mayor take a quick question about the compost program?

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

LORD MAYOR: I think it is also available to people that live on houseboats, as well. I’ve just clarified that.

Chair: I think that’s no to the—

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Wasn’t going to be the question, but—

LORD MAYOR: Yes, I’m happy to take a—

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Yes, just a quick one. Thank you.

Chair: Okay, righto. Well, if you—LORD MAYOR, if you want to take the question, then—

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Yes. Love the program, think it’s great. Did you—I was wondering why you thought it hadn’t had faster take-up and whether you think the initial signup process, where initially you had to watch a video and then watch another educational video before you could get the rebate, do you think that was one of the reasons it was a bit slow on the uptake, and is that why you’ve taken that requirement away now?

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Look, we’re keen for more people to have access to it, and we do want to make it simpler. That’s one of the—you know, we’re always listening to feedback. That’s one of the things that we’re constantly taking onboard. Having said that, I mean, obviously, this is ratepayers’ money that’s been invested, so there does need to be a process in place, but we wanted to make it simpler and we do want more people to take advantage of it. All Councillors in this Chamber can help by getting the word out to their residents and see this program grow and grow over the years. Thank you for your support, Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN, and I do ask for other Councillors to get onboard and support and promote this program. Like many Council programs, you know, it is one thing that some people know about, but the more people that know about it, the better because we can get the message out to other residents.

One final thing that I just wanted to point out about this program is that, when we talk about large-scale composting programs or food and organic waste programs, they do involve large facilities and they do involve trucking material around the city, and so it is actually an environmental benefit for people, if they can, to use this material on their own properties. Obviously, there’s great benefits to that happening as opposed to trucking it around the city. I’m not saying that we shouldn’t truck it around the city or that we shouldn’t continue to roll out our food and organic waste pilot because we are committed to that, but if people can use this on their own properties, that is a wonderful thing and something that we should certainly encourage.

The other thing I would point out is that people in apartments and townhouses can also get access to this, as well, and so there’s the ability for different sizes of composting equipment or worm farms. Some of those are very large scale, but some are more suitable to people living in in smaller households or apartments. There’s something for everyone in this program.

Item A, Mr Chair, is the Stores Board submission, which is the post-market submission for the kerbside large items collection and recycling service. This was referred to earlier. On 5 November, we went out to tender seeking a supplier for our annual kerbside collection. The tenders closed in February last year and, obviously, we’ve been through a process of evaluation and assessment and negotiation to get the best possible outcome. Look, one of the things that is reflected in this tender is that, like pretty much anything at the moment, there are cost pressures on any kind of contracts because we know that there’s pressures on materials, supplies and labour, there’s pressures on a whole range of different inputs into contracts.

The other pressure on this one, as well, is that we have seen an increase in the volume of material coming through. Now, whether that’s a temporary increase or a more permanent one, only time will tell. It could be part of the post-COVID-19 cleanout phenomena, where the year of the pause or, in fact, the fact that people are spending a bit more time at home or were spending a bit more time at home has caused them to or prompted them to do more cleaning out and more tidying up. Maybe it was that their home office or particular rooms in the house had to be cleaned out for them to use it in those work from home periods. We don’t know. Only time will tell, but we have seen an increase in the tonnage of material that people are putting out.

We’re obviously acknowledging this going forward, that it is likely to require increase in funding. We are budgeting that increase in funding, but obviously, if the volumes turn out to be less than what is predicted, then the cost of the contract will come down. This is a contract that is very much based on volume, and so if in the future people are putting less out on the kerbside, or if there is more being taken by the urban recyclers, then the cost of this contract comes down accordingly.

The submission today recommends Curbside Services Pty Ltd as the preferred tenderer for Brisbane’s kerbside collection service. The new contract includes an initial term of four years commencing on 1 July this year, with an option to extend for an additional period of up to four years. I did say earlier that we are committed to retaining this service for the long term and that it was only paused for one year, but the ongoing commitment remains and that is a permanent commitment, so just reaffirm that.

Item B, the adoption of the Local Law Making Procedure. Council has the authority to make and enforce local laws that are necessary for the good rule and local government of Brisbane. Section 30 of the City of Brisbane Act (COBA) allows Council to decide its own process for making a local law, noting that this cannot be inconsistent with the Act. Council adopted its current law making procedure in 2010 and it has not been amended since then. In that time, the City of Brisbane Act and City of Brisbane Regulation have been amended, such that amendments to the procedure are needed to ensure consistency and alignment.

I would point out that where an amendment to the City of Brisbane Act or a Regulation occurs, we step in to effectively adopt that change as soon as possible. However, there is a need to update our policy to reflect that change. We have been operating in accordance with the Act, we will continue to operate in accordance with the Act and the Regulation, but there is a need to update the policy to reflect changes that we make. The scope was also for other general improvements to the procedure, as well, and of greatest importance is the extension to the period of consultation.

Chair: LORD MAYOR, your time has expired.

**464/2022-23**

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

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you to Mr Chair and thank you to the Councillors.

 I was just pointing out of greatest importance is the extension of the period of public consultation so that it aligns with the State interest check consultation period of 20 business days, and that provides for additional consultation on a proposed local law where significant amendments are proposed as the result of initial public and internal consultation. So, those the reasons for this change. I guess the most important change from a public point of view is that increase in the—or the extension in the public consultation period. Thank you, Mr Chair.

Chair: Thank you.

Further debate?

Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair. I speak on both these items now—I will—

**Seriatim – Clause B**

|  |
| --- |
| Councillor Jared CASSIDY requested that Clause B, ADOPTION OF THE LOCAL LAW MAKING PROCEDURE, be taken seriatim for voting purposes. |

Councillor CASSIDY: Listening to the LORD MAYOR, it’s pretty clear he doesn’t have a very strong commitment to waste reduction, in listening to what he just said then, that he’s spent the same amount on organic waste reduction as he’s spent on his Metro visitor information centre, which gets about a dozen visitors a week. That’s all he’s spent on organic waste reduction. So, instead of investing in a full FOGO (food organics garden organics) scheme like 140 other councils around Australia, 25% of councils—it’s doubled in the last two years—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: —doubled in the last two years—

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

Councillor CASSIDY: —the amount of councils that have gotten serious about reducing their organic waste and gotten serious about addressing climate change, but we’ve got a denier over here. We’ve got a denier sitting in the LORD MAYOR’s chair, and that’s very sad for the people of Brisbane. He’s greenwashing with a few buckets. He hands out a few buckets with a $70 rebate, but he won’t get serious about tackling climate change at a citywide level and won’t get serious about reducing organic waste at a citywide level. How sad that is for Brisbane. We know his commitment to general waste isn’t much better either, because we know that the previous contract, he says, trust him. He says trust him about this kerbside collection contract because, you know, he’s bringing in for four years and how could he possibly cut it?

Well, he did. He did cut it. He prioritised himself. He prioritised his advertising budget, his inner city projects over suburban services during the pandemic. It bit him on the bum, Chair, because I accessed the same polling that he put out in the field. I did that file call and I saw the community sentiment around basic services, the spike in the number of people who said they’re not getting good value for money in the suburbs from this LNP Administration, the spike in the number of people who are saying this LNP Administration is not delivering waste services very well in the suburbs of Brisbane, coincided with the time that he cut kerbside collection.

So, he didn’t want to bring it back, but he got a bit scared. He got scared of the community campaign that was gearing up in LNP wards right around Brisbane to demand better from this LNP Council, to demand value for money. They were seeing their rates increase each and every year to the highest levels on record. Residents were seeing debt increase to the highest levels on record here in Brisbane. What were they getting for it? An LNP LORD MAYOR that was cutting basic services out in the suburbs of Brisbane, an LNP Mayor that cut kerbside collection at the drop of a hat to continue to fund his own waste and mismanagement here in the inner city of Brisbane. So, we certainly hope we don’t see more cuts like that, but under this LNP Mayor nothing is guaranteed.

When you look at the level of service that is required, I’m not sure if he’s—he said earlier that he’s increasing funding, as if he’s increasing the amount of service. We’re not seeing that. We’re seeing an increase in funding because costs are going up and he seems perplexed as to what’s happened over the last few years. He’s listed a few of those in some of those costs going up and labour shortages, but also there’s a whole lot more people living in Brisbane now. One of those key issues with increasing population we have in Brisbane is the provision of infrastructure in our suburbs and the provision of services in our suburbs.

If he’s already complaining about the price of these contracts going up, we worry that at some point in the future when he needs to build another metro information centre or a green bridge information centre, or $14 billion toll tunnel information centre, that he’ll cut kerbside collection at the drop of a hat because he has a track record. This LNP Mayor has a track record in cutting community services. What is required is 41 weeks of the year of kerbside collection, which sounds like fairly ongoing basic waste collection to me.

The LNP tried to make the argument a few years ago that this was just a one‑off, little project that happened once a year. Well, in fact, it happens 80% of the year. That is day-to-day, ongoing, basic work of Council, and that should absolutely be the sort of work that we need to look at in comparing the level of service, the cost to the ratepayers of Brisbane of externalising that kind of work, or whether that’s appropriate to be brought in-house, and I think those comparisons should be made.

Today we’ll be supporting this item because we, of course, support kerbside collection, but we wouldn’t trust the LORD MAYOR as far as we could throw him, which brings me to Clause B. He’s given half an explanation as to what’s changed in the local law making procedure. He said that it’s, you know, been 12 years since the City of Brisbane Act was changed and he assured us that all of the local laws that have been brought through this place were done in the appropriate way. It just happened that the procedure which needed to be followed to make sure those local laws are legal was wrong and it was out of date, but apparently we are to trust him on this.

I mean, either it’s really sloppiness on this 20-year-old LNP Council’s part where, you know, they have taken their eye off the ball—we see that at E&C meetings. They go for 20 or 30 minutes. Nothing’s ever discussed outside of what’s put on the table in front of them or something’s gone wrong. City Legal has said, there’s a serious problem here. Your procedures aren’t right. We’re not sure, we’re not sure whether any local laws that have come through this place in the last decade have any problems with them. There’s no real explanation as to why this is being brought here today.

The LORD MAYOR said that there were some aspects of this which had to align with changes made to the City of Brisbane Act. Then, there were some other aspects and some other changes that were being made that don’t necessarily relate to changes in the City of Brisbane Act, but what’s been given to us in the papers today doesn’t make that clear. The LORD MAYOR didn’t make that clear, either. What we have come to expect from this LNP Administration is not much detail when it comes to process. You know, again, it’s once bitten, twice shy with this LNP Administration. We won’t be supporting the Local Law Making procedure without further information.

Chair: Thank you.

Further debate?

Councillor MARX.

Councillor MARX: Yes, thank you, Mr Chair. I rise to speak on item A, the post-market for kerbside large item collection and recycling service.

 This annual citywide service collects sizable unwanted household items that are too big for wheely bins, allowing residents to do their spring clean or the Marie Kondo declutter of their homes, with the peace of mind that Council will collect it from the kerbside. Residents can refer to the website or the bin app to find their suburb’s located week so that they can make plans in advance. Please ensure, though, when you are planning to put anything out, make sure you don’t put it out ‘til the weekend before your Monday start date. That does lead to problems of illegal dumping, which can be a problem across the city, as we know.

The item before you today ensures the continuation of this service over the next four years. During this contract period, the kerbside collection services was not immune to the impact that COVID-19 would bring to the community. However, I would like to thank the residents of Brisbane for their patience and understanding during this time. As has been repeated many times here, the LORD MAYOR made the difficult decision to pause this service for two years to enable the funds to be redirected to local businesses and other parts of the city. However, he was able to bring it back 12 months early, so in actual fact, residents only missed the one year. It’s also important to highlight Operation Collect and the outstanding work undertaken to help residents recover from the impact of the February 2022 flood event.

As Australia’s most small-business-friendly Council, we are reaffirming our support for local business and jobs today because the network to run the service goes beyond the roles involved with collecting the material, but the future ability to work with Council’s treasure troves and benefactors of the recovered materials. In addition to the annual kerbside collection service, all households also receive free waste vouchers, giving residents 10 free trips to the tip and helping residents save up to $127 a year. Residents, as we also know, can also donate urban—sorry, household items in reusable condition to friends or family or a local charity or other reuse and recycling organisations.

I noticed the LORD MAYOR also in his speech mentioned urban recyclers and they are a much loved part of the community and the kerbside collection. Urban recyclers are those who choose to go out to the community suburbs, wherever the kerbside collection is happening. They will gather anything that they can find that they can feel that they can reuse again, and that is something that is completely acceptable to Council. We do ask, of course, that people who do that are mindful and respectful of the homeowners, and don’t leave the place a bigger mess than what they potentially found it.

I know also Councillor CASSIDY—through you, Mr Chair—talked about the LORD MAYOR not having any real commitment to waste reduction, talked about, you know, full FOGO for all the other 120 councils. I’m not sure—Mr Chair, through you—whether Councillor CASSIDY is actually aware of the size of Brisbane City Council. The councils that he refers to are minute in comparison to us, and one of the ways that they have dealt with full FOGO in their councils is they’ve either got full funding from their State Government, they’ve cut the bin size, or they’ve cut the regularity of the bin service.

Now, I have been to Melbourne and seen the tiny little red bins that they have down there in Melbourne, and I can tell you right now, having been to the transfer station where those red bins end up, there are huge contamination levels, because the reality is if a resident does not have enough room in his red top bin to put their waste in, they will put it in the next available bin that has space, and generally, that’s the green top bin. That is not what we want here in Brisbane City Council. We’re talking about do it right, do it once. So, I want to commend the item to the Chamber. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you.

Further debate?

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, I rise to speak on item A and item B.

 Firstly, with respect to item B, the kerbside collection services, can I just start by saying that it is one of the shameful periods of this LNP’s Administration that it decided the best way to save a few dollars was to cut one of the most essential and basic services that a city council can provide to its residents, and that is waste collection. That anybody thought that it was a good idea to try and save—I think it was six million. I don’t know how much was actually saved. That’s never been revealed, but instead of cutting junkets for overseas or marketing or, you know, wasteful expenditure on the Metro that keeps blowing out, this Council thought it was okay to cut kerbside collection. Now, that is a shameful period in this LNP Administration.

Now, if the LORD MAYOR was sitting here, he’d probably stand up and say, wasn’t me, wasn’t me, it was the officers, they made me do it, because he does everything the officers say they should do. So I think there is a bigger question here about why Council officers are recommending that waste services are being cut. Who’s doing this, the LNP, the officers, the Council? Because the ratepayers of Brisbane deserve a reliable waste collection service, and the fact that the LNP thought this was low hanging fruit is absolutely not acceptable. Now, the report before us today outlines the brief for assessment of all the tenders. It runs through a range of procurement risks, and those risks that are mentioned in here are quality of service, availability of fleet, composition of fleet, increasing recycling volumes.

Now, they’re all rated as low, but I think that a key one was left off. Cuts to the service by the LNP, that should have a risk rating of high. The comments there should be that the ratepayers of Brisbane are at risk of losing this service because the LORD MAYOR could unilaterally decide to cut it at any period of time. Risk allocation: Council. The biggest risk to kerbside collection in this city, as has been demonstrated by the practical actions of the LNP LORD MAYOR and the LNP majority Councillors is themselves. It is not acceptable to cut waste services to this city. It’s not acceptable to try and save a few dollars when you’re out there junketing around the world. You are spending hundreds of thousands of dollars, if not millions of dollars on wasteful marketing, and yet you want to cut waste. It’s not acceptable.

I hope this will end up being a reliable service for Brisbane residents, but the risks are solely with this LNP Administration who we know, when it suits them and they think they can get away with it, they will cut this service. Even today, they could not on the record today guarantee that they would not cut it.

LORD MAYOR: Point of order, Mr Chair.

Chair: Point of order to you, LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Claim to be misrepresented.

Chair: Claim to have been misrepresented noted.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Well, we’ll see, won’t we? Past actions indicate here the LORD MAYOR’s track record in the future, that’s for sure.

Item B, the adoption of the local law making procedure. I completely agree with Councillor CASSIDY here. This has come out of the blue and I reckon there are some big, big problems behind the scenes that have not been disclosed to Councillors. There are a couple of things of concern to me, and I will not be supporting this motion. I will be abstaining because, again, no briefing for Councillors, no discussion with Councillors, no explanation as to why we’re doing it. The only explanation in here is, well, the City of Brisbane Act’s changed but we haven’t updated our policies. Well, that’s just not good enough. There is an obligation on the owner of this policy to update it. Update timeframes are put into the policy. This Council is responsible for setting policies, but there are some problems with this one.

The first issue that is of concern to me relates to public consultation. If there’d been some discussion with Councillors about this, we might have actually got something a little bit better for the ratepayers of Brisbane. Changes to Council local laws can have significant impact on residents, and I think it’s pretty critical that we engage in open and transparent consultation with residents. The first thing is in Clause 6, public consultation. If Council’s making an interim local law or it is adopting a model local law, it does not have to undertake public consultation.

Now, sometimes I suspect there may be an interim local law that might be urgent, but I’m not sure what that might be. More importantly, adopting a model local law should not be undertaken without consultation. Now, I’m sure the LORD MAYOR will stand up and say, well, the consultation would have been undertaken by the State Government. This is the same State Government he stands up and calls incompetent every two minutes, so why would he be suggesting that our Council literally adopt something that an incompetent level of government says we have to do? I think that there should be consultation. We should not be adopting model local laws without consultation with the ratepayers of Brisbane. That is our responsibility.

There’s also some issues with consideration of submissions and how we respond to those. The big problem, I think, with all Council consultation—and this is whether it’s neighbourhood planning or whatever they’re calling it now—this Council undertakes a form of notification that is not consultation. There’s a lovely spectrum of consultation and Council’s at the bottom end of that. They say consultation, but what they mean is notification. It is critical that Council provides an open and transparent response to submitters in making local laws. It also is critically important that there are, I guess, valid and detailed responses to that consultation.

Now, in section 8, it says Council proposes to make a significant amendment to the proposed local law. Council must resolve to carry out additional consultation. I’m not sure why there’s so many capital letters for these things. I just—I think they’re probably drafting errors, but why would additional consultation have capitals? I don’t—State interest check. Why do they have capitals? There’s some really weird things in here. Anyway, I just raised that because we just don’t—you know, basic English.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: It is, yes. The issue here, we must resolve to carry out additional consultation. If Council resolves to carry out additional consultation, Council may determine how the additional consultation will be conducted. So, I guess the question is, who does this? Who does this? Is it going to come back here? Is there going to be a resolution of full Council? Is Council actually here a delegate? E&C? Is it the LORD MAYOR? Is it the CEO? I would like some clarification around who is going to authorise these changes. It should be full Council, is my issue, but I am concerned that this LORD MAYOR, of course, will delegate off all these responsibilities as he does with absolutely everything else so he can say, it’s not me, it’s not my fault. We know that he’s got a track record on this.

So, I think that there are some real concerns with how this has been drafted, and I think the real reason for it being done has not been disclosed by the LORD MAYOR, and I think he should come clean about why this is happening.

Chair: LORD MAYOR, your claim of misrepresentation.

LORD MAYOR: Yes. There was some suggestion that I had somehow been unclear about support for kerbside collection on an ongoing basis. Let me be clear, kerbside collection is here to stay. No ifs, no buts. It’s here to stay.

Chair: Thank you.

Further speakers?

Councillor CUNNINGHAM.

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: Thanks, Mr Chair. I rise to speak on item B.

 Brisbane City Council currently has 30 local laws on its books. Council has the authority from the City of Brisbane Act to enact local laws for, quote, ‘the good rule and good of’—‘the good rule’, sorry, ‘and local government of Brisbane’. As the LORD MAYOR outlined earlier, Council adopted its current local law making procedure in 2010. Since then, there have been 14 local laws, including associated subordinate local laws that have been worked on in some form under the framework that is set out in the current procedure. However, we’ve seen significant amendments to the City of Brisbane Act in this time and the City of Brisbane Regulation.

Therefore, there is a need to update the procedure to capture any potential improvements and align with current legislation and regulation. The new procedure provides more clarity about Council’s obligations when it proposes to make a local law that contains one or more anti-competitive provisions. This is something which is called out by COBA and which we are reflecting. Importantly, the updated procedure will see the extension of period for public consultation to 20 business days, to align with Council’s obligations to provide relevant government departments 20 business days to provide submissions on any proposed local law through the State interest check process.

The amendments also deal with providing for additional consultation on a proposed local law, where significant amendments are then proposed as a result of the initial public consultation period. The updated procedure captures Council’s obligations when making rules and guidelines which support local laws and clarifies administrative processes and procedures, following the adoption of the local law. In response to Councillor CASSIDY—through you, Mr Chair—I honestly don’t understand why Labor would vote against additional consultation on local laws. I don’t know why they’d be okay with changing the timeframes. So, Mr Chair, I guess we will see and will commend the procedure to the Chamber.

Chair: Thank you.

Is there any further debate? No further debate.

LORD MAYOR?

We now move to the vote on these items, in seriatim. Item A.

**Clause A put**

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

Chair: Vote on item B, please.

**Clause B put**

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

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

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

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

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

#### A STORES BOARD SUBMISSION – POST-MARKET FOR KERBSIDE LARGE ITEMS COLLECTION AND RECYCLING SERVICE

 **165/830/179/863**

**465/2022-23**

1. The Chief Executive Officer provided the information below.

2. The Chief Executive Officer and the Stores Board considered the submission, as set out in Attachment A (submitted on file), on 22 February 2023.

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

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

 Purpose

5. The Stores Board recommends approval of entering into the following contract:

Contract title: Kerbside Large Items Collection and Recycling Service

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

Contractor: Curbside Services Pty. Ltd.

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

Price basis: Schedule of rates

 Background/operational impact

6. The kerbside large items collection and recycling service is a Council service, collecting large items placed on the kerbside in grouped suburbs across Brisbane. The service is typically scheduled across 41 weeks of the year. It is estimated that approximately 230,000 households, or 47% of the city’s approximate 488,000 households participate directly in the collection service.

7. On 2 November 2021, Council approved a Significant Contracting Plan (SCP) to establish a new CPA in the form of a preferred supplier arrangement. A public tender was subsequently released to the market on 5 November 2021, and closed on 4 February 2022, with two tenders received. An evaluation process was then undertaken, including a clarification and negotiation process, with evaluation completed in 2022.

8. As part of the tender evaluation, analysis was undertaken to determine comparative pricing for both tender submissions. This analysis identified that the estimated expenditure in the SCP was inadequate to deliver the scope of services.

9. Demand from residents, especially during COVID-19 markedly increased material volumes, seeing an increase of 34% during the tendering period over volumes estimated in the Request for Proposal (RFP).

10. On 29 November 2022, Council approved an amendment to the original SCP, approving an increase in the estimated expenditure from $46.4 million to $67 million over the potential eight‑year term. The necessity to amend the original approval has extended the anticipated period to finalise this process.

11. A key focus of the new CPA is for the service to facilitate the reuse and recycling of collected goods, increasing the recycling component and reducing material volumes entering landfill. The engagement of initiatives, pilots and trials in parallel with the scheduled service throughout the contract term will target expanding recycling volumes and was a focal point of negotiations.

12. What is being procured and why: Kerbside large item collection and recycling services to support Brisbane residents.

Pre-market approval: Council on 2 November 2021

Process used: Request for Proposals (RFP) public tender

Closing date for responses: 4 February 2022

Offer validity period expiry date: 17 March 2023

Pre-market approval adhered to? Yes, an amendment to the estimated expenditure reported in the SCP was approved by Council on 29 November 2022.

 Summary of responses

13.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Registered address,****ABN and ACN** | **Relevant local office?** | **Non-price score *[out of 100]*** | **Comparative price\* *[after any negotiations]*** | **Value for money (VFM) Index\*\*** |
| **Recommended offer** |
| Curbside Services Pty. Ltd. (Curbside Services) ^ | Level 1, 172 Evans Road, Salisbury, QLD, 4107ABN: 93 099 234 536ACN: 099 234 536 | Yes\*\*\* | 73 | $7,438,996 | 99 |
| **Offer not recommended** |
| Handel Group Pty Ltd (Handel Group) | Unit 3, 259 Cullen Avenue East, Eagle Farm, QLD, 4009ABN: 89 625 084 077ACN: 625 084 077 | Yes | 61 | $25,573,890 | 24 |

\* Comparative price is tendered pricing normalised for 230,000 households participating in the service and delivery of 488,000 flyers annually. All monetary figures in this submission are exclusive of GST.

\*\* Non-price score divided by comparative price, multiplied by 10,000,0000.

^ Incumbent supplier.

\*\*\* Local office: 548 Tarragindi Road, Salisbury, Qld, 4107.

 Evaluation of responses

14. Evaluation criteria:

1. Mandatory/essential criteria:

- Tenderers were required to attend a scheduled tour of a Resource Recovery Centre.

- Tenderers to achieve a satisfactory financial status.

- Tenderers to submit a satisfactory response in relation to legislative compliance.

1. Non-price weighted evaluation criteria:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Local benefits | (30%) |
| Track record and experience | [Commercial-in-Confidence] |
| Innovation and partnerships | [Commercial-in-Confidence] |
| Capacity and risk management | [Commercial-in-Confidence] |
| Workplace Health Safety and environment | [Commercial-in-Confidence] |

1. Price model:

- Normalised tendered price.

15. Addenda issued:

Six addenda were issued before the close of tenders to clarify tenderer queries.

16. Submissions not considered further as lodged late:

None

17. Submissions not considered further as incomplete/non-conforming:

None

18. Submissions not considered due to failing a mandatory criterion:

None

19. Initial evaluation:

Two conforming responses were received. Tenderers were required to complete a number of quantitative questions contained in the response schedule. Both tender submissions were individually assessed by the evaluation panel and subsequently moderated.

20. Shortlisting and additional stages:

Responses underwent a preliminary compliance/conformance screen, with both tenderers progressing to evaluation. An initial shortlist was undertaken based on the tenderers’ total score against the non-price weighted criteria. A further shortlist was required, based on VFM, with Curbside Services the sole tenderer shortlisted to enter negotiations due to the significant VFM gap between tenderers.

21. Summarise any clarification/scope changes/negotiation of tenders undertaken:

Comparative pricing was determined via normalising tendered pricing, based on 230,000 households participating directly in the service and delivery of 488,000 flyers annually. Clarifications were issued to both tenderers and sought to understand the composition of tenderers’ pricing models, potential third‑party recycling costs and previous collection history in greater depth. Negotiations were entered into with the recommended tenderer and centred around lead time on its new vehicle fleet, rise and fall proportions, pricing movement upon outright ownership of its new vehicles, increasing recycling volumes through initiatives, pilots and trials and extension of its offer validity date.

22. Summarise the circumstances regarding any tenderer removed from further consideration due to unacceptable risks for Council (e.g. cyber-security, environmental, financial, contract departures, reputational):

Not applicable

Most advantageous outcome for Council

23. Most advantageous:

The recommended tender is Curbside Services for the following reasons:

- it achieved the highest non-price score, lowest comparative price and highest VFM

- it is a highly experienced provider and long-term incumbent to Council for the services

- it was the only tenderer to offer a scheduled service collection model, the primary model sought under the RFP

- the service is to be undertaken with a new waste compactor fleet installed with an in‑vehicle monitoring system (IVMS) and fully integrated camera system on each truck operating Software as a Service (SaaS) solution WasteTrack, providing collection service planning, management and monitoring

- it agreed to enter negotiation on rates for the new waste compactor fleet upon becoming fully depreciated, potentially delivering cost savings

- it is an Australian-owned, Brisbane family business, incorporated and based in Brisbane, employing local staff with benefits derived from the contract to remain in Brisbane.

24. Tenderers not recommended:

The proposal from Handel Group was an alternate proposal as it nominated an on-demand collection model instead of the scheduled service collection model requested in the RFP. The alternate proposal was evaluated as the RFP allowed for alternate offers to be submitted. Handel Group’s on-demand collection model would require residents to register for the service through the tenderer before being issued a large fold-out recyclable flexible skip for their material. The nature of this model was less competitive in terms of pricing across all facets, whether compared against the recommended tenderer’s pricing, or in both instances whether household uptake of the service was limited or high. Handel Group’s comparative price was significantly higher than the recommended tenderer, resulting in receiving the lowest VFM and removal from further consideration, as their alternate offer did not represent best value for money or the most advantageous offer to Council.

25. Environmental management, quality assurance, access, and equity, Zero Harm and support for local suppliers, locally produced and Australian products:

Both tenderers provided detailed responses and documentation outlining their organisation’s workplace health and safety (WH&S), environmental and quality assurance policies that were to the satisfaction of the evaluation panel.

The recommended tenderer is an Australian-owned, Brisbane family business, incorporated and based in Brisbane, employing local staff with benefits derived from the contract to remain in Brisbane. The scheduled service collection model recommended facilitates participation of urban recyclers, increasing the recycling and resource recovery undertaken, and is a critical component allowing Council to minimise waste disposal and waste levy impacts for the residual waste requiring disposal.

The recommended tenderer will use a fleet compliant to Euro 6 emission standards for delivery of the service (excluding two tippers and two supervisor utility vehicles). The environmental benefit of progressing from the current vehicle fleet to Euro 6 emission standard will provide further, significant reduction of Nitrogen Oxide emissions from diesel engines (a 67% reduction compared to Euro 5).

The recommended tenderer provided some options in its proposal for increasing recycling. While the options are not being implemented at this stage, they have been included in the contract and may be investigated (along with other pilots/trials) during the term of the contract.

26. Risks associated with this contract (including mitigation strategies):

| **Procurement risk** | **Risk rating** | **Comments/other risk mitigation strategies** | **Risk allocation** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Quality of service | Low | The recommended tenderer is a long-standing incumbent provider of the services to Council and are well versed in Council’s operational needs, meets the contract specification requirements and have acceptable performance levels. | Contractor |
| Availability of fleet | Low | The recommended tenderer was transparent in dealings with Council, regarding the lead time of the new waste compactor fleet impacted as a result of global supply chain shortages. To ensure continuity of service, agreement, including specific rates for utilisation of the existing waste compactor fleet during the initial 12 months of the new arrangement have been formalised via the contract. | Contractor |
| Composition of fleet | Low | The kerbside collection service is solely driven by the volume of material deposited on the kerbside by residents for collection. As material volumes increase, the requirement for additional waste compactors to be operational also arises. Historical data confirms a minimum of eight waste compactors are necessary to undertake the services. In instances where greater than eight waste compactors will be required, authorisation from the Collection Contracts Manager, WaRRS, must be obtained prior to any additional compactors entering service. | Contractor |
| Increasing recycling volumes  | Low | A key focus of the new CPA is for the service to facilitate the reuse and recycling of collected goods, increasing the recycling component and reducing material volumes entering landfill. The engagement of initiatives/pilots/trials in parallel with the scheduled service throughout the contract term will target expanding recycling volumes, either in connection with the recommended tenderer or potentially through third party opportunities. | Contractor and Council |

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

No, the contract is not listed as a critical contract, however, the contractor is required to have a Business Continuity Plan in place.

 Contract proposed

28.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Type of procurement: | Establishing a CPA in the form of a Preferred Supplier Arrangement. |
| If establishing a new CPA, how will it be operated? | Orders are to be placed with the preferred supplier as required. The contract will be managed by WaRRS. |
| Contract standard to be used: | Bespoke services contract developed by City Legal, City Administration and Governance (CAG). |
| Amendments to the contract standards? | Not applicable |
| Has the proposed contractor(s) signed the contract to formalise its offer? | Yes |
| Execution date of contract: | 17 March 2023 with a service commencement date of 1 July 2023. |
| Contract duration: | An initial term of four years with options to extend for additional periods of up to four years, for a maximum term of eight years. |
| Price basis: | Mix of lump sum and schedule of rates. |
| Variation for rise and fall in cost: | Pricing will be adjusted quarterly for movement in fuel pricing and annually for movement in labour and consumer price index indices.  |
| Provisional sums? | Not applicable |
| Security for the contract: | Not applicable |
| Defects period/warranty period? | Not applicable |
| Liquidated damages: | No |
| Software component? | No |
| Does this proposed contract involve leasing?  | No |

 Contract expenditure and budget availability

29. Estimated expenditure under this CPA/contract:

Based on historical levels and anticipated future volumes, expenditure is estimated to be up to $67 million, over the potential maximum eight-year term.

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

Funds are available, however, the term of the contract extends beyond the current approved budget.

31. Indicative program and supporting information:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Program: | 6 – City Standards, Community Health and Safety |
| Outcome: | 6.3 Managing and Reducing Brisbane’s Waste and Litter |
| Strategy: | 6.3.1 Effective Waste Stream Management and Reduction |
| Service: | 6.3.1.1 Waste Stream Management and Reduction |
| Operating: | Annual Kerbside Large Items Collection and Recycling Service |

32. Benefit or saving against pre-market estimate (if any):

There are no reportable procurement savings, however, operational efficiencies will be delivered through the IVMS and fully integrated camera system on each new waste compactor operating SaaS solution WasteTrack, providing collection service planning, management, and monitoring. Software features such as GPS tracking, and local and remote digital video recording will provide further proof of service and cover for accident/property damage claims as data and images will assist WaRRS in promptly responding to incident reports from residents. Initiatives/pilots/trials are to be undertaken in parallel with the collection service throughout the contract term to offer opportunities for reducing material volumes (which will reduce costs) and/or increase recycling.

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

34. **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Stores Board recommends approval of entering into the following contract:

 Contract title: Kerbside Large Items Collection and Recycling Service

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

 Contractor: Curbside Services Pty. Ltd.

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

 Price basis: Schedule of rates

 Person to manage: General Manager, Waste and Resource Recovery Services, City Standards, Brisbane Infrastructure

 Extension authority: The optional additional periods may be approved by the Chief Procurement Officer, Strategic Procurement Office, Organisational Services, subject to the satisfactory performance of the supplier.

**ADOPTED**

#### B ADOPTION OF THE LOCAL LAW MAKING PROCEDURE

 **155/715/468/3**

**466/2022-23**

35. The Divisional Manager, City Administration and Governance, provided the information below.

36. Section 30(1) of the *City of Brisbane Act 2010* (COBA) provides that Council may decide its own process for making a local law to the extent that the process is not inconsistent with the provisions of COBA.

37. On 19 October 2010, Council resolved to adopt the *Local Law Making Procedures* (the current procedure) which sets out Council’s own local law making process covering matters such as stakeholder and public consultation and the passage of the local law through Council. The current procedure has not been updated since its adoption in 2010 despite several amendments being made to COBA.

38. It is proposed that the current procedure be repealed and replaced with the Local Law Making Procedure (the new procedure) as set out in Attachment B (submitted on file).

39. The new procedure ensures better alignment between Council’s local law making process and COBA. Importantly, the new procedure:

(a) provides more clarity about Council’s obligations when it proposes to make a local law that contains one or more anti-competitive provisions

(b) extends the period for public consultation to 20 business days to align with Council’s obligations to provide relevant government entities 20 business days to provide submissions on any proposed local law

(c) provides for additional consultation on a proposed local law where significant amendments are proposed as a result of initial public and internal consultation

(d) captures Council’s obligations when making rules and guidelines which support local laws

(e) clarifies administrative processes and procedures following the adoption of a local law.

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

41. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A**

**Draft Resolution**

**DRAFT RESOLUTION TO ADOPT THE LOCAL LAW MAKING PROCEDURE**

As Council:

1. may decide its own process for making a local law in accordance with section 30 of the *City of Brisbane Act 2010*
2. adopted the *Local Law Making Procedures* on 19 October 2010
3. has conducted a review of the adopted *Local Law Making Procedures* and identified the need to update the *Local Law Making Procedures*

then Council:

1. resolves to repeal the *Local Law Making Procedures* adopted on 19 October 2010

(ii) adopts the Local Law Making Procedure as set out in Attachment B (submitted on file), in accordance with section 30(1) of the *City of Brisbane Act 2010*.

**ADOPTED**

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

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

The DEPUTY MAYOR (Councillor Krista ADAMS), Civic Cabinet Chair of the Economic Development and the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Sandy LANDERS, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 7 March 2023, be adopted.

Chair: DEPUTY MAYOR.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair. Before I get to last week’s Committee report, just a reminder about the Brisbane Business Hub and what’s going on in the hub, which is in Queen Street above the Visitor Information Centre. In the coming week, we have got a couple of free events scheduled. On the 15th—tomorrow, Social Media - Introduction to Online Platforms for Marketing Success. Cemoh is our business expert on this, about how fundamentals of marketing to gain valuable insights into how you can use marketing to build your brand and business.

On Thursday, Long Live Employee Engagement, a workshop to look at boosting employee engagement, to boost customer loyalty and productivity, identifying the motivators that help each of us be more engaged, productive, and healthier, and that’s from Mojo. On the 21st, Navigating Industrial and Workplace Relations Changes in 2023. This one is a masterclass with CCIQ (Chamber of Commerce and Industry Queensland) to join the Workplace Services team to understand what you need to know about reforms and tips to protect your business from risk and create a safe working environment. They continue to do a fantastic job over there and, again, I ask all Councillors to make sure they share it with their businesses to know that there’s plenty out there to support them from Brisbane City Council and BEDA (Brisbane Economic Development Agency).

Last week, we had a presentation from BEDA, in particular, the destination marketing update. Although you may not actually see it in Brisbane, we are out there at the moment about to hit the campaign trail in our southern and our regional area, southern states and regional areas to make sure people know that, even though it is getting a little bit miserable and wet and windy down south, that it is still a lovely warm 29 to 35 degrees on Friday here if they wanted to extend their summer, as well. We’ve always got our social channels on, making sure that there’s plenty happening on radio podcasts, working with Australian Business Review, Inside Retail, and sponsorship to promote what we are doing in Brisbane right across Australia.

The ‘Summer’s Still Calling’ campaign is really targeting those audience to book a Brisbane holiday in the autumn months by showcasing our endless summer offering and alfresco way of life. Coming up to the Easter school holidays, we all know how fantastic it is out there, but what we’re trying to tell are the SINKs (single income, no kids) and DINKs (dual income, no kids), which are the 20 to 49-year-olds, the families, which are 25 to 59, and specifically New South Wales, Victoria, Tasmania and Western Australia to use those domestic travels, particularly some of those flights, maybe they’re still using—they’ve still got some credit on from COVID, to make sure that they come and see us. We’re looking at TV, catch-up TV, online video, YouTube, native tile, TikTok, outside advertising, news cords, social and programmatic displays to make sure that the rest of Australia sees why this is the place you want to be at Easter. Thank you, Mr Chair.

Chair: Thank you.

 Is there any further debate? No further debate?

 We move to the vote on this report.

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

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

The Deputy Mayor, Councillor Krista Adams (Civic Cabinet Chair), Councillor Sarah Hutton (Deputy Chair), and Councillors Greg Adermann, Jared Cassidy, Kara Cook and Steven Huang.

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – DESTINATION MARKETING UPDATE

**467/2022-23**

1. The Head of Marketing, Brisbane Economic Development Agency, attended the meeting to provide an update on Brisbane’s destination marketing campaign. He provided the information below.

2. ‘Alive with Opportunity’ is one of Brisbane’s marketing campaigns that has been advertised since September 2022 and will run through to June 2023. The campaign has been designed by layering search terms, display ads and case studies to create a more cohesive understanding of the opportunities Brisbane can offer as a destination for business growth, investment and talent. It focuses on sectors including health and advanced manufacturing in food and agriculture. Channels for this campaign include:

 - search engine and social marketing

 - radio and podcasts

 - Australian Business Review, Inside FMCG and Inside Retail

 - sponsorships in key industries

 - programmatic displays (automated digital advertisements).

3. ‘Summer’s Still Calling’ is a campaign encouraging audiences to book a Brisbane holiday in the autumn months, by showcasing Brisbane’s outdoor appeal and alfresco dining options. It will run from 5 March to 31 May 2023 across a range of consumer touchpoints. The campaign will link with the travel website Expedia, creating co-branded video content and has been featured on the television program Sunrise as well as in *The Courier-Mail*. The visitbrisbane website features a dedicated major events stream and uses the tagline ‘It’s here, why aren’t you?’ to create a fear of missing out and entice audiences to make an emotional decision to book their trip to Brisbane to attend exclusive events.

4. The Committee was shown a marketing video for the ‘Summer’s Still Calling’ campaign.

5. The Civic Cabinet Chair thanked the Head of Marketing for his informative update.

6. **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 Sandy LANDERS, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 7 March 2023, be adopted.

Chair: Councillor MURPHY.

Councillor MURPHY: Thanks, Mr Chair. Last week, the Transport Committee was presented with an explainer on HASTUS, which is Council’s bus scheduling system. Every day across Brisbane, Council is responsible for scheduling around 10,000 trips across our fleet of almost 1,300 buses and a workforce of over 2,000 drivers. That is a very complex task, and HASTUS is the software system that we use to help us deliver services and coordinate our bus network. HASTUS is used around the world and it helps us bring a lot of the pieces of the network puzzle together, from driver shifts and transit ticketing information to fuel and vehicle requirements and capabilities. It also allows us to respond and manage unexpected events such as staff absences and road incidents. The success of this tool is one of the reasons our bus network is so popular.

We know that more Brisbane residents opt to ride on a bus than any other form of public transport in the city. Another part of the reason our network is so popular is because of our team of bus drivers, Chair. I’d like to talk today about Queensland’s Bus Driver of the Year awards. We know that we employ 2,200 bus operators, which makes us one of—not just the largest bus operator in Queensland, but also one of the largest operators in the entire country. Our drivers are responsible for delivering a critical service to our city and they are, of course, as we often say in this Chamber, our ambassadors out on the roads.

We know that Brisbane residents love to say ‘thank you driver’, but these awards give us the opportunity to formally recognise our favourite drivers. There were almost 1,000 drivers nominated by passengers, and last week, the finalists were announced. Just nine were selected from the list of 1,000, and I’m very proud to say that two of the finalists are Transport for Brisbane bus drivers. Sharif Shafey and Jason Morris are two of the three finalists in the South East Queensland Bus Driver of the Year category.

Sharif Shafey is a bus operator from our Toowong Depot. Sharif was nominated for his friendly and caring approach to passengers. He even likens his regular passengers to a second family. He said the nomination makes him very proud to know his passengers feel safe when riding with him.

Jason Morris is based at our Garden City Bus Depot, and he was nominated for putting his passengers’ needs first. He says that he loves hearing ‘thank you driver’ at the end of a trip, and he always tries to make a positive impact on someone’s day. Voting is open for another week, so I would encourage all Councillors to hop online and to submit a vote for Sharif and Jason. It’s probably the one thing in this Chamber that we can all agree on, and I’ll leave further debate to the Chamber, Chair.

Chair: Thank you.

Is there any further debate? No further debate.

 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), Councillor Angela Owen (Deputy Chair), and Councillors Jared Cassidy, Steven Huang, David McLachlan and Jonathan Sriranganathan.

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – HASTUS – COUNCIL’S BUS SCHEDULING SYSTEM

**468/2022-23**

1. The General Manager, Strategy and Network Services, Transport for Brisbane, attended the meeting to provide an overview of Council’s bus scheduling system, HASTUS. He provided the information below.

2. HASTUS is a software system created by GIRO, that has been used by Council since 2000 to schedule bus services in accordance with network planning requirements and demands. HASTUS interfaces with Council’s SAP system and other systems, and allows for rapid testing of multiple scenarios using complex algorithms to ensure resource use is optimised.

3. Used across 28 countries and in all Australian states, except the Australian Capital Territory, HASTUS helps schedule more than 10,000 daily trips in Brisbane, using Council’s 1,266 buses and 2,300 drivers across its seven bus depots. HASTUS analyses parameters and rules based on enterprise bargaining agreements (EBA), awards and legislative requirements to provide:

- driver work schedules (runprints)

- public information

- daily operations management options

- additional data for decision-making.

4. Council undertakes the following four-step process to maximise efficient outcomes through HASTUS.

1. Global vehicle optimisation, including route distribution, driver needs and minimising non‑service time and distance.

2. Optimisation of depot vehicle and crew schedules, taking into consideration differing duty types, meal arrangements, driver availability and depot capacities.

3. Creation of rosters, grouped into teams based on duty types and specific needs for drivers and depots.

4. Options for daily operations management, including pre-allocating vehicles and crew to complete work in advance.

5. External interfacing with SAP Payroll and Translink’s ticketing and real-time systems allows for reporting on costs for vehicle leases, labour and fuel to assist with decision-making and the monitoring of monthly costs to Council. This allows for informed decisions to be made about whether changes will be implemented across various planning scenarios.

6. The Committee was shown examples of vehicle blocks, crew schedules, base rosters and daily schedules for Sherwood Depot, highlighting the complex factors that generate schedules and rosters. While the majority of the outputs are generated automatically using parameters and rules, manual input is still required to ensure outputs adapt to absences, road incidents or fast bus trips.

7. Recent Council achievements involving HASTUS include:

- implementing modules to improve accuracy and reduce manual data entry for payroll

- preparation and maintenance of contingency schedules for implementation at short notice or in an emergency

- adjusting schedules to reduce driver requirements, while minimising increases in labour costs

- improved efficiency, resulting in an average of only 44 schedule changes per depot in 2022

- the implementation of 53 of the 78 testing scenarios created by HASTUS, with the remaining 25 scenarios either still being considered or rejected. Of these scenarios:

- 37 did not require any optimisation

- 33 required optimisation of a single depot

- four required optimisation of more than one depot

- four required optimisation of all depots.

8. GIRO have provided analytics on Council’s bus usage compared to other clients, revealing Council’s bus travel distances are lower than comparative GIRO clients. This has been attributed to the geographic spread of bus depots, Council’s awards, EBA and fatigue rules, and a lack of on-road bus parking and layover facilities. These factors make the switch to electric vehicles less complex. Council’s buses benchmark at higher-than-average service speeds due to dedicated busways, with a consistently positive in-service time ratio.

9. HASTUS undergoes continuous, ongoing upgrades, with version 2023 scheduled to go live in the second half of 2024. This upgrade will transition the system to a vendor cloud environment, reducing internal costs and reliance on Council infrastructure. It also provides improved services and support from GIRO, including more locally-based experts, two new modules, scheduling options for Metro vehicles and electric buses and a new external interface.

10. Following a number of questions from the Committee, the Civic Cabinet Chair thanked the General Manager for his informative presentation.

11. **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 7 March 2023, be adopted.

Chair: Councillor WINES.

Councillor WINES: Mr Chair, the Committee last week saw a presentation on the Asphalt Innovation Committee (AIC) and sustainability in asphalt. Councillors may recall I made some general comments about new materials that we use to make sure that our asphalt is full of recycled materials, but before I get to that, I’d just like to make some general comments about asphalt innovation. The Asphalt Innovation Committee has existed informally from about 2004 but was formalised and brought into the Asset Management branch in 2012. It focuses on what we can do to make our city clean and green and sustainable. AIC looks for new methods and technologies which will allow our road pavements to be both more sustainable in their materials, but also more durable in the long term.

I have with me some examples—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: —which some people may be familiar with. All right, so I would like to also just remind Councillors, the virtue of rubber in our asphalt, it is a tyre rubber, not a car tyre, it is a truck tyre rubber, not a car tyre rubber. We went over this last week, but there it is again—

Chair: Are you tabling these, Councillor WINES?

Councillor WINES: —for those who—sorry?

Chair: Are you tabling these, Councillor WINES, or just showing them?

Councillor WINES: Right, well, I could table them for—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: Yes, please have—you know, I encourage all Councillors to have a look at it because it is pretty neat. It is pretty neat, Mr Chair. The rubber provides more elasticity in the pavement and creates better performance in the surface itself. It ensures that the road is actually more resistant to UV, which is one of the factors that degrades our roads. The AIC doesn’t just focus on performance enhancement, but industry engagement, as well. That’s why we work on a range of—we use a reclaimed asphalt pavement here, which is what we use in asphalt, so that’s—we actually take the surface and try and reuse it.

One of the ongoing issues with that is that it becomes, over time, too small. It requires a larger grain, I suppose, larger rock, but as we reuse it, it gets smaller, but it’s something that we do attempt to use. Of course, we use glass as a sand substitute in both road base and in footpaths. So, if people want to have a look, we’ll just pass those around. They are more interesting the more you look at them, I assure you of that.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: That’s right and such as my commitment to recycling, some Councillors may have heard some of these comments before.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: But in all seriousness. This Council is deeply committed to sustainability in a practical sense. But also while we do that, making sure that our assets remain at a high standard and finding new ways to improve.

Councillor interjecting.

Councillor WINES: So I—can I just recognise the works of the Asset Innovation Committee and the Council officers involved in that? In particular, Mr Joe Bannan and his team. This morning, the report also speaks to three petitions, which I will encourage Councillors to consider.

There was a question in this morning’s Committee, which I’ll address now regarding—this morning’s Committee was in regards to safe pedestrianisation around key vulnerable pedestrian zones. So, for example, hospitals or very high usage pedestrian areas. It discussed a range of ways that we change speed limits and things down to 40 kilometres an hour.

We had a question today: how come we did that in Newstead and around the Mater Hospital and around the Children’s—the Lady Cilento Hospital? Why we—in this petition it’s not being proposed here—the petition was for 30 kilometres, when those were discussing 40.

Can I also remind Councillors that in in consideration of the Ashington Street petition, the weekday traffic there was of 500 vehicles per day, with 85% of vehicles travelling at or below 33 kilometres an hour, which is below the standard trigger for traffic calming.

So I just wanted to make those comments in response to a question in our Committee presentation this morning.

Chair: Thank you.

 Is there further debate?

 Councillor STRUNK.

Councillor STRUNK: Thank you, Chair. Listen, I rise to speak on the first petition, Clause B. In regards to the residents of Ashington Street. I rise to speak because, first of all there is, what 48 signatures and the majority were people that actually live in that street.

 Of course, the people that live in the street have decided that a reduction to 30 kilometres per hour would be appropriate for their street. I know, even from my own neighbourhood roads within the Forest Lake Ward, especially in Forest Lake itself, that quite frankly 30 is probably a better speed for a road in those sort of areas.

 I know myself when I drive where it’s signed 40 that it’s really unusual for me to even get close to the 40. Especially with some of the traffic calming chicanes and things like that that are usually designed in those roads.

 Now reducing speed also in some cases, of course, would actually reduce the amount of noise that—especially in this road here where there’s two platforms. Because people going over a platform, especially at 40—and some tearaways will do that just to test out their four-wheel drives, I suppose—make quite a lot of noise doing that. So, I just think that should be considered as well.

 I don’t think simply saying your request will be noted, is good enough. Now, we were presented an information sheet recently in Infrastructure on Speed Limit Review and I thank the Chair for making that available. It’s a two pager, which was condensed down from about nine or 10 pages online. But it says a need for a review should take place if traffic behaviour, significant safety issues and the third thing is road upgrades, which isn’t included in this as a suggestion, there’s no upgrades that I’m aware of in the streets surrounding this Ashington Road.

 But anyways, it’s a really good document to actually show you the process of what Council should be doing when receiving petitions like this one. From residents who live in the area and have to traverse and or put up with speeding or other issues related to that.

 In the Infrastructure today, as the Chair was saying, we were presented a Queensland Government initiative on the variable—on the vulnerable, I should say, not variable—the Vulnerable Road Users Speed Limit program that the Queensland Government initiated. In listening to the presentation I would think that this street would be a really good candidate, or streets like this would be really good candidates, for this particular program.

 Now I know there was limited funding but maybe Council can actually do this to undertake this project themselves and not have to be funded by the State Government to do so. All the petitioners are asking for is a review. Refusing their reasonable request is really disrespectful and quite arrogant actually, I think.

 The residents who live in the streets are probably the best judge as to what they need. When it comes to public safety, on this side of the Chamber, that’s number one. Public safety is number one and this is what the residents are experiencing in that street and we will not be supporting the recommendation. Thank you, Chair.

Chair: Further speakers?

 Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Thanks, Chair. I rise to speak on the petition for a 30 kilometre an hour speed limit for Ashington Street. The first thing I wanted to note was that every single household on this street has supported this petition.

Councillor interjecting.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: So it’s not a huge petition. I think all are—what did the report say? That there were 48 signatures, of which 27 live on Ashington Street itself. It actually is the case that every resident wants this speed limit lowered to 30 kilometres an hour and I do think that’s important for Councillor WINES and for the Mayor and the rest of the LNP Administration to take note of. Is that there is unanimous support for lowering the speed limit.

 That’s perhaps a little bit surprising because maybe historically we might have thought that residents wouldn’t want speed limits to drop right down to 30 kilometres an hour. But on this particular street, in this particular part of West End, there’s really strong support for that.

One of the main drivers for this is that a few other streets along Montague Road have had their right turns closed off in the past couple of years. So, I was quite supportive of closing off the access from Montague Road to those other streets. But of course when you close off access on other streets further down, that pushes further traffic on to Ashington Street. What’s actually happening is that Ashington Street is the last residential side street before you get to the very busy intersection of Vulture Street and Montague Road.

So since all the new development has gone in down along Montague Road, Ashington Street has seen quite a noticeable increase in the volume of cars that are shortcutting between Hardgrave Road and Vulture Street—Hardgrave Road and Montague Road⎯to avoid the Vulture Street intersection. In particular there’s been a higher rate of really heavy vehicles, so big construction trucks coming down this very small residential street. It’s clear that the existing traffic calming isn’t deterring those heavy vehicles and delivery vehicles from shortcutting in this way.

Crucially Ashington Street has very narrow footpaths. There’s only like a metre between the kerb and channel and the private property boundaries. So there’s no room, there’s no width to widen the existing footpaths. Unfortunately, the existing footpaths are periodically interrupted by electricity poles that stick up out of the middle of the path. So, you’ve got basically footpaths that are not wheelchair accessible, they’re not quite wide enough for prams or wheelchairs to get down and as a result, quite a few pedestrians and certainly cyclists and e-scooter users, et cetera, just do have to use the road.

So this is not just a kind of convenience issue, this is actually a disability access issue. Because people with wheelchairs or people who have some kind of mobility aid are forced to walk down the middle of Ashington Street and that’s obviously not very safe if the speed limit’s still 40 kilometres an hour.

So I think this would be an excellent candidate to trial 30 kilometre hour speed limits in Brisbane. It’s a very short street. All the residents are quite supportive of it and I think there’s a—certainly as Councillor, I’m even willing to allocate a bit of my SEF funding towards supporting additional changes to the built form to make that 30 kilometre an hour speed limit viable.

I was disappointed to get a kind of standard form response from the relevant officers. I would ask, through you, Chair, to Councillor WINES, please have a closer look at this one down the track. Because I think you know the weight of evidence from around the world is that on these very small, narrow streets, there are a lot of benefits to dropping the speed limit to 30 kilometres an hour. This would be a great candidate to trial that.

You’re not going to have any public pushback from the local residents or the local Councillor. But it’s certainly going to reduce the volume of rat-running from heavy vehicles. I would suggest it would also reduce the wear and tear on your existing traffic calming devices. Because those big trucks rolling over those little speed bumps is certainly wearing them out pretty quickly.

I think a couple of times now, the Council has had to go out and repaint them or even fix up potholes in those speed platform devices. So, it’s actually costing Council more money to have more vehicles shortcutting through this street and travelling at speeds to hit those platforms.

So I’m not arguing here that every street in Brisbane has to go to 30 kilometres an hour. I’m simply saying that this one small residential street in an inner city suburb should be a good candidate for a trial and we’ve got the residents on board here. The other thing to note is just that this is a key walking route to the local primary school, West End State School now has, I think it’s now over 1,400 students enrolled at West End State School. A lot of these—

Councillor interjecting.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: A lot of these students do use Ashington Street because it’s a quieter, safer street than walking up the main road. So, this is a school route as well and I think that adds to the case for lowering speed limits. There’s all the other little issues like wheelie bins blocking footpaths and delivery vehicles blocking footpaths, et cetera. But the point is that this street is essentially being used as a footpath by pedestrians. The footpaths themselves are too old and narrow so pedestrians are walking down the middle of the road.

 If we know that pedestrians are walking down the middle of the road, I think we should really start talking about how we can transition this street into being more of a shared street treatment. Similar to what we’ve done with Dock Street in South Brisbane.

I say again to Councillor WINES, I’m very supportive of putting a bit of SEF funding towards this. The problem at the moment is that the officers are saying no, it’s already got traffic calming, it’s already 40 kilometres an hour. Even if there’s money available, we don’t want to make any changes. I think that’s the wrong answer from the Council officers.

I think they’re still looking at this through a very car-centric lens. When the goal with these areas—it’s interesting hearing Councillor ADAMS talk earlier about the future of the Kurilpa precinct and supporting active transport and leafy boulevards and all that sort of stuff. This is the precinct, this is the area where we can do that sort of stuff.

We don’t need to wait for new development to make it happen. We can lower speed limits now. We can make some minor changes to traffic calming or add additional treatments at the intersections at either end of this street and greatly improve safety outcomes for local pedestrians and cyclists. Also improve the amenity for residents who are feeling the burden of that heavier volume of heavy vehicles.

So yes, I’m not going to support this petition response here today but I do hope that the Administration will look again at this and identify it as a great opportunity to experiment with some alternative street treatments like 30 kilometre speed limit or a shared street treatment, et cetera. This is really a no-brainer as far as I’m concerned. It’s disappointing that we even have to have petitions and lobby the whole Council for something so minor.

Like I said, 20 households on the street, it’s a small street, this shouldn’t be a big issue. But unfortunately the LNP at the moment isn’t really listening to the views of local residents. They’ve all signed the petition, they’ve all spent time talking to each other and meeting together on the street to decide what changes they want.

We’ve got agreement from all those residents that they want more traffic calming and lower speed limits, which is maybe unusual to get unanimous agreement on something like this. So they’ve done the work of demonstrating public support and local consensus. They’ve got me on board, they’ve got the State MP on board. Surely, it’s not too much to say okay, let’s listen to the community and try and respond to the needs that they’re articulating. Thanks.

Chair: Thank you.

Further debate?

 Councillor CUMMING.

Councillor CUMMING: Thank you.

**Seriatim - Clause B**

|  |
| --- |
| Councillor Peter CUMMING requested that Clause B, PETITION – REQUESTING COUNCIL REVIEW EXISTING TRAFFIC CALMING DEVICES AND TRIAL A 30 KM/H SPEED LIMIT ON ASHINGTON STREET, WEST END, be taken seriatim for voting purposes. |

Councillor CUMMING: Yes and I wish to speak on item D. This is a petition asking Council to reduce the speed limit from 50 to 40 kilometres an hour on the foreshore between Wynnum Creek, Wynnum, and Lota Creek, Lota, which is about five kilometres of the Esplanade in Wynnum Manly. Actually, I did note that it was presented to Council by me on 9 August 2022 so it’s been over seven months to get a response back, which is a bit slow, I think.

 Anyhow, the petition contained 153 signatures, 128 live in Wynnum Manly or Lota, 22 in other suburbs of Brisbane and three outside Brisbane so it’s very much a local petition. There is a section of the Esplanade which is already 40 kilometres an hour. A section of Royal Esplanade, it’s about 430 metres in length, according to the report and it’s classified as a High Activity Transport User Area and a recommendation to reduce the speed limit from 50 to 40 kilometres an hour was endorsed by the SMC (Speed Management Committee) and Council implemented a 40 kilometres high activity zone in 2020, which was very welcome.

 I remember talking to one of the Council officers and he said that it was—the survey came up with very high figures and it was one of the highest in any suburban area in Brisbane. There’s a lot of markets held in that area and the Jan Powers Market is held twice a month and the local craft market, run by the Manly Chamber of Commerce, is run every Sunday, so there’s markets Saturdays and Sundays quite often on weekends.

 There’s a lot of restaurants and the like around the area. There’s a lot of people walking to and from places of—restaurants and bars and whatever around that area. So, it will be interesting to see what the figures show for the rest of the Esplanade. I think there’s a possibility around the Wading Pool in Wynnum will be similarly very high level and also be reduced to 40 as well, but anyway, we’ll see what the surveys show.

 The fact that Council is prepared to—and is going to undertake surveys, pedestrian surveys, will be very welcome and I look forward to the results in due course.

Chair: Thank you.

Any further speakers?

 Councillor WINES.

Councillor WINES: Thanks, Mr Chair. Just in response to some of the speakers, in reverse order. Thanks to Councillor CUMMING. As he rightly identifies, we have reduced the speed limit in that general vicinity of where the petition was made, but the specific area being discussed will now be covered through an investigation through the speed limit review process.

 Councillor STRUNK was also right to indicate that I handed out some paperwork, which you can find on the internet. That is meant to be a bit of a cheat sheet to try and help people understand how the speed limit review process works.

Just a really quick summary of that, there is an early assessment made by Council⎯this is the really quick version. An early assessment is made by Council about whether it may or may not qualify. If it may qualify it is then sent to a panel, which includes Queensland Police, the representative of DTMR (Department of Transport and Main Roads) and a representative of Brisbane City Council. All three must agree, it’s not two to one, all three must agree to the reduction. That is one of the reasons why there are comparatively few of them.

So I just wanted to touch on that really quickly⎯generally how it works. But that paperwork is available for viewing and for distribution from our website.

In regards to Councillor SRI’s comments, I’m more than happy to call the traffic count and have a review of it. As I said, the existing study indicates 500 vehicles per day and an 85% at below the 33 kilometre an hour level. There is already two traffic calming devices, two speed tables in Ashington Street, so I am more than happy to review that and to put it under consideration, potentially in the future.

I also note that its location near Montague Road and Davies Park would probably indicate that some of the work that is about to commence in the review into Montague Street may benefit residents of Ashington Street when that work begins in the near future as well.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Will Councillor WINES take a very quick question?

Chair: Councillor WINES will you take a question?

Councillor WINES: Yes.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Thanks, Chair, through you. Councillor WINES just in terms of the speed limit stuff. Is there scope for the Council to initiate a trial of lower than speed limits, even where the speed limit review process wouldn’t ordinarily recommend that?

Councillor WINES: No, we aren’t in a position to be able to overrule the Speed Limit Review Committee. So I can—speaking from my own experience, I’ve only ever been able to get three speed limits reduced: one inside the shopping district on Mitchelton and Blackwood Street, Mitchelton; one inside the shopping precinct of Kedron Brook Road, Wilston; and one right next to the netball courts on Green Street, Downey Park—excuse me, I just called—Northey Street and Downey Park. So, they are not straightforward things to get in.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor WINES: Well, actually I would argue, Councillor SRI that that would actually indicate that that’s not necessary because compliance is already so high. So, that would actually work against your argument. So I think I’ve addressed the speakers in reverse order and the issues they raised with us. Can I also say, if Councillors want to see the recyclable materials, I’ll place them on the tabling desk. If you’d like to see them for yourselves.

Chair: Thank you.

 We now move to the vote on this report.

 Items A, C and D together. Items A, C and D.

**Clauses A, C and D put**

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

Chair: Vote on item B.

**Clause B put**

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

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

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 17 - The DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Krista ADAMS, and Councillors 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, Steven TOOMEY and Andrew WINES.

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

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 – SUSTAINABILITY IN ASPHALT INNOVATION

**469/2022-23**

1. The General Manager, Asset Management, Brisbane Infrastructure, attended the meeting to provide an update on sustainability in asphalt innovation. He provided the information below.

2. Council maintains a 5,800 km road network with 96.5% being an asphalt surface. Three‑quarters of Council’s road network are low-speed roads providing direct property access. Environmental deterioration is the dominant reason for pavement rehabilitation. The challenges that Council faces with asphalt maintenance are maximising performance, minimising whole‑of-lifecycle costs, choosing optimum materials and improving standards.

3. Performance requirements for Council’s roads are different to State road authorities who undertake most of the pavement research and development in Australia. Slight changes in the cost of works and processes that increase the durability of road pavements between rehabilitation treatments, provide significant cost savings to Council. There is an ongoing need to investigate new and innovative pavement solutions to economically maintain Council’s road network.

4. The Asphalt Innovation Committee (AIC) is an internal Council working group spread across Brisbane Infrastructure’s branches, each with competing priorities and agendas. The AIC:

- addresses the challenges of road pavement design, construction and maintenance

- was established approximately 10 years ago to advance the investigation and implementation of asphalt surfacing technologies

- is an example of co-operation amongst technical experts across Council and currently has members from Brisbane Infrastructure’s Asset Management, City Projects Office and City Standards.

5. To further the research goals identified by the AIC, Council has engaged with South East Queensland universities in a range of research projects at the undergraduate and post-graduate level. Projects have been undertaken with Griffith University, Queensland University of Technology, University of Queensland, University of Southern Queensland and University of the Sunshine Coast. Council has benefited from collaborating with these universities through testing of asphalt mixes to provide better understanding of pavement performance.

6. The AIC was involved in a number of Austroads research projects being undertaken by the Australian Road Research Board (ARRB). The most significant project was Cullen Avenue West, Eagle Farm, which was the first use of EME2 asphalt (high modulus asphalt). EME2 is used as an asphalt base layer and is characterised by high stiffness, high durability, superior resistance to permanent deformation and satisfactory fatigue resistance. Following the AIC and ARRB’s research project at Eagle Farm, EME2 was introduced as a standard product for Australia.

7. Standards and practices have been improved following research project outcomes of the AIC including:

 - validation of multigrade bitumen performance

- revised Type 3 asphalt specification

- increased bitumen content and compaction

- introduction of a revised mix design

- crushed glass and crumbed tyre rubber in asphalt

- polymer modified emulsion surface treatment for local roads

- stabilisation of pavement gravel

- revised pavement design methodology.

8. The AIC will continue to revise, reform and continue Council’s innovation and collaboration through the following proposed themes:

- recycling and circular economy

- technology and digital engineering

- infrastructure resilience

- performance enhancement

- collaboration and industry engagement.

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

10. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

#### B PETITION – REQUESTING COUNCIL REVIEW EXISTING TRAFFIC CALMING DEVICES AND TRIAL A 30 KM/H SPEED LIMIT ON ASHINGTON STREET, WEST END

 **137/220/594/73**

**470/2022-23**

11. A petition requesting Council review existing traffic calming devices and trial a 30 km/h speed limit on Ashington Street, West End, was presented to the meeting of Council held on 15 March 2022, by Councillor Jared Cassidy on behalf of Councillor Jonathan Sriranganathan, and received.

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

13. The petition contains 48 signatures. Of the petitioners, 27 live in Ashington Street, 19 live in The Gabba Ward and two live in other wards within the City of Brisbane.

14. Ashington Street is classified as a Neighbourhood road in Council’s road hierarchy under *Brisbane City Plan 2014*. The street has two existing speed platforms, is approximately 215 metres long and has a posted 40 km/h speed limit. Ashington Street is situated between Hardgrave Road and Montague Road, providing access to local residential properties. Attachment B (submitted on file) shows a locality map.

15. The petitioners’ request for changes to the existing traffic calming devices is noted and an investigation has been conducted. A review of Ashington Street has identified red threshold markings, 40 km/h speed limit markings and two speed platforms. The existing traffic calming devices are 60 metres apart and 70 metres from the intersection on each side. This is a typical design for traffic calming devices and is considered adequate. The existing traffic calming measures in place, in addition to the narrow width of Ashington Street, are typical characteristics of local access streets and alert motorists they are in a low‑speed residential road environment.

16. Council has assessed the traffic volumes and speed of motorists using Ashington Street from a traffic survey undertaken in October 2022. The weekday traffic volumes recorded show an average of 500 vehicles per day using Ashington Street, with 85% of all vehicles travelling at or below 33 km/h. Furthermore, a review of the Queensland Government’s crash data over the last five years has been undertaken for Ashington Street. The data shows no crashes have occurred during this time, indicating there are no safety concerns with the current road configuration.

17. In light of the above, Council does not propose any changes be made to traffic calming measures on Ashington Street at this time.

18. The petitioners’ request for a 30 km/h speed limit trial has been noted. All speed limits across Queensland are determined in accordance with guidelines set out in the Queensland Government’s *Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices*. This ensures that speed limits are set in a consistent and credible manner across Queensland. Speed limits must be realistic, consistent and encourage voluntary compliance. Arbitrarily imposed speed limits that are set too low can attract poor levels of compliance.

19. Based on the above, Council is not supportive of a 30 km/h speed limit trial in Ashington Street. The petitioners are encouraged to raise any concerns with speeding motorists directly with the Queensland Police Service via the Hoon Hotline on 13 HOON (13 46 66).

Consultation

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

Customer impact

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

22. The General Manager recommended as follows and the Committee agreed, with Councillor Charles Strunk dissenting.

23. **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:** 137/220/594/73

Thank you for your petition requesting Council review existing traffic calming devices and trial a 30 km/h speed limit on Ashington Street, West End.

Your request for changes to the existing traffic calming devices is noted and an investigation has been conducted. A review of Ashington Street has identified red threshold markings, 40 km/h speed limit markings and two speed platforms. The existing traffic calming devices are 60 metres apart and 70 metres from the intersection on each side. This is a typical design for traffic calming devices and is considered adequate. The existing traffic calming measures in place, in addition to the narrow width of Ashington Street, are typical characteristics of local access streets and alert motorists they are in a low-speed residential road environment.

Council has assessed the traffic volumes and speed of motorists using Ashington Street from a traffic survey undertaken in October 2022. The weekday traffic volumes recorded show an average of 500 vehicles per day using Ashington Street, with 85% of all vehicles travelling at or below 33 km/h. Furthermore, a review of the Queensland Government’s crash data over the last five years has been undertaken for Ashington Street. The data shows no crashes have occurred during this time, indicating there are no safety concerns with the current road configuration.

In light of the above, Council does not propose any changes be made to traffic calming measures on Ashington Street at this time.

Your request for a 30 km/h speed limit trial has been noted. All speed limits across Queensland are determined in accordance with guidelines set out in the Queensland Government’s *Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices*. This ensures that speed limits are set in a consistent and credible manner across Queensland. Speed limits must be realistic, consistent and encourage voluntary compliance. Arbitrarily imposed speed limits that are set too low can attract poor levels of compliance.

Based on the above, Council is not supportive of a 30 km/h speed limit trial in Ashington Street. You are encouraged to raise any concerns with speeding motorists directly with the Queensland Police Service via the Hoon Hotline on 13 HOON (13 46 66).

Should you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact Ms Akansha Shetty, Transport Network Officer, Transport Network Operations, Transport Planning and Operations, Brisbane Infrastructure, on (07) 3178 8839.

Thank you for raising this matter.

**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 7 March 2023, be adopted.

Chair: Councillor ALLAN.

Councillor ALLAN: Thank you, Mr Chair. Item A is the Committee presentation from last week’s meeting and it featured a development approval at 72 and 78 Cowie Road, Carseldine. The application was for a subdivision and it comprised of two large allotments with a combined site area of about two hectares. The generous site sits within the Emerging community zone and within the Carseldine residential precinct of the Bracken Ridge and district neighbourhood plan.

The site benefits from several key attributes such as the existing public park, which adjoins the site. Other attributes include the site’s proximity to key arterial roads, namely Gympie Road and Beams Road. Offering easy commuter access to Brisbane and the north. The Carseldine train station provides further future residents with more commuting options.

72 and 78 Cowie Road will provide more housing for Brisbane, with 23 small lots between 350 square metres and 440 square metres and 10 standard lots between 450 and 607 square metres. Under the development, the small lots will be provided with a building location envelope, to ensure dwelling houses can be constructed in accordance with the sitting requirements of the Small lot code without further development permits.

The development appropriately reflects the outcomes sought by the neighbourhood plan as it creates functional and integrated communities. The Emerging community zone is in accordance with the planning requirements for the area, by facilitating additional supporting infrastructure, such as an extension to the future road network.

In response to Council’s City Plan, the newly created streetscape will be improved to a neighbourhood standard. With a number of the existing trees to be retained and replacement of two trees identified for removal to facilitate new road access. To promote walking and a high level of pedestrian movement and amenity, all verges to the new access roads will be constructed with footpaths, street trees and turf. Those footpaths will be on both sides of the road.

Council has approved the development at 72 and 78 Cowie Road, Carseldine as it clearly contributes towards the Schrinner Council’s vision to provide more housing options in Brisbane. I’ll leave further debate to the Chamber.

Chair: Thank you.

Is there any further debate? No further debate.

 We 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.

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

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 22 - The DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Krista ADAMS, and Councillors 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, Steven TOOMEY, Andrew WINES, and the Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Jared CASSIDY, and Councillors Peter CUMMING, Steve GRIFFITHS, Charles STRUNK and Nicole JOHNSTON.

NOES: 1 Councillor Jonathan SRIRANGANATHAN.

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

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

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE:**

Councillor Lisa Atwood.

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – 72 AND 78 COWIE ROAD, CARSELDINE (A005990359)

**471/2022-23**

1. The Manager, Planning Services, Development Services, City Planning and Sustainability, attended the meeting to provide an update on 72 and 78 Cowie Road, Carseldine (A005990359) (the site). She provided the information below.

2. An ariel view and context map was shown to the Committee, displaying the proximity of the site to surrounding locations, including Gympie and Lacey Roads, Fitzgibbon Bushlands, Carseldine Homemaker Centre, Aspley HyperMarket with high frequency bus interchange and Carseldine train station. In accordance with *Brisbane* *City Plan 2014* (City Plan), the zoning map demonstrated that the subject site is zoned Emerging community. The applicant for the development is QLD Estates Pty Ltd c/o JFP Urban Consultants Pty Ltd.

3. The site has an area of 2.024 hectares, which will be reconfigured into 33 lots with a new road, a drainage reserve and access easements. Details of the lot sizes include:

- 23 small lots between 350 m2 and 449 m2

- 10 standard lots between 450 m2 and 607 m2

- no more than six contiguous small lots.

All lots include minimum rectangular dimensions in accordance with the Subdivision code.

4. The site integrates and connects the surrounding locality within the neighbourhood plan. A building envelope plan was provided for small allotments and reflects the Dwelling house (small lot) code. The site supports the provision of useable private open space and provides flexibility in housing outcomes. Streetscape upgrades including footpaths to all new roads are to be provided to ensure pedestrian amenity is achieved.

5. Bloodwood Place is identified as a future road corridor project. As such, a land dedication of 9.7 m along Bloodwood Place on the western boundary of the site is incorporated to ensure the future road corridor remains consistent with existing approvals adjoining the site. New roads will connect the adjoining properties.

6. The development includes provisions for:

 - an upstream stormwater drainage connection for the adjoining park lot

- a 10-metre-wide drainage reserve and bioretention basin in the north-eastern corner of the site to divert and capture stormwater flows.

7. The development was approved for the following reasons.

 - Results in lots that enable the relevant outcomes and standards required by City Plan.

 - Effectively integrates with existing and planned infrastructure and services to the extent these are identified or necessary to support the development for its intended purpose.

 - A range of lot sizes are provided, and large clusters of smaller lots are avoided.

 - Results in lots that are consistent with the zones, zone precincts, neighbourhood plans and overlays that apply to the site.

 - Results in lots that feature a useable shape with a minimum rectangle dimension to accommodate future development.

 - Aligns with the Bracken Ridge and district neighbourhood plan.

 - Contributes towards Council’s vision as a well-designed, subtropical city.

 - Facilitates the creation of suitable lots in accordance with *Planning (Walkable Neighbourhoods) Amendment Regulation 2020*.

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

9. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

Chair: Councillor LANDERS.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

|  |
| --- |
| **472/2022-23**At that time, 3pm, it was resolved on the motion of Councillor Sandy LANDERS, seconded by Councillor Sarah HUTTON, that the meeting adjourn for a period of 15 minutes, to commence only when all Councillors had vacated the Chamber and the doors locked.Council stood adjourned at 3.01pm. |

**UPON RESUMPTION:**

Chair: Thank you, Councillors.

 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 James MACKAY, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 7 March 2023, be adopted.

Chair: Councillor DAVIS.

Councillor DAVIS: Thank you, Mr Chair. Last week’s Committee presentation was on Council’s exciting ninja courses. Now in four parks across the city, our ninja courses provide an excellent opportunity for residents and visitors to get active, challenge themselves and have fun. The courses feature a range of obstacles that challenge strength, agility and coordination.

 Our first ninja course opened in Guyatt Park in St Lucia and was a local initiative of Councillor MACKAY. It proved so successful that we’ve now opened ninja courses at Teralba Park in Everton Park, Whites Hill Reserve in Camp Hill and Doulton Street Park in Calamvale. So we now have one north, south, east and west of the city. I know that the LORD MAYOR and Councillor OWEN had a great time at the opening of the Doulton Street Park ninja course late last year. This is a very special one, Mr Chair, because we actually partnered with Stretton State College to help design the course and I’m told it’s a great big hit with the kids.

 Each of these courses is bespoke and has its own unique set of obstacles. Ranging from quin steps, jungle bars, scaling walls, to tightropes, vertical ladders and more. Another great aspect of the ninja course initiative is the community engagement that it fosters. Council has partnered with Park Warrior to create a website where individuals can log their times, watch instructional videos and compete against others for the fastest time.

 The website also features a leader board where participants can see how they stack up against others who have completed the course. This creates a sense of community and a bit of healthy competition that encourages individuals to continue challenging themselves to improving their fitness.

 The ninja courses provide an excellent opportunity for people to break out of their sedentary lifestyles and engage in physical activity that improves their health and wellbeing. Hopefully inspire them to try new things, push themselves out of their comfort zones and build their confidence. It is an opportunity for individuals and groups to come together, have fun and support each other in achieving their goals.

 Finally, I want to acknowledge the hard work and dedication of our team in bringing this initiative to life. From the planning and design to the construction and installation, it’s been a good team effort. I also want to thank the community for their enthusiasm and support for the project.

 Mr Chair, there were also two petitions and I’ll leave further debate to the Chamber.

Chair: Thank you.

Is there further debate?

Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair.

**Seriatim - Clause A**

|  |
| --- |
| Councillor Jared CASSIDY requested that Clause A, COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – NINJA COURSES, be taken seriatim for voting purposes. |

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much. I’ll just start on Clause C, which is a petition requesting Council increase funding for suburban drainage projects. This is a petition that I started and lodged last year to Council. The response that we get here today in the petition response, is disappointing but it’s not surprising. The LORD MAYOR has a track record for neglecting our suburbs. We’re now over a year on from the 2022 floods and residents want to see action.

 But all they see from the LNP LORD MAYOR is waste and mismanagement that is costing them big time. He has now racked up $1 billion in blow outs on the Brisbane Metro, hundreds of millions on the inner city bridge program. He’s just wasted $10 million on his $14 billion toll tunnel proposal. But what do the suburbs out—what do the people in the suburbs get? They get diddly‑squat.

This response to my community petition at least confirms what we all knew; that the LORD MAYOR’s spin after the floods was just that. He claimed last year that he was spending $130 million on drainage this year. But the response before us today has admitted that he’s spending just $32 million in stormwater infrastructure. So rates have gone up in the last year to historically high levels—over five per cent for—almost six per cent for residents in flood‑affected suburbs in my ward, but we are not seeing an investment in drainage infrastructure.

You know the LNP’s $100 million lie is now here in black and white for everyone to see. Hundreds of residents took the time to fill out the drainage survey I sent around my community last year. Hundreds have signed this petition and 70% of the hundreds of people who filled out a separate budget submission survey, listed drainage as their number one issue. But what this LNP LORD MAYOR’s number one priority is, is definitely not drainage out in the suburbs of Brisbane.

His number one priority is of course his inner city projects and his advertising budget. The only time locals catch a glimpse of this LORD MAYOR is during the couple of seconds it takes them to grab the *Living in Brisbane* newsletter out of their letter box and put it straight into the recycling bin.

Suburban residents want funding for basic suburban projects like drainage, but instead they get the multimillion-dollar Visitor Centre here in Adelaide Street, across from City Hall, sitting completely empty. They want their rates spent on projects important to them out in their community, but instead they see their rates spent on the $2 billion Metro project.

They want a LORD MAYOR and a Council who deliver services, but instead they get bombarded with this ratepayer-funded advertising, which is all just about self-promotion for the LORD MAYOR. So my community, like many around Brisbane, was devastated by the flooding in February 2022. They have been incredibly resilient, personally, as is so often the case in these disasters. The ones who most need help tend to be among the ones who are last to ask for it.

In this case people just have expressed a view that their Council should be delivering basics out in the suburbs.

Councillor interjecting.

Councillor CASSIDY: It should be a function of Council to deliver basic suburban infrastructure like drainage with the rates they levy from local residents. It’s a pretty simple equation that most people agree with in Brisbane. The people who disagree with that is the LNP and LNP Councillors here in this Chamber.

So residents in my ward of Deagon and right across Brisbane have been let down by this LORD MAYOR, Adrian SCHRINNER, and his LNP Administration, but I will continue to fight for better services for our suburbs.

Councillor interjecting.

Chair: Thank you.

Any further debate?

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, I rise to speak on item A, B and C. Firstly, can I just start with the ninja courses because it’s really interesting what the LNP is prepared to talk about in this place? I’m quite certain Councillor DAVIS thinks genuinely this is a great outcome. There’s a ninja course in the western suburbs, there’s a ninja course in the northern suburbs, there’s a ninja course in the eastern suburbs, there’s a ninja course in the southern suburbs.

I’m sure she thinks that’s very fair. I’m sure she thinks that’s a very reasonable and considered allocation of Council funding and I’m sure it is. Reasonable and considered because it’s all going into LNP wards. Not a single cent, not one dollar, not one dollar of the capital funding that has been allocated to these projects has gone into a ninja course in a non-LNP area. So there’s not one in a Labor ward, there’s not one in a Green ward and there’s not one in my ward.

So that’s bad enough, right? It’s bad enough that the LNP are so proud of their pork barrelling that they just put it in writing now and they don’t even think about it anymore. One hundred per cent of funding all the time goes into their own areas.

Then let’s look at those wards that don’t get that capital funding for projects like this. You know my ward never got any capital funding for the outdoor gyms either and I’m still waiting for that to happen with my SEF funding. But let’s talk about SEF funding, in June last year, immediately after the budget, I put a memo forward, as I do each year, saying I wanted to build a ninja playground in Chelmer. I’d done the consultation on it, residents were supportive, this was the outcome.

It’s now mid-March, nine months on, I’m still waiting, still waiting for some advice back. I’ve had some verbal advice; oh prices have gone up Councillor. But not a single person has provided me with a scope of works, with any kind of trust allocations. Trust me, I’m asking. I don’t want to spend $260,000 on doing something when I’ve only got $160,000. We have to actually allocate the funding as needed.

Councillor interjecting.

Councillor JOHNSTON: But have there been any other options presented in terms of—I’ve been asking can I allocate funding this year and next year? No response about that. So Councillor DAVIS, your staff⎯through you, Mr Chair⎯your staff are unable to respond to SEF requests in my ward to build a ninja playground. I’m sure Councillor MARX is looking really puzzled.

Councillor interjecting.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, but June is when I put the things in that I want. So we still do not have any kind of written information to me about the ninja playground. But this is the you beaut system that the LNP brought in last year, where officers who are actually responsible for these things can’t talk to you. You’ve got an Outcome Manager⎯I think that—no, what do you—I don’t even know what they’re called any more. That poor guy is running around—

Councillor interjecting.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, or girl. Trying to run around and do everything that a whole team of people used to do in Asset Services South. It is unfair and unsustainable on those officers. Meanwhile, when I make a request in writing, there is still no action. Nine months. But yet here’s Councillor DAVIS standing up, talking about how proud they are to deliver them in LNP wards. When I’m proposing to use trust funds, SEF funds, in Tennyson Ward and I can’t even get some basics to bring it forward. That is not good enough.

 Item B, I know Councillor COOK is not here but this is an important issue to her. The backflow valves were recommended after the 2011 floods and they’ve still not been done. They’ve still not been done. I actually got a look at Council’s Operational Review of the 2022 floods. Can I say, not an operational review. There’s a couple of memos on the file, there is no proper review that’s been done. Not at all, it was absolutely shocking.

 So I’ve done—or will be doing a supplementary request, just in case someone didn’t actually disclose all the documents, which wouldn’t be a surprise either. Was there one about drainage? No, no, no there was not. So I know that this is something Councillor COOK thinks is important. It was recommended after the 2011 floods and this Council is not investing enough in delivering for backflow valves.

 Finally, item C. I too, like Councillor CASSIDY, noted the LNP has blatantly lied in its public statements to the media and to the people of Brisbane when it claimed that there was $140 million being invested in drainage. Now we knew that was not true. We just knew that was untrue. There may have been some additional money for clean-up after the floods. But certainly there was only ever $30-odd million allocated in the budget for new and retrospective refitting of drainage in Brisbane.

 That is woeful out of a budget of $4 billion, $4 billion and this Council’s spending $32 million on drainage. So let me put on the record the following. We still have a number of drains in Brisbane that have not been cleaned up after the 2022 floods. That is now almost 13 months ago. That includes, (1), the retention basin in Ortive Street, Yeronga, which is still caked in the same mud and still not functional, as it was when it flooded in late February 2022, over a year ago. Council still cannot provide a timeframe for when it will be fixed.

The emergency bypass valve is working and Council says that’s fine, there’s no problem. There’s no rush to clean up this drain in an area that floods in heavy rain all the time. It is appalling that 13 months on, Council has not prioritised the cleaning up of the drains.

Secondly, I have an open drain in Oxley which appears to be the land that Council forgot. It’s actually, in my view, fenced off behind private property, which is probably why Council forgot it. But it’s an open drain running down to Oxley Creek. Now, I raised it last year with Council officers and I’ve sent all that information over to Councillor MARX earlier today. Because I raised it in Committee as well. Nothing’s been done.

There were dumped tyres, dumped metal. The channel was full of weeds, full of weed trees. This is a drain that flows in and out to Oxley Creek and is part of a drainage system for one of the worst affected streets in Brisbane, Logan Avenue, Oxley, and one of the worst flood-affected areas in Brisbane. That’s still not been done.

Then of course we get to Cactoblastis Corner. The park that I did the motion on last week for Council to clean up. So bad was the damage down in that park that Council’s stormwater mains and UU’s (Urban Utilities) water supply and sewerage mains were catastrophically damaged by that landslip. But what did this Administration do? They voted to block a motion to fully restore it, which means they do not support restoring this parkland area and the services that are located within it. It is not good enough. This Administration is drastically underfunding drainage works around Brisbane.

 Then we get to Hyde Road, Yeronga, an issue well-known to this Council. Where, for the past 15 years, Council has allowed illegal fill and illegal pipes to be installed on private property and on Council land and Council will do nothing to rectify the situation. Council simply says it’s too long ago; we’re not going to do anything about it. Despite the fact that it’s adversely contributed to flooding for residents who live nearby in Yeronga West.

It is not good enough. It is appalling that Council is refusing to fix known drainage problems and requiring private property owners to fix them. I noted last week that the Administration was happy to find a solution underneath some buildings in Spring Hill for those residents. But out in Yeronga where residents are being flooded because of illegal drainage, Council will not require rectification. When it’s on Council land, they won’t do anything about that either.

So here we have an Administration that refuses to properly fund drainage in this city, refuses to do it. They won’t clean up the drains after the floods, and we’re still waiting. They aren’t investing in the backflow valves. They won’t make sure that the drains they know—they know were not built properly, were built illegally and have caused huge damage—have not been fixed. That’s just three examples in my ward.

Then, of course, you’ve got the 2001 report that said the stormwater network in Yeronga West should be upgraded and there should be no further infill—

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, your time has expired.

Further speakers?

Councillor OWEN.

Councillor OWEN: Thank you, Mr Chair, and Mr Chair, I rise to speak about the wonderful ninja courses and to say how important they are to maintaining that active and healthy lifestyle in our city. Can I say a very special thank you to the students of Stretton State College, who actually took part in the workshops whilst I worked with the Council officers to actually deliver the type of equipment in that ninja course that they were looking for.

 So having this direct consultation with those students, that was an absolutely fantastic part of the process, Councillor DAVIS, through you, Mr Chair. I do thank and commend the officers for their willingness to really engage with those young people and also myself. I know that when the LORD MAYOR came out for the official opening of that ninja course—now, I’ll just remind everybody that my ward is the southernmost ward of the entire city. So it is out there in the suburbs where the LORD MAYOR came out to actually make sure that the project that we were delivering was what the community wanted and can I tell you that they resoundingly said yes. So the LORD MAYOR does come out regularly into the suburbs, despite what those on the opposite side of the Chamber might wish to perpetuate. It’s a falsehood that they are perpetuating.

 So we, out in the suburbs, appreciate this investment by this Administration in an active and healthy lifestyle for our young people. Also the collaboration that did occur in this project. So on behalf of my Calamvale Ward residents, I say thank you for our Doulton Alfred Park ninja course.

Chair: Thank you.

Any further speakers? No further speakers.

Councillor DAVIS.

Councillor DAVIS: Well thank you very much, Mr Chair. In response to some of the comments that were made during the course of the debate and thank you Councillors for your contribution. I just want to point out two things. It’s pretty clear to me that Councillor JOHNSTON has not read the response to the petition regarding backflow valves.

In 2021, Mr Chair, the State Government released an updated Economic Framework for Drainage Infrastructure and that included backflow valves. So following the 2022 flood, Council has undertaken a review of backflow sites that were identified in the 2012 AECOM report, against this new framework, including those that were in Morningside. That review remains underway as our application of this new methodology is assessed against industry best practice.

Secondly, just in response to the allegations that in this budget we are not spending record levels on infrastructure—stormwater and draining infrastructure. There was a very specific question to the petition and the correct information was provided. However, $131 million was earmarked in this year’s budget for a range of things. For investment in drainage, for investment in stormwater projects, as well as flood recovery work.

So it is a bit mischievous and unreasonable that those that contributed to the debate, that were questioning the amount that is being invested in drainage and stormwater, would indicate that we had not provided accurate and correct information regarding the amount of spend in this year’s budget.

Councillor interjecting.

Chair: Thank you.

 Councillors we now move to the vote on this report. Item A in the first instance.

**Clause A put**

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

Chair: Items B and C together.

**Clauses B and C put**

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

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

The voting was as follows:

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

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

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 – NINJA COURSES

**473/2022-23**

1. The A/Manager, Major Projects and Asset Coordination, Natural Environment, Water and Sustainability, City Planning and Sustainability, attended the meeting to provide an update on Council’s new ninja courses. He provided the information below.

2. Council is committed to providing extensive play and fitness equipment across the city. Due to community interest in the television series *Australian* *Ninja Warrior*, Council introduced ninja courses to provide a more challenging fitness opportunity for park users. District level parks were chosen to install the ninja courses based on the following qualities:

- available space

- a significant residential catchment

- existing supporting recreational infrastructure including car parks, other playground equipment and picnic facilities

- the opportunity to consolidate facilities and provide a greater range of recreational offerings.

3. The ninja courses are a series of connected fitness challenges with the aim to remain on the equipment for the duration of the course, without touching the ground. Users follow the sequence of equipment features and try to improve their completion time. The Committee were shown several equipment features of the ninja courses.

4. In 2020, Council installed its first ninja course in Guyatt Park, St Lucia, and it was well-received by the community. One of the most popular features of the ninja course is a link to Park Warrior, where users can upload and race against their own and other course times. Due to its popularity, Council committed to install another three courses across the city to provide greater accessibility for residents. Designs were prepared for Teralba Park, Everton Park; Whites Hill Reserve, Holland Park; and Doulton Street Park, Calamvale, to suit the unique constraints of each site. All courses were completed by the end of September 2022.

5. The Committee was provided with an outline of the three additional ninja courses:

- Teralba Park – located near the basketball court and picnic facilities, the course has a U-shape design with 11 obstacles and a perimeter of sandstone blocks which creates informal seating for spectators

- Whites Hill Reserve – located beside existing fitness equipment, the course has a linear configuration with nine obstacles and features sandstone block wall seating and a connecting path to the car park

- Doulton Street Park – due to the course’s proximity to Stretton State College, consultation was undertaken with school students which resulted in a slide and trapeze being incorporated into the 11-obstacle course.

6. The Civic Cabinet Chair thanked the A/Manager for his informative update.

7. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

#### B PETITIONS – REQUESTING COUNCIL URGENTLY INSTALL BACKFLOW DEVICES IN MORNINGSIDE WARD

 **137/220/594/115 and 137/220/594/148**

**474/2022-23**

8. Two petitions were received requesting Council urgently install backflow devices in the Morningside Ward. Petition 137/220/594/115 was presented to Council at its meeting of 14 June 2022, by Councillor Kara Cook, and received. Petition 137/220/594/148 was received during the Winter Recess 2022.

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

10. The petitions contain a total of 315 signatures. Of the petitioners, 281 live in the Morningside Ward, 29 live in other suburbs in the City of Brisbane and five live outside the City of Brisbane.

11. Petitioners advise that during the 2011 and 2022 floods, parts of the Morningside Ward were affected by backflow flooding from the Brisbane River which affected the drainage network and flowed onto roads.

12. The petitioners understand that the installation of backflow devices will not prevent backflow flooding, however, may lessen the impact of flooding during such events.

13. The petitioners have requested that:

(a) Council investigates the impact of backflow devices in Morningside Ward and possible locations for their installation; and

(b) the locations identified in 2011 and 2012 as feasible for backflow devices in Morningside Ward be urgently installed, including (but not limited to):

- Apollo Road, and Carbeen, Coutts, Kenbury and Bulimba Streets, Bulimba

- Stage 2 Jamieson and Stuart Streets, Bulimba

- Lindsay Street, Hawthorne

- Adina, Frank, Brentnall, Waite and Wendell Streets, Norman Park.

14. An independent review has been undertaken with respect to the 2022 Brisbane flood event. The Brisbane City Council 2022 Flood Review (the Review) made 37 recommendations, all of which have been adopted. Recommendation 3.1 of the Review recommends that Council continue to assess and prioritise the installation of backflow devices as part of its flood mitigation strategy. The Review can be found at www.brisbane.qld.gov.au on the ‘2022 severe weather event recovery’ webpage.

15. Following the Review’s recommendations, Council is reviewing the feasibility of the backflow device sites identified in the 2012 report against the latest Economic Assessment Framework provided by the Queensland Government. The investigation is in progress and any future works identified, as a result of the investigation, will be considered along with other potential projects across the city according to citywide priority and budget availability as determined through Council’s annual budget process.

16. It should be noted that Stage 2 backflow device construction works at Jamieson and Stuart Streets, Bulimba, were completed in 2017-18.

Consultation

17. Councillor Kara Cook, Councillor for Morningside Ward, has been consulted and does not support the recommendation.

Customer impact

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

19. The Divisional Manager recommended as follows and the Committee agreed, with Councillor Jared Cassidy dissenting.

20. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A**

**Draft Response**

**Petition References:** 137/220/594/115 and 137/220/594/148

Thank you for your petitions requesting that Council urgently install backflow devices in the Morningside Ward.

An independent review has been undertaken with respect to the 2022 Brisbane flood event. The Brisbane City Council 2022 Flood Review (the Review) made 37 recommendations, all of which have been adopted. Recommendation 3.1 of the Review recommends that Council continue to assess and prioritise the installation of backflow devices as part of its flood mitigation strategy. The Review can be found at www.brisbane.qld.gov.au on the ‘2022 severe weather event recovery’ webpage.

Following the Review’s recommendations, Council is reviewing the feasibility of the backflow devices sites identified in the 2012 report against the latest Economic Assessment Framework provided by the Queensland Government. The investigation is in progress and any future works identified, as a result of the investigation, will be considered along with other potential projects across the city according to citywide priority and budget availability as determined through Council’s annual budget process.

It should be noted that Stage 2 backflow device construction works at Jamieson and Stuart Streets, Bulimba, were completed in 2017-18.

Please let the other petitioners know of this information.

Should you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact Ms Lee Garnett, Principal Program Officer, Major Projects and Asset Coordination, Natural Environment, Water and Sustainability, City Planning and Sustainability, on (07) 3027 4706.

Thank you for raising this matter.

**ADOPTED**

#### C PETITION – REQUESTING COUNCIL INCREASE FUNDING FOR SUBURBAN DRAINAGE PROJECTS

 **137/220/594/124**

**475/2022-23**

21. A petition requesting Council increase funding for suburban drainage projects, was received during the Winter Recess 2022.

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

23. The petition contains 578 signatures

24. Council has allocated $32 million for the design and construction of stormwater drainage infrastructure in the 2022-23 budget. This funding is shared across 190 suburbs.

25. Council’s stormwater works program aims to deliver infrastructure to minimise flooding impacts on residential properties. In developed areas, Council seeks to provide a 1 in 10-year immunity from overland flow flood inundation to living and utility areas of residential properties. The stormwater works are identified from planning studies and stormwater drainage investigations arising from flooding complaints.

26. The list of proposed works is reviewed and prioritised as part of the annual budget development process. The capital works program is prioritised on a citywide basis having regard to cost-effectiveness, frequency and severity of flooding, and the number of affected residential properties.

27. Council regularly inspects and maintains its stormwater drainage system to ensure it is clear and functioning as expected. Approximately 100 kilometres of the enclosed drainage network is inspected annually. While gully traps, which are prone to blockage, are proactively inspected and cleaned up to 12 times per year.

28. In addition, since the February 2022 flood event, Council inspected approximately 8,078 gully traps, and cleaned them as needed. Inspection of the entirety of the 367 kilometres enclosed drainage network, which was inundated during the February 2022 flood event, was completed at the end of November 2022. With remaining maintenance works anticipated to be completed by the end of February 2023, weather permitting.

Consultation

29. Councillor Jared Cassidy, Councillor for Deagon Ward, has been consulted and does not support the recommendation.

Customer impact

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

31. The Divisional Manager recommended as follows and the Committee agreed, with Councillor Jared Cassidy dissenting.

32. **RECOMMENDATION:**

**THAT 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:** 137/220/594/124

Thank you for your petition requesting that Council increase funding for completion of all new and outstanding stormwater drainage maintenance jobs and upgrades.

Council has allocated $32 million for the design and construction of stormwater drainage infrastructure in the 2022-23 budget. This funding is shared across 190 suburbs.

Council’s stormwater works program aims to deliver infrastructure to minimise flooding impacts on residential properties. In developed areas, Council seeks to provide a 1 in 10-year immunity from overland flow flood inundation to living and utility areas of residential properties. The stormwater works are identified from planning studies and stormwater drainage investigations arising from flooding complaints.

The list of proposed works is reviewed and prioritised as part of the annual budget development process. The capital works program is prioritised on a citywide basis having regard to cost‑effectiveness, frequency and severity of flooding, and the number of affected residential properties.

Council regularly inspects and maintains its stormwater drainage system to ensure it is clear and functioning as expected. Approximately 100 kilometres of the enclosed drainage network is inspected annually. While gully traps, which are prone to blockage, are proactively inspected and cleaned up to 12 times per year.

In addition, since the February 2022 flood event, Council inspected approximately 8,078 gully traps, and cleaned them as needed. Inspection of the entirety of the 367 kilometres enclosed drainage network, which was inundated during the February 2022 flood event, was completed at the end of November 2022. With remaining maintenance works anticipated to be completed by the end of February 2023, weather permitting.

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

Should you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact Mr Siva Sivaananthan, Senior Engineer, Major Projects and Asset Coordination, Natural Environment, Water and Sustainability, City Planning and Sustainability, on (07) 3403 4789.

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 7 March 2023, be adopted.

Chair: Councillor MARX.

Councillor MARX: Yes, thank you, Mr Chair. I’m just rising to speak on item A. We had a presentation last week at Committee about the domestic animal ownership and compliance within Brisbane. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you.

Is there any debate? No debate.

I move to the vote on this report.

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

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

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

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – DOMESTIC ANIMAL OWNERSHIP AND COMPLIANCE IN BRISBANE

**476/2022-23**

1. The General Manager, Compliance and Regulatory Services, Lifestyle and Community Services, attended the meeting to provide an update on domestic animal ownership and compliance in Brisbane. She provided the information below.

2. Council manages all domestic animals in Brisbane in accordance with the Queensland Government’s *Animal Management (Cats and Dogs) Act 2008* (the Act) and Council’s *Animals Local Law 2017* (the Local Law). The Act regulates dog registration, pet identification and management of regulated dogs, and promotes responsible pet ownership. The Local Law ensures domestic animals are kept in ways that are consistent with community expectations and promotes responsible pet ownership.

3. To better understand domestic animal populations in Brisbane, Council engages Nature Pty Ltd to undertake market research and analysis to obtain detailed data on domestic pet ownership and compliance. From this, reports are provided to Council which includes dog registration, microchipping and desexing. In 2022, the report also included statistics of dog ownership since the start of the COVID‑19 pandemic.

4. The Committee was shown images detailing the following Brisbane information:

- pet ownership between 2012 to 2022

- pet ownership by region

- the top 5 suburbs for pet ownership

- statistics on multiple pet ownership

- key insights of pet ownership during the COVID-19 pandemic.

5. Council plans to deliver the following events/initiatives:

- ‘DogFest’, a community event to be held at Victoria Park / Burrambin on 19 March 2023

- ‘Operation Wanted’ dog desexing campaign, in collaboration with RSPCA Queensland and local participating veterinary clinics

- proactive media opportunities to promote responsible pet ownership

- continued investigation of ways to improve registration rates.

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

7. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor JOHNSTON.

**477/2022-23**

At that juncture, Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON moved, seconded by Councillor Steve GRIFFITHS, that the notified motion submitted by Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON at the meeting on 7 March 2023, be taken off the table. Upon being submitted to the Chamber, the motion was declared **lost** on the voices.

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

The voting was as follows:

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

NOES: 18 - The DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Krista ADAMS, and 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, Steven TOOMEY and Andrew WINES.

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 7 March 2023, be adopted.

Chair: Councillor HOWARD.

Councillor HOWARD: Thank you, Mr Chair and tonight I would like to start on a more sombre note than I normally do when giving my reports and refer to the Whiskey Au Go Go 50-year anniversary that occurred last week. At 2.08am on Thursday 8 March 1973, a fire was deliberately lit which cost the lives of 15 people. Donna Phillips is a survivor and was a bar attendant on that night and has been the most amazing advocate for the survivors and for the families who lost their loved ones during that long, 50-year period.

 So last Wednesday, the 8th, we met on the site of this dreadful event. I’m actually pleased to say that it was very sad but at the same time uplifting. In that there were families of survivors that were there. There were police, there were ambulance people, there were just—firies, it was just an amazing event for me to be part of.

 Now, I can’t begin to imagine the fear of those present, nor the anguish that has caused to all their families for half a century and the raw pain that was evident on that day with some families who have children who’ve never met their mother or their father as a result of that dreadful event.

 It was really something special, but I just want to pay a big, big—say a big, big thank you to Donna Phillips, because over the many years, she has been steadfast in trying to find the truth. We know that there are commissions that are there and people are waiting for some answers.

 But one of the things that I’m most proud of is that through my advocacy, we were able to have a small plaque on the footpath where this dreadful event occurred and every year we have met on this place. Sometimes there’s only a few people, but with this one being the 50th anniversary there was quite a number of people there. I really want to just remind the Chamber of some of the more horrendous things that have happened in a place that I’m very proud to represent. But Fortitude Valley in the past has had some horrendous things occur. So this was one of them. I just want to say a big thank you to all of the families who did attend and to say our thoughts are with you, always.

 Moving to some of the more lovely things that happen. Last Saturday, I think the LORD MAYOR mentioned, it was St. Patrick’s Day Parade. It was a bit early because of course it’s got to be the Saturday before St. Patrick’s Day and the LORD MAYOR mentioned Fiona Hodges. Now Fiona does the most amazing job of wrangling lots and lots of Irish, right across Brisbane,

 The parade is extra special. You see all of the people coming out. We had wolfhounds, we had 250 dancers, it was just amazing. So I really want to say a big thank you to the St. Patrick’s Day Parade people for their ongoing commitment to ensuring that Brisbane, at some stage, is not only clean but green also on St. Patrick’s Day.

Councillor interjecting.

Councillor HOWARD: We also had—I also attended the Co.As.It. International Women’s Day event and we had the Lady Mayoress as the guest speaker, who has people practically in tears. If she’s not crying, then the rest of the audience was crying. But it was an amazing group of Italian women meeting at the Greek Club. So you can only imagine what happened there.

 They actually take a break so that everyone can chat with each other because that’s how important Co.As.It. is to the Italian community and to the services of their families, right across Brisbane. We had Laura Churchill provide a parade, Kim Skubris was the MC and the monies raised—and there was quite considerable monies raised—went to the dementia support and mind wellness services.

So I want to say a big thank you to Nina Schrinner, the Lady Mayoress, because her comments to these ladies is just so genuine and authentic and it means such a lot to them.

I also attended on the same day Pakistan Day. This is the first time that we’ve held an event in King George Square. Everyone was incredibly, incredibly excited about that. So again, a big thank you to all of those who participated in the very first, and I’m sure it will not be the last, Pakistan Day Festival that they held in King George Square. The organisers were incredibly grateful to Brisbane City Council for the opportunity to have that in the Square. There were so many people there, even though it was raining a little bit, but they all had a great time.

I just also want to give a shout out to Growl Theatre which of course is in—through you, Mr Chair, is in your ward, but I used to look after them and so we have constantly been attending their events. So, A Comedy of Tenors was another amazing event. They are so kind to me; I always get a photo with the cast. So we kept up that traditional again and that was, again, quite, quite amazing.

The final thing before moving to the report is that I had the pleasure of attending the Queensland Music Awards’ Song of the Year announcement that we just did down in the Valley just today, around lunchtime. So for the first time in history of the Queensland Music Awards, Sycco, also known as Sasha McLeod, has won this prestigious award for two years in a row. So she has a plaque side by side in the Valley Mall and deservedly so.

Her song, ‘My Ways’ won the award in 2022 and her song ‘Dribble’ won in 2021. She’s an amazing young lady. She was there with her friends; they were so excited. But it’s just—I think that the Queensland Music Awards just do so much for our local artists, to see a young person such as Sasha being able to achieve some of her dreams and for us to be able to provide a platform that is there forever.

She sort of mentioned that, you know, in a long time from now she’ll be able to come to the Valley and see the two plaques. We said that she could even go for a third, if she’s lucky this year. So we’ll have our fingers crossed for that. So that’s the week that was.

Moving to the Committee presentation. We had a presentation on the Community Leasing Information Portal, also known as CLIP. Now, I know that we have sent information out to the wards about this, but CLIP is a complete, accurate and live information source about Council-owned community assets. Utilising our existing corporate systems, CLIP provides a portal for tenants to complete various lease transactions.

I really want to impress upon the Councillors in the Chamber the importance of talking to your organisations about these initiatives that our team at Community Leasing are putting forward. To try and make like easier for the many, many organisations we have across Brisbane.

So CLIP went live on the 6 February and within three weeks, we had 27 applications for works submitted, 10 obligation updates provided and 14 requests for copies of their contracts. The Committee was provided with a demonstration of CLIP and shown how lessees access and use the portal. So it was a great presentation. I want to thank all of our officers who have been involved in bringing it to fruition and I will leave further debate to the Chamber.

Chair: Thank you.

Is there any further debate? No further debate.

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 – COMMUNITY LEASING INFORMATION PORTAL

**478/2022-23**

1. The Manager, Healthy and Vibrant Communities, Connected Communities, Lifestyle and Community Services, attended the meeting to provide an update on Council’s Community Leasing Information Portal (CLIP). He provided the information below.

2. CLIP is a complete, accurate and live information source about Council-owned community assets. Utilising existing corporate systems, CLIP provides a portal for tenants to complete various lease transactions such as:

- requesting a copy of their agreement

- viewing the obligations of their lease

- submitting a general enquiry about their lease

- lodging an application for works on their lease site

- updating their organisation’s details

- updating pool facility usage for pool lessees.

3. CLIP aims to improve efficiencies through standardising processes, enabling data driven decision‑making and supporting proactive community facility planning based on need.. The benefits of CLIP for lessees include:

- information and forms being available in one central location with 24/7 access

- forms pre-populated with basic lease details

- viewing lease information and map boundaries

- regular updates to forms and the portal

- being able to track transactions and interactions

- access to records and prior submissions.

Feedback from lessees has been positive, highlighting the ease of using the portal and how it keeps users informed and provides relevant details.

4. CLIP went live on 6 February 2023, and within three weeks, there were:

- 27 applications for works submitted

- 10 obligational updates provided

- 14 requests for copies of contracts.

5. The Committee was provided with a demonstration of CLIP and shown how lessees access and use the portal via the Council website. Lessees who have not yet registered for CLIP will be provided the opportunity for one-on-one training and assistance, with feedback received used to enhance the user experience.

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

7. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

Chair: Councillor CUNNINGHAM, Finance 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 7 March 2023, be adopted.

Chair: Councillor CUNNINGHAM.

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: Thanks, Mr Chair. Item A was the Committee presentation which was from our Chief Procurement Officer. He provided the Committee with an external market update. As we all know, markets for goods and services have been incredibly volatile over the past couple of years and the Strategic Procurement Office has been working tirelessly to shield Council from as many negative impacts of the volatility as is possible.

 Council has responded to the economic markets in a number of ways including increased use of rise and fall clauses and supplier relief clauses to share the market risk, ordering materials further in advance and maintaining a supply pre-purchasing items such as pre-cast concrete pipes and box culverts, exploring new suppliers and market capacity, and reviewing product substitution and redundance.

 Thankfully, the second quarter of the 2022-23 financial year has seen a decrease in the overall volatility of most spend categories that Council has. We’re not out of the woods yet through, Mr Chair, and uncertainty does remain a concern for the Council officers and I commend the report to the Chamber.

Chair: Thank you.

Is there any further debate? No further debate.

We move to the vote on this report.

Upon being submitted to the Chamber, the motion for the adoption of the report 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 – EXTERNAL MARKET UPDATE

**479/2022-23**

1. The Chief Procurement Officer, Strategic Procurement Office, Organisational Services, attended the meeting to provide an external market update. He provided the information below.

2. The last financial year has seen highly volatile economic markets. Council’s annual addressable spend totals at $1,205 million, broken down into the following categories:

- $425 million in construction and operations

- $385 million in transport and utilities

- $285 million in enterprise services

- $110 million in Information and Communications Technology (ICT) and technology.

3. Council has responded to volatile economic markets in a number of ways, including:

- increased use of ‘rise and fall’ clauses and supplier relief clauses to share market risk with suppliers

- ordering materials further in advance and maintaining a supply of materials

- pre-purchasing items such as precast concrete pipes and box culverts

- exploring new suppliers and market capacity, including social enterprises

- reviewing product substitution and redundance.

4. The Enterprise Services category has seen issues with supply and movements in the consumer price index, which are impacting price. Council is currently working with stakeholders to manage demand and review scopes of work to alleviate spend and costs.

5. In the Transport and Utilities category there is a focus on investigations and negotiations around electricity, gas and diesel to reduce Council’s exposure to market volatility.

6. Council is ordering bulk quantities of hardware in advance to secure supply and minimise price impacts for ICT. Most software is influenced by foreign currency, therefore, by price fixing in Australian dollars under contracts, Council is locking in certainty on prices.

7. In the Construction and Operations category, Council is undertaking a number of approaches to respond to market volatility, including early contractor involvement through expressions of interest and early tender involvement methods consistent with other government agencies. Rise and fall arrangements are being included on multiple construction contracts, including a review on the delivery model of contracts to minimise risk to contractors, and increasing the inventory for frequently used products such as timber and cast concrete.

8. The second quarter of the 2022-23 financial year has seen a decrease in the overall volatility of most spend categories, with the exception of cyber security services which has had an increase of 14% from last quarter.

9. Following a number of questions from the Committee, the Civic Cabinet Chair thanked the Chief Procurement Officer for his informative presentation.

10. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

## CONSIDERATION OF NOTIFIED MOTION – NORTH WEST TRANSPORT NETWORK:

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

**480/2022-23**

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

*This Council:*

1. *Notes Transport Minister Mark Bailey’s letter rejecting Council’s offer to work together in developing the North West Transport Network plan.*
2. *Notes that the North West Transport Corridor is a critical environmental asset that must never been developed for an at-ground road or rail proposal.*
3. *Urges the State Government to drop their plan to resume homes and bulldoze important bushland for a heavy rail route as is currently proposed.*
4. *Requests that the State Government come to the table to help produce a transport plan that will ease the daily commute of north-west Brisbane residents.*

Chair: Is there any debate?

LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Yes, Mr Chair. As I mentioned earlier in the meeting. This Council, this Administration, has consistently held the charge when it comes to planning for the future and proposing solutions to problems that face our traffic and transport network.

 Whether that has been the construction of our first ever green bridge, or Australia’s first ever green bridge, through to the major road and transport upgrades that have happened over the successive many years, led by this Council and led by its predecessor councils. We have a proud record of leading the charge.

Councillor interjecting.

LORD MAYOR: We did so when it comes to reactivating discussion on the North West Transport Corridor or network. Why? Because no one else was doing it. Because, despite the fact that there’s a preserved corridor of bushland and homes, nothing has been done in decades. Why? Because the city is growing fast. Why? Because if we don’t do it, then it’s quite clear that nobody else will lead the charge.

 So we are very determined to make sure that our city’s infrastructure is upgraded as the city grows. But we also know, because we have been involved in building this infrastructure. Whether it’s tunnels or bridges or road upgrades or active travel links or public transport improvements, we do know that community involvement and community consultation is critical in getting a better outcome.

 We also do know that it’s very much common sense that, if you’re building major infrastructure through an already developed area, that it makes sense to consider underground options. As I mentioned, the Cross River Rail project is underground. It wouldn’t fly if it was above ground. Building Cross River Rail through the suburbs and via a bridge across the Brisbane River would be a pie in the sky solution. It would never fly. For the same reason, it’s never going to fly to build an at-surface railway line or road motorway corridor through the North West Transport Corridor.

 It doesn’t take a genius to work that out, and that is the simple proposition that we put forward to Infrastructure Australia. The options that need to be considered need to be underground, and whether that’s a road motorway or whether that’s a rail line, whether that’s the ability to improve transport links, underground options need to be considered.

 Now, when we invited the Transport Minister to be part of our study more than three years ago, in fact in November 2019, we didn’t hear a lot for eight months, in fact, we heard nothing for eight months. But thankfully, Mr Chair, you were committed to this project and you got on with the job. You progressed the planning work, and you didn’t wait eight months to start the project. You got on with the job.

 What we heard eight months later is that the Minister for Transport, Mark Bailey, ruled out participating in the study and said he would do his own study. That was in July 2020, so almost three years ago we heard Minister Bailey say he would do his own study.

 Mr Chair, did we hear officers engaging on this study? Did the State officers approach us about their study? Did we hear anything? There’s been nothing. There’s been absolutely nothing, and so three years have gone past. No engagement from the State on this study that they promised three years ago, and then obviously it has all come to a head last week.

 But what did we hear last week? Minister Bailey said, and I’ll repeat what was said earlier today—on radio, on ABC last week he said, ‘the North West Transport Corridor will be an important access into the city’. He then went on to say, ‘clearly there needs to be a rail solution through there’—through there—‘at some point’.

 There are two critical words in that statement. First of all, ‘clearly’, this is a statement he believes in very clearly. This is not a question. He’s not saying, maybe there needs to be a rail line through there at some point. He’s saying, clearly. He believes this to be true. He has made it quite clear that his plan is clearly to build a rail line, but not under there, ‘through there’. Not over, not via a bridge structure like we see with Airtrain, through there. Those two words are absolutely critical. So we see he clearly believes there needs to be a rail line constructed through there, and he believes it should be through, not under, or over, through—through homes, through bushland. This is a very firm statement, and one that we should take very seriously.

 We’ve heard all types of things said in recent days, and the Minister has had multiple opportunities to rule this out. Has he ruled it out, Councillor WINES?

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: No. He has in fact ruled out building a tunnel from Brisbane to Auckland. He has ruled out building a monorail somewhere else, but guess what he hasn’t ruled out. He hasn’t ruled out bulldozing bushland and homes to build a rail line through there. He’s done a lot of personal attacking. He’s made a lot of claims. He has behaved like a child that has thrown all of their toys out of the cot, yet he has not ruled out bulldozing bushland and homes.

 How hard is it? How hard is it? It’s very simple. He can rule out building a tunnel to Auckland, but he can’t rule out bulldozing bushland and homes. This is pretty straightforward.

 In Parliament today, Minister Bailey further added on this matter and confirmed that the State—or he claims the State has not done any work despite promising to do some work three years ago. His quote in the State Parliament today, and I quote word for word, ‘the only studying on the North West Transport Corridor in recent times, has been by the Brisbane City Council, not by us’. So he’s admitted that he’s let three years go by, and despite promising to do a study has not actually done a study.

 Guess what? Yesterday we heard that he was going to spend $20 million on doing a study, so the study he promised three years ago. He’s going to ignore the $10 million Federally-funded study, and he’s going to do his own that costs twice as much. You can just imagine the scenes here. Oh, we need to commit to our promise that we promised three years ago. We’re going to do a study. Minister, how much is it going to cost? Twice as much as the Council study. This is ludicrous. You can’t make this stuff up. The level of incompetence I have not seen with any other minister, and it is genuinely concerning that this is the Minister tasked with delivering major transport as we approach the Olympic Games and Paralympic Games.

 What might be behind Minister Bailey’s refusal to rule out bulldozing homes and bushland? He claims there is no plan. He claims that we’re the only ones that have done a study, yet we should rightly be concerned by the information on the Department of Transport and Main Roads website, because it is that website which makes it crystal clear—and this website, which is live today—this is up there on the website of the Department of Transport and Main Roads today. North West Transport Corridor, it talks about how the corridor was originally preserved in the 1980s based on current planning for a four-lane divided road. So a motorway was the original plan. We know this. We’ve moved away from that. We are looking at other options. We’re looking at underground road and transport options. We’ve made that clear.

But then the Minister’s departmental website goes on to say, in recent years the corridor has evolved from a motorway project to an integrated transport corridor that caters for walking, cycling, rail and road.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Everything.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Then it goes on over the page to say, the multimodal road and active transport route would run along the preserved North West Transport Corridor, connecting into the Stafford Road tunnel. So it doesn’t say it will go via a tunnel to the Stafford Road tunnel; it says it will go along. This is the Minister’s departmental website today. He has the hide to suggest that this is somehow scaremongering, when it’s his own departmental website that talks about bulldozing homes through the corridor to build a multimodal transport link, and despite being given multiple opportunities to rule it out, he has refused to rule it out. Residents should be rightly concerned by this.

Finally goes on to say, the transport corridor would allow greater public transport and active transport opportunities by providing a turn-up-and-go rail service with a high-quality cycleway along the corridor. Not under the corridor, along the corridor.

Chair: LORD MAYOR, your time has expired.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you.

Chair: Further speakers?

Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair. I rise to speak on this motion today. There’s not a lot you can really say about this, because much like this LORD MAYOR, Adrian SCHRINNER, the motion is pathetic and incompetent. There is a distinct lack of facts and reality, but that is what we’ve come to expect from the LNP, of course. They won’t let facts get in the way of a good story. They won’t let facts get in the way of a good scare campaign, and we’ve heard that today. He’s clawing at bits of paper that his staff have stuffed into a big binder for him, and he’s got his highlighter out and he’s trying to selectively pick things to cook up some story, to cook up some fight about this. But it’s fallen very flat with the community, and we’ll get to that shortly.

 The LORD MAYOR’s fight here isn’t based on truth. Instead, it’s based on disinformation and fearmongering. It’s just lies and petty politics, and I’ll agree with Mark Bailey, the Transport Minister, on one thing: this is a very, very tired old LNP Administration. Twenty years, and this is what they’ve got to. After 20 years, they’ve looked around, the cupboard is bare. It’s threadbare. Their housing strategy a couple of weeks ago was one page of new things out of 32 pages, a couple of blank pages in the middle. They have totally and utterly run out of ideas. They’ve run out of money as well. So, what do they decide to do? Pick a fight with the State Government. That’s a true tried and tested method, they thought.

 If the LORD MAYOR would actually present—as he’s tabled a few documents today, will he table the submission to Infrastructure Australia?

LORD MAYOR: Point of order, Mr Chair. It’s on the website right now, as we speak.

Chair: Point of order.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: Okay, that’s great, so why did they reject it? Why did they reject it?

LORD MAYOR:Because we didn’t want to bulldoze homes and bushland.

Councillor CASSIDY: They couldn’t get it past—he couldn’t get it past his mates, Graham Quirk and Amanda Cooper. Couldn’t get it past them. No support whatsoever, because instead of all his fairy tales, we should actually look at the facts. There are lots of consultation reports on Council’s website and proposals about this North West Transport Corridor, and what the LORD MAYOR has been out in the media over the last week saying is completely at odds with the findings of the research on his own project, on the $10 million that he wasted, completely at odds.

 What we do know is that what he presented and what he talked about in the media—his mega toll tunnel, his $14 billion mega toll tunnel—was the least supported option by the community. What this LORD MAYOR sent to Infrastructure Australia, a mega toll tunnel was, no matter how that question was asked in the community consultation—and it doesn’t matter at what stage, whether it was online, whether it was in-person—his proposal was the least supported option by the community. That’s a fact, the least supported by the community. That is a fact. So he totally ignored his own community consultation, because it didn’t align with his political strategy of attacking the State Government.

 Given this, we know that the LNP went into this for political purposes for a predetermined outcome, Chair. We know that Brisbane’s most conservative LORD MAYOR we’ve ever seen, Adrian SCHRINNER, has form when it comes to waste. We’ve seen that on the Kingsford Smith Drive project we talked about earlier today. He’s wasted money on his Metro, $1 billion over budget and a year delayed. He’s blown the budget on his inner city bridges by hundreds of millions of dollars. He’s tapped that budget entirely dry, and before any bridges are even delivered, he’s cut three of them out of that program.

 He’s the guy that oversaw CityCycle, that disaster. He’s the guy that oversaw the TechOne contract, which bled $55 million from the ratepayers of Brisbane, and now he’s the guy that has wasted $10 million of taxpayers’ money on a study that he knew was going nowhere but continued to waste that money so he could pick a fight with the State Government. This one really does take the cake, Chair.

 This LORD MAYOR, Adrian SCHRINNER, cosied up to Scott Morrison before the last Federal election. It didn’t work too well for Scott Morrison. I suspect it won’t work too well for Adrian SCHRINNER either. He was Australia’s worst Prime Minister, and I think that isn’t debatable, absolutely the—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: Ryan Murphy thinks Scott Morrison was a great Prime Minister. There you go. He cosied—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Back to the debate, please.

Councillor MURPHY, please don’t call out across the floor.

Councillor CASSIDY: This study into this transport corridor that this LORD MAYOR had absolutely no jurisdiction over—he got this money from Scott Morrison; they cooked this up together, just so he could make a political point about this. So he carried out this project without the State Government. That’s well established. We’re not debating that fact whatsoever. The State Government said they wouldn’t be involved in this project, so why did he plough on? That’s for him to answer.

 But the community consultation was really clear. If you look at those consultation reports, the number one option for people who contributed to this LNP’s consultation project was for rail. So everything that this LORD MAYOR has just got up here and rubbished—whether it was a rail option, a cycling option, pedestrian options or even busway extensions—everything that he’s got up here and rubbished is at odds with the consultation report he generated himself. So perhaps he’s a little bit confused, and it was clearly swiftly rejected by Infrastructure Australia.

 This is particularly incredible, of course, because we know the LNP—or the Liberal and National Party Government of Australia’s worst Prime Minister, Scott Morrison—stacked out the Infrastructure Australia board with their cronies. The current government had to clean that out because proper processes weren’t being followed. So it’s incredible that the most conservative Mayor in Australia couldn’t even get a project through with his mates on the previous board of Infrastructure Australia, absolutely incredible.

 I think Adrian SCHRINNER is becoming the laughing stock of Brisbane, but don’t take it from me, of course. Don’t take it from me.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY And they won’t. That’s fine. That’s fine. Let’s go through some of the comments that have appeared on LNP Councillors’ social media pages in response to their pathetic scare campaign. The LORD MAYOR’s office, I presume, got the little graphics designed up and they sent them out to their northside councils and said, quick, you’d better all post these at once; let’s do this coordinated thing. Let’s have a look at what some of the residents in the northside of Brisbane had to say about Adrian SCHRINNER and their local LNP Councillors.

 Craig said, ‘this is just lobbying for another toll road, isn’t it?’. Gavin said, ‘what a joke of a post’. Lucille said, ‘Bridgeman Downs bushland is already being bulldozed in koala habitat areas, and you don’t seem to care Tracy Davis’. Chris said, ‘$14 billion for a motorway in 2023. You’ve got to be kidding’. Aidan said, ‘what a dumb take’. Ian said, ‘Save our bushland? It was the LNP who supported over 130,000 hectares of broad-scale land clearing over the last 20 years’. David said, ‘BS virtue-signalling, so out of touch’. I agree. Rob said, ‘Pull your head in, mate’. So the people are speaking. The people are speaking loudly and clearly, and I have to agree with them, you should pull your head in, LORD MAYOR.

 Just imagine what the LORD MAYOR could have done with this $10 million. Our suburbs are really crying out for a council to be a council. They want the LORD MAYOR to show some leadership here in this place and say he actually wants to do good for the people of Brisbane; he wants to fix those issues out in the suburbs, whether it’s investing in local roads, and rat running, and local road infrastructure and congestion in our communities; whether it’s about installing footpaths in the 6,000 streets in Brisbane that don’t have any at all; whether it’s about investing some of that money into drainage to flood‑proof our city that has just experienced the worst flood we have ever seen on record. Perhaps he could have just started doing his job. That would have been quite an interesting and novel thing.

 He’s forgotten about the basics. He can claim, I suppose, that his $14 billion mega toll tunnel does go through the suburbs, but I think they started to panic, Chair, these LNP Councillors, when they started to get the response that they did. I’ve seen some of them replying and saying, oh, no, what we’re talking about is multimodal, multimodal. Of course, they keep saying it will be multimodal underground, as if there’s going to be cycleways and pedestrian connections in a toll tunnel.

 How easy is it to walk through the CLEM7 tunnel? Who here has cycled through the CLEM7 tunnel? What a joke. What an absolute joke. They say this toll tunnel is going to be multimodal. Out of the goodness of some private operator’s heart they’re going to allow pedestrians and cyclists a way to get through there, and fully fund it privately. That is a joke, and this motion is a joke.

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY, your time has expired.

Any further speakers?

Councillor LANDERS.

Councillor LANDERS: Thank you, Chair. I rise to speak on the motion before us. Council invited the community to have their say on Brisbane’s North west transport network in late 2019 and provided the findings to Infrastructure Australia in mid-2022. This was a study on residents’ travel behaviours, and where transport services and infrastructure could improve. It was therefore a multimodal consultation. We wanted to hear from residents how they got to work, to school, leisure, shopping, and the issues that they had as well as suggestions to improve their travel, whether it was active travel, public transport, or by car. The consultation was extensive and included online surveys, emails, mail, phone feedback, as well as many in-person consultations, and I attended many of those consultations to listen to residents, in particular, Carseldine Central and Carseldine Markets.

 Chair, the common theme, regardless of the type of transport residents wanted, was the importance of preserving our bushland; preserving the community that lives around the bushland; and time and time again I heard them say they wanted to see a tunnel option instead of an above-ground solution.

 Gympie Road has been an issue in my community for a very long time, with the growth in Moreton Bay and Sunshine Coast. This major arterial road runs through my community, with local traffic having to navigate across it. Just to go to get milk and bread, get the kids to school, or to go from home to work, takes so much longer as a result. I do have to say that my residents, though, have been fantastic. They’ve been managing this for a very long time, and in my commute home every day I watch them as they are very patient and they give way to each other, even though it’s their turn to go. You see them stopping and letting people get through the gap and working together. They are lining up down Gympie Road in amongst major traffic—these cars are lined up and making a lane on the side of the road. If the local member can’t see that, he’s not getting out of his office.

 This is why I’m so disappointed that, after such an extensive and thorough consultation with residents, the State Government is ignoring the residents. The State Government has forgotten them, and they don’t care about the northern suburbs. In fact, they don’t care about Moreton Bay residents, who also provided their feedback.

 In fact, we’re talking about the State Government wanting to do their own consultation, which of course, as the LORD MAYOR said, they still haven’t done. Let me give you an example of what happens when they do consultation. An example is Strathpine diamond interchange, also in my community, and which goes across Gympie Road. It is in the heart of this area. Residents raised concern during consultation that the turning lanes that came off the highway, and the lanes off the interchange on to Bald Hills Road, had been reduced. We could see that there would be an issue with school traffic alone. But instead of being listened to, people were told, and I quote, ‘the Strathpine and Bald Hills Road intersection would operate at, or better than, pre-project conditions’. They obviously realised during construction that there was a problem, and suddenly they added to this construction signals at Attley Street.

When residents and I raised our concerns about this, we were told, no, that’s okay, it’s because, Councillor, you’ve mentioned many times the difficulty of turning into that road. We’re going to put signals there. It wasn’t part of the initial consultation, and of course, our fears were realised, and turning traffic congested the overpass.

The State Government solution was then to put a variable message sign up to direct school traffic to use Attley Street and direct traffic down local streets, where traffic calming had been installed just years prior to improve safety, local streets that are unsuitable for such volumes. The school was not informed. I was not informed. Residents were not informed. So it was only myself talking to TMR (Transport and Main Roads) that pointed out to them that they were pushing this traffic on to an unsuitable road.

This is the result of State Government cutting corners and not addressing the congestion in northern suburbs, where we still are waiting, two Federal elections later, for Linkfield Road, which is the sister road to the Strathpine diamond exchange, to be duplicated, and the Beams level train crossing to be removed. Council, in the meantime following community consultation, has upgraded Hoyland Street, Norris Road, Dorville Road, Roghan Road, and has started on Beams Road.

This is the time when we have secured the Olympics and should be benefiting from that to build a legacy for Brisbane and for Queensland. Transport was a key focus, not stadiums, to securing the Olympics. This is a regional Games, and we should be getting the necessary infrastructure to support this. It’s about tourism, business and jobs, not just the Games, that will benefit us before and after the Games have finished. Instead of ignoring residents, the State needs to listen, like Council does, and join us in lobbying the Federal Government for this vital infrastructure. Shame on you, Councillor CASSIDY. It is your residents who are being affected by this, and shame on you for not supporting a solution for your residents.

Chair: Further speakers?

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Thank you. I rise to speak on the motion before us today. I start by saying, this is the best bit of political chicanery that I’ve seen for some time from the LNP Administration, because they’ve really just clocked off in the last couple of years. They’re not paying attention to what’s going on. But we have to say, when it comes to stuff-ups and trying to deflect and apportion blame elsewhere, the LORD MAYOR is taking the cake this time round.

 Let’s start with what actually happened. The State has identified a corridor in the northern suburbs for future transport planning. Council has decided that they will go ahead and do the planning for the State Government project, and when they write to the State Government about it—albeit I heard that was tardy from Minister Bailey—he writes back and says, no, thanks, Council, we’re doing our planning.

 What does the LORD MAYOR do at that point, or the Council offices, or the CEO, or the Divisional Manager? Whoever it is, what do they do at that point? Do they go, well, okay, the State said they’re doing planning on a State corridor. Why don’t we do our jobs and invest our time, our resources, our money, our expertise into fixing some Council roads? Do you think maybe the people of Brisbane who elected us to do the job for the ratepayers of Brisbane might expect we actually do the job, instead of trying to play these games behind the scenes with the State Government? No. Apparently they went, no, okay, I’ll go talk to my mate down in Canberra, Scottie from marketing, and he’ll support me. That nasty State Government is not interested.

 The next thing that happens is, they’re off down there, and they’re talking to their mate, Scottie, one of the most reviled Prime Ministers in recent memory, and he stumps up $10 million to fund a study by Council about a State corridor. Does anybody see where this is going pear-shaped? Well, certainly not the LNP, because this is the exact same problem they had on the Metro, because for Metro, Council did the same thing. They pushed ahead with the project before they had State Government approval to go through State Government land, and that cost the ratepayers of Brisbane millions of dollars in payouts to private contractors, because Council completely stuffed up the management of a major project. Here we go again. They’re at it with another project in the northern suburbs. Absolutely appalling behaviour.

 Now, it gets better. This just gets better and better. The Council officers presumably spent thousands of person hours undertaking this, hours that could have been spent fixing safety on the Ipswich Road corridor, fixing the intersections that do not have traffic controls, fixing the intersections on Oxley Road that desperately need turning lanes and traffic lanes. Engineers who’ve been otherwise engaged in a project that is not a Council responsibility have been neglecting the projects needed in Brisbane. It explains so much to me about why they’re so busy all the time, and, I’m sorry, we don’t have any time to do this, we’re so overwhelmed with work. Now we know why. They were working on a dodgy project on State Government land that they had no authority to do.

 Then it gets better. They’ve got their money from Scottie, and off they go and they put their report together. First time that comes out, the community goes, whoa, no, no. So there’s consultation. They’re going to try and talk them round. The community come back then with options about what they’d like to see, and the Council goes, right, we’ll put it up to our mates at IA, because Scottie put his mates, the LORD MAYOR’s mates, best mates—Amanda Cooper, who he served with the whole time she was here, Graham Quirk, for who he was the Deputy Mayor for nine years—they put their report up, and there’s a bunch of other LNP apparatchiks and appointees on IA, and guess what. They came back and they said, oh, no, we don’t think this is a very good idea; we’re not doing it; we’re not supporting it; we’re not recommending it.

 Still then the LORD MAYOR comes out going, it’s all the State Government’s fault. It’s all the State Government’s fault. That Mark Bailey, it’s his fault that my dodgy project, funded by the Federal Government, pursued by me, not supported by my own former colleagues in Infrastructure Australia—it’s not my fault that it didn’t happen; it’s the State Labor Government’s fault.

 It’s Mark Bailey’s fault. Look, he’s at fault for a lot of stuff, but this one is an own goal by the LNP, who have botched, botched this, botched it, and in the proceeds of doing that have made sure that thousands and thousands of hours of work by Council officers, that could have gone into actually undertaking critical projects like the intersection upgrade of Venner Road, Waterton Street and Ipswich Road, have been done. Looking at actually supporting a tunnel under Ipswich Road, which has been recommended by Council officers to be investigated. But guess what? They just rule that out. They go, no, we’re not doing that. That’s recommended by Council, but they won’t even do anything recommended by Council.

 This LNP Administration has lost the plot, lost the plot. They are here to handle Council issues on behalf of the ratepayers of Brisbane. The LORD MAYOR stood up today and said, one of our things is we’ve got to lobby the State Government to get action for upgrades around the city. We’ve done a petition calling on residents—Councillor GRIFFITHS, you’ll appreciate this—we’ve done a petition calling on residents—sorry calling on Council to work with the State to upgrade the single-lane rail bridge at Cardwell Street, which is a massive bottleneck. Council won’t even write to the State Government to say, can you look at this? It’s an issue in our transport network, and it is a massive bottleneck and choke point. They won’t even do that. They won’t even do that.

 It is clear that this LNP Administration is only governing for themselves. They are only governing to try and save the seats that they want to protect in the northern suburbs. But what is overwhelmingly clear about what is going on is they are incompetent, and they are not even able to do it when there’s pork‑barrelling from the Feds, when they’re mates are on the approvals board, when they use all the resources of Council officers that should have gone into fixing things across the suburbs that desperately need doing, that are on the LGIP (Local Government Infrastructure Plan) and are unfunded, and they’re not doing any of that work. They’re doing this instead, and then when it goes pear-shaped it’s somebody else’s fault.

 It’s not anyone else’s fault, and after 20 years in administration, the people whose fault it is are the LNP. They are getting this wrong. They are doing damage to this city and its reputation. They are neglecting the suburbs. They are causing confusion. They are wasting ratepayers’ money. They are wasting the effort of Council officers, directing them on projects that are absolutely not relevant to the work of this Council, when there are huge priorities elsewhere in every single ward in this place, every single ward.

 The LORD MAYOR could be out there every week saying, the State Government should get on to this. Is he doing that? No. He tried a game of political one-upmanship, and he failed. He failed spectacularly, and that is hurting our city.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: So let me be clear—

Chair: Councillor MURPHY, please.

Councillor JOHNSTON: This LNP Administration has a track record of botching major projects. Look at the Metro. Now look at this useless attempt to try and one-up the State Government that has just failed and blown up in their faces. What do they want to do? Bring it in here, because they think they’re going to get more brownie points by raising attention and blaming the State Minister. For God’s sake. The people of Brisbane want us to govern for the city. They want to see resources allocated fairly. They want to see it invested into the projects that are important in our city: flood recovery, road safety improvements, active travel, stormwater drainage, park investment, in the road space—this LNP Administration has fundamentally let this city down.

 The priorities should be investing in the Council road network that needs the money, not in investing in dodgy State Government projects because you don’t like what the State Government is doing. So it is appalling, appalling that Brisbane City Council has wasted all the money and effort on something that’s so botched.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, your time has expired.

Any further speakers?

Councillor DAVIS.

Councillor DAVIS: Thank you very much, Mr Chair. I rise to talk to the motion, which I know is of great interest to my local community. Mr Chair, we have heard absolutely nothing of substance from Councillor CASSIDY in his contribution. He’s doing nothing but spinning a particular narrative, not based on facts but based on talking points that were provided to him by his mates on William Street.

 Minister Bailey has sent Councillor CASSIDY into this Chamber to do his dirty work. It’s clear he has no interest at all in listening to local residents. Councillor CASSIDY was elected to be a voice for northside residents, not a lackey for the State Labor Government, but he knows that he has nothing of substance to contribute. He’s not prepared to take a stand against State Labor’s insane plan to clear one of Brisbane’s most valuable natural resources for heavy rail, so he resorts to shallow political attacks.

 He is trying to confuse and obfuscate what this is about. He wants to make this issue about absolutely anything except a practical, safe and environmentally conscious solution to congestion on the northside of Brisbane. Shame on him. Shame on him for failing to stand up for the community in the northern suburbs who do not want their homes bulldozed.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor DAVIS: Mr Chair, the State Government has always known that the transport system in the northern suburbs couldn’t cope with existing traffic volumes, let alone into the future given the growth that we’ve experienced in the region. But in the time since the land was acquired as road reserve, which was a number of decades ago, that land has grown into a green spine that has significant rich ecosystems, home to all manner of native wildlife and loved by the local community, and now that’s all at risk.

 I’ve always welcomed a qualified, quantified business case on how to alleviate those transport difficulties within the north-western suburbs, but we haven’t seen one from the State Government yet, unless it’s got something to do with heavy rail.

 I’m actually quite interested to understand how many community consultation sessions Councillor CASSIDY turned up to, because I attended every single one of the ones that were held in my ward, and I can assure the Chamber that the overwhelming feedback from those who were in attendance, who knew that we have to address the issue of congestion on the northside, is that any outcome that was agreed to, to move forward to address this issue had to be underground and not interfere with the Chermside Hills Reserve.

 I can remember the anxiety of one particular resident from Everton Park, who came to the community consultation sessions. She was in tears. She was in absolute tears because she didn’t know what was going to happen to her home. I can assure that resident that under the proposal we put to Infrastructure Australia nothing would happen to her home, but under the proposal as put forward by Minister Bailey we know what’s going to happen to her home. It’s going to be resumed for heavy rail. That’s what’s going to happen.

 As I said, our residents know that doing nothing is not an option. We need a transport solution in the northern suburbs, and we need it sooner rather than later. We’ve heard the Opposition Leader talk a lot about the cost of the planning and infrastructure, but we also need to be talking about the cost of not building this infrastructure.

 In 2021, Council studies found that the net cost to Brisbane’s economy of congestion on the northside was $312 million. By 2031, it becomes $538 million, and by 2041, we are looking at a figure of around $859 million. That’s triple the amount of impact to our local community and to our economy. That’s why Brisbane City Council took the initiative and did what the State Government has been refusing to do for decades. We undertook a business case with Federal Government funding to investigate real, practical solutions to congestion on the northside of Brisbane.

 What came of this was community feedback. We have environmental reports that say that the topography of the corridor was unsuitable for at-grade proposals to deal with the congestion, and of course that the best outcome was going to be to go underground.

 Aside from the new runway at Brisbane Airport, pretty much every other major infrastructure solution in the last 20 years has gone underground. As the LORD MAYOR pointed out, the Clem7, Airportlink, Legacy Way, the Metro and now Cross River Rail are all going underground, and that’s where the north west corridor should go too.

 We are a mature, established and biodiverse city, and the consultation was very clear that there was not community support for the clearing of hectares of homes and bushland for a solution. I’m very proud that Council has led the work on this solution, when it really should have been the work of the State Government, but if we are to make a sensible, long-lasting solution happen, we need all levels of government to work together. Instead, Minister Bailey is more interested in sniping from the sidelines than he is in making a productive contribution to this discussion.

 I’m yet to hear a sensible plan from him, just that half-baked thought about above-ground heavy rail solution. I can tell you again that the people in my community will reject it. The local MP, Mr Mellish, knows that there’s no support for Minister Bailey’s plan to blitzkrieg the bushland for a heavy rail solution, but he’s been pretty quiet on this front, Mr Chair, because he knows this is not what the community wants. They don’t want their houses resumed or the Chermside Hills Reserve bulldozed, because once it’s gone, it’s not coming back.

 Within the North West Transport Corridor, there are 21 threatened plant species. Ecologists employed to do the field studies for the business case confirmed the existence of an endangered eucalypt woodland and open forest community within the Chermside Hills Reserve. What they noted was that this vegetation community had significant conservation value and is only found in the Chermside Hills Reserve area. In other words, Mr Chair, it’s unique and cannot be offset in another location, but it would survive, of course, if the solution went underground.

 There’s a plethora of native species found in the area: Powerful owls, Grey‑headed flying foxes and Tusked frogs, not to mention the sugar and squirrel gliders, and of course a thriving wallaby population and a koala presence. What our community needs is for Minister Bailey to rule out mowing down the Chermside Hills Reserve to make way for heavy rail.

 Mr Chair, I’d like to leave the Chamber with a quote from one of my residents, which I think sums it up quite nicely, ‘both environment and wildlife need to be considered and protected in decisions regarding transport within this area. This is an opportunity to really plan for the future and look after the habitat that is a large portion of the planned area. Once bushland is destroyed, it won’t come back, and neither will the wildlife’. I leave further debate to the Chamber.

Chair: Thank you.

Further speakers?

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN, you have the floor.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Thanks, Chair. I rise to speak on the motion before me. I’ll be abstaining from voting on this motion today for a couple of reasons. The first is that we got very little notice of it, and I haven’t yet had time to consult with the people I represent about how I should vote on it. I also don’t feel like I’ve had enough information provided to me to make an informed decision. So I’ll be abstaining for today, but I did want to make a few comments.

 The first is, I think I depart slightly from the ALP and Independent Councillors in that I don’t necessarily object to the principle of spending several million dollars on exploring options for major transport projects. I think reasonable people can debate whether the particular allocation of $10 million was well spent. Maybe it wasn’t the most strategic way to go about things, but as a broad principle I think it is reasonable to invest money upfront to explore options, to do some consultation, to plan ahead before you start committing to particular projects.

 I also think it is acceptable and justifiable for a local council to spend money and to allocate resources, planning and advocating for changes in terms of projects that might otherwise be a State Government responsibility. If the State Government has been dragging its feet and hasn’t been delivering on this important transport infrastructure, I think there is a case for Council to use its resources to leverage some support and influence on the State Government.

 I don’t necessarily think the Council has succeeded with that, and I think in this case the strategy hasn’t worked out too well, but again as a general principle I think it is okay for the Council to play a role in articulating proposals and developing plans, even if it’s trying to eventually get the State Government to pay for it.

 Having said that, I’m pretty dubious at the moment about whether an underground solution along this corridor would ever happen. I’m perhaps more pragmatic than some of the LNP Councillors in this Chamber, because I’ve seen how hard it is to get money out of the State Government, and I certainly don’t think private toll roads or toll tunnels are a suitable answer either.

 It’s all well and good for Councillors in this place to say, we need tunnels, but I don’t see the LNP at the State level arguing for money to go towards public transport tunnels. If the LNP at the State level isn’t arguing for it, I don’t think the Labor State Government is going to be coughing up that kind of money any time soon, given how high costs are getting on some of these kinds of projects.

 I did just want to say that I also have concerns about tree clearing along the corridor. I grew up around that area and used to ride around Chermside Hills. I distinctly remember—I may have been only eight or nine at the time—being really shocked to come over a hill that we always rode across to find it bulldozed. At that time it had been bulldozed for some suburban sprawl development, and I do think there’s an irony of residents whose homes were forest only 10 or 20 years ago who are now concerned about the forest next door. Nevertheless, there are significant patches of vegetation through that corridor that need to be seriously considered.

 I must say though I was quite angry at what I felt were some fairly hypocritical comments about bulldozing and removing homes. I say I was angry, because I have a recent memory of the LNP Administration taking around 50 homes for the widening of Lytton Road, which was justified on the basis that it was necessary to move people around from the eastern suburbs. I should add, that project had bipartisan support, and I’m equally angry at the Labor Councillors for their complicity in forcing those residents to move out of their community. But I do think it’s pretty disingenuous and hypocritical for the LNP to now say, oh how dare anyone ever propose removing homes for a transport project, when the other Council administration has done it many times.

 Just the other week, we were debating whether part of a private property should be acquired for a Priestdale Road project, but just a few years ago we had 50 homes in East Brisbane compulsory-acquired, residents forced out so that the Council could widen a 700-metre stretch of road. I thought that was disgusting, and I agree that removing homes for a transport corridor should be a last resort, but I do think the LNP is on pretty shaky ground to be trying to point the finger at the State Government about this stuff when it’s got a pretty bad track record in terms of displacing people from their homes for these mega projects.

 I will say that I would like to see a much wider range of options considered for public transport solutions for the north-western suburbs. I’m strongly opposed to either a new highway or road project or car tunnel project for the corridor. I don’t think creating more road capacity for cars is going to deal with the issues that Councillor LANDERS identified for Gympie Road, et cetera. The solution really does need to be public transport.

 But there are a range of options that need to be on the table. I’m quite supportive of course of bus rapid transit (BRT) along Gympie Road. I think that’s something that the Council and the State Government should be working together on, for 24-hour BRT lanes along Gympie Road, take away a couple of lanes of general traffic and put them towards BRT. That’s what we need to do in the long run, even if there is some political pain in the short term.

 I think a similar approach should be explored for some of the other north‑western corridors, such as perhaps Trouts Road or Old Northern Road. Maybe there are options where, rather than spending billions of dollars on tunnels or bulldozing bushland, we can make better use of our existing road corridors and set aside lanes that are currently used for cars to carry light rail or BRT, or indeed perhaps heavy rail.

 So I think a wider range of options do need to be considered, and having read as much as I could find about what the Council put forward, I think the scope of what the Council was exploring and consulting on was too narrow. It’s inevitable that when you only present a very narrow range of options, and force residents to choose between crappy option A and crappy option B, you’re going to get a fair bit of pushback. That’s what has happened here. The Council hasn’t really started with the broader question of, what are the solutions to traffic congestion on the northside? It’s more been a question of, okay what’s the best way to deliver a North West Transport Corridor along this alignment?

That was perhaps the wrong question to put to the community. We would have been better off having a more broad-ranging approach where we looked at, how can we improve existing bus routes and connections to train lines and transit hubs? How can we make better use of our existing major road corridors and repurpose some of that car space for public transport options?

I do still think heavy rail needs to be part of the conversation. I’m certainly not declaring a particular position on behalf of the Greens here today, but it’s disappointing that the relationship between the Council and the State Government seems to have broken down to such a point that we can’t even have an intelligent conversation about this.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: That really proves my point, doesn’t it? The interjection from Councillor MARX was, they started it. I’m not here to adjudicate on who started the conflict. I don’t have a particularly positive impression of the way Minister Bailey plans transport projects, and I’ve been quite critical of some of his decision-making in regards to Cross River Rail, for example. The point here is though that the Council’s current strategy for influencing the State Government to achieve positive outcomes for the north-western corridor is not working. This strategy of unilaterally planning something, and then being angry at the Minister because he didn’t come to the table, isn’t yielding results, and I’m interested in results to address the traffic congestion issues on the northside.

 I would urge Councillors from both the major parties to cool down and think deeply about how we can actually get some solutions on the corridor that strike the right balance in terms of environmental considerations, amenity for residents’ homes, and the need to improve public transport through the inner north and the north‑western suburbs.

 I personally believe greater emphasis needs to be put on how we can create walkable mixed-use neighbourhoods in the suburbs themselves, rather than focusing purely on how we can transport more and more commuters in and out of the city centre. A lot of people who live in the north-western suburbs don’t actually work in the CBD. They work in suburban areas around the northside, and if we want to reduce traffic congestion—I think this is an important thing for Councillor DAVIS and Councillor LANDERS to be mindful of—it’s not just about moving more and more nine-to-five office commuters in and out of the city centre. We need to have safer, more accessible transport routes to local schools, shopping precincts, industrial hubs, commercial hubs, and employment hubs in the suburbs.

 In general, I’m a bit sceptical that it’s a good use of money to spend billions of dollars moving more people in and out of the CBD rather than creating mixed‑use walkable neighbourhoods close to where people already live and bringing the jobs to the people rather than spending so much money trying to take the workers long distances to get to their existing employment locations. It’s a shame we can’t have a more informed and nuanced discussion about this, but hopefully that will come over time.

Chair: Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN, your time has expired.

Any further speakers?

Councillor WINES.

Councillor WINES: Thanks, Mr Chair. I rise to speak in support of the resolution presented to us. Can I begin by defining the problem? There is a catastrophic failure of the transport network throughout the north-west of Brisbane. If you live at Alderley, and you have to do something at Albany Creek at 6pm at night, you have to leave before 4.30pm in the afternoon. There is a massive shortfall in public transport. If you look at the city as a whole, there is significant train and significant busways for major parts of the city, but there is not an equivalent for the north-west. When you look at a map of freeways and highways, there is the Gateway, there is the South East Expressway, there’s the Centenary Motorway, and then there’s nothing for the north-west.

 It is a major shortcoming that really does reduce the quality of life for people who live in that community. The numbers that Councillor DAVIS discussed of economic lost opportunity as a result of that congestion are real. They are spoken about in our report. I encourage all Councillors to read it. If you have a lot of time, all 633 pages are available for your viewing pleasure on the website right now, or you can simply read the—there are two summary documents, the larger summary document and the smaller summary document, which I can tell not enough participants in today’s debate have read, and that is really disappointing.

 As a person who identifies strongly with north-west Brisbane, who understands very much what Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN was talking about—and I don’t know how to break this to him: if something happened when he was eight or ten, it wasn’t 10 or 20 years ago but sadly, Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN, it’s more like 30 years ago. We’re roughly the same age. If something happened to you when you were roughly eight, it wasn’t 10 or 20 years ago. Just food for thought. It’s a realisation that has occurred to me as well.

 Can I assure Councillors that this resolution is important. There is a piece of land set aside for a transport corridor. Because there was no maintenance that occurred upon that corridor, it became extremely environmentally valuable. Can I refer Councillors to Chapter 14 of the report, which speaks to how valuable it has become to our community?

 Councillor DAVIS spoke to some of the plant life, but I will speak to some of the fauna life. There is in the endangered species identified the Fairy martin, the Welcome swallow, the koala, the grey-headed fox, and vulnerable species, the Tusked frog, the White-throated needletail, the Powerful owl, the Squirrel glider, the Sugar glider, and the Short-beaked echidna, all are resident inside this transport corridor.

 Here’s the situation. You have a catastrophic failure of the transport network here. You have a deeply valuable environmental asset here. I know that north‑westerners who associate with people like Councillor DAVIS and I think it’s really important and valuable. I have noticed that people who associate with Minister Bailey think it isn’t. That was one of the takeaways that I took from the Facebook discussion, that a lot of people who associated with Mr Bailey are completely comfortable with putting a heavy rail line through there. That was the takeaway from mine.

 Let’s refer to the resolution in front of us. Item 1 notes Transport Minister Bailey’s letter rejecting the offer to work together to develop the North West Transport Corridor. That was tabled in Question Time, but I want to draw to the attention of the room the final statement in the fifth paragraph: the Queensland Government does not currently support the North West Transport Corridor being used for a future road corridor. That is the sort of specific language one would find if you had a plan for another type of transport.

 So, no, it’s not a road corridor, as the LORD MAYOR rightly pointed out earlier in this debate, there is work that the State have announced from 2009, when Mr Murray Watt was the MP for Everton, that converted that road corridor to a heavy rail corridor. That is not in dispute at this time. So this letter occurs—Mr Bailey does reject our offer of cooperation. I think that is not up for debate. It also identifies that this is now a rail alignment.

 I’ll also table Chapter 14 of the document, which shows that this is an extremely important environmental corridor, and that any work at the surface is extremely damaging to the natural space there. It has become increasingly clear, both from the letters from the Minister, from the standing position they have, from the fact that no matter how hard we press the Minister to rule out a rail option, he refuses to do so. It is actually very strange, and his tweet earlier today, ruling out things to Auckland and Birdsville and Vanuatu, indicates he does have the capacity to rule things out, so I would encourage him to rule this out.

I don’t understand why it’s so difficult, unless of course the multimodal northside transport study that the State have now commenced will show this, unless it is actually part of their plan. The circumstantial evidence and the lack of a strong position by the Minister indicates that’s likely the case. Now I have to just rest on this ever so slightly. The Minister and two of his associates, Mr Sullivan of Stafford and Mr Mellish of Aspley, accused us of being humiliated because we spent $10 million doing this work. Well if it’s humiliating spending $10 million to do this, how humiliating is it to do it for $20 million, which was their play, which is their proposal?

 It should be cheaper because we have given them all of our work, so it should be a portion of that because we have—our submission to the multimodal northside transport study is all of this work. $10 million worth of studies that show the environmental importance, that show the catastrophic failure of the network, that actually shows—as I said, had people bothered to read it, it would show that it proposes an underground rail line, because that’s what the public asked for. So it showed a multimodal—it actually shows a road tunnel and a rail tunnel and how you would do a Metro bus-type of transport system for the northside as well. We did it all, we provided all options and it provides a surface bikeway option. That’s what our work shows. I encourage the State not to dismiss it because we did it and that’s just a bit, a bit too likely for my tastes. It is—

Councillors interjecting.

Councillor WINES: And I hear interjections agreeing that we should be dismissed because it’s our work and I don’t think that’s fair.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor WINES: I don’t think that’s fair at all. There was a question posed earlier by the Leader of the Opposition, why did Infrastructure Australia reject our work? It was because we did not provide a surface alternative through the bushland. So let’s have a look, let’s take it from the political perspective that our opponents like to see the world. They’re of the view, that the Federal Liberal Government paid the Liberal Council to work out how to save the bushland and address the traffic problem, which we were more than happy to propose and they were more than happy to consider, an underground transport system.

 Now the Federal Government changes colour, it becomes a Labor Government and all of a sudden we have to—we must now discuss a surface option. So now you’ve got a State Minister who won’t rule out a heavy rail line, you’ve got a Federal Government who insists that it must be on surface and they’re all the Labor Party groups. The Liberal Party groups want to put this thing underground and save the bushland, both the rail and the road. So the circumstantial evidence would suggest to you that if there’s any collusion it’s between the Labor governments, State and Federal, not between us. We were paid to make sure that we got a solid outcome that addressed transport in all modes and the environmental concerns and if there were other benefits that could be put forward from that.

Councillors interjecting.

Councillor WINES: Well that’s a fair question, have we been paid? Now on the topic of humiliation, the State Minister came out and said to us how humiliating they spent all this money and didn’t actually do the work. But the Minister in fact had been paid the money—excuse me, I’ll put it differently. The State Minister’s department had received the money from the Federal Government and had held it for some years, had held it for some years. As a result of the name-calling launched by Mr Bailey, we pointed out that he had not paid his invoices and was in fact holding Federal money that was meant to be ours. I can confirm that Mr Bailey has advised us through the media that he has directed the department to pay us last Friday.

 So I’m not sure what’s more humiliating, saying it’s humiliating that we spent the money, or more humiliating that they’re about to spend twice as much to do what we’ve already done, or to be found out that they sat on money that wasn’t theirs, that wasn’t paid to them for anything that they would do, it’s actually appalling. It’s just really sad and I just hope that the Minister just comes to the table and tries to do the right thing for the residents of the northside. I know we have a southside Opposition and—

Chair: Councillor WINES, your time has expired.

Is there any further debate? No further debate.

LORD MAYOR, summing up.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair and thank you to the Councillors that have participated in this discussion. A really important one for a significant part of the city, but also an important one for anyone that cares about the future of the whole city when it comes to investing in transport infrastructure. Because the type of arguments and discussions that we’re having here relating to the north west corridor are also the type of arguments and discussions we’re having for the whole city as we plan to gear up for the 2032 Olympics and beyond.

 If something like this can happen and the way this has played out, which is really alarming, that the logical solution for transport infrastructure is ruled out and ridiculed, yet a solution that involves bulldozing bushland and homes is quite clearly the preferred option—and I use the word clearly and once again through bushland and homes, which is the Minister’s own language—then residents across Brisbane should rightly be concerned about the State Government’s plans for infrastructure in the lead up to the Olympics. Are we going to see them walk away from building things properly and go to the cheapest and most destructive form of building infrastructure through homes, through bushland?

 This is a matter that everyone in Brisbane should be interested in, but as Councillor WINES pointed out and as Councillor LANDERS and Councillor DAVIS have pointed out, the north-western suburbs have been desperately neglected by the Labor Party, by the Labor State Government and the Labor Party. The Labor members for that area are running scared, they’re keeping a low profile, they’ve been fed their political lines from the Minister, but they’re not buying it because they know their residents are concerned. Their residents have every right to be concerned because time and time again the Minister has been asked to rule out his plan to go through bushland and through homes to build a rail line, yet he has refused to do so, he has refused.

 Even today on his own departmental website he talks about the multimodal rail, road and active transport corridor would run along the preserved North West Transport Corridor. Now if anyone has any doubt about where that is, the State Government helpfully provides a map, it provides a map. Now this map is not dated the 1980s, it is not dated 2009; this map is dated 2021. 2021 and it has an arrow here pointing to the North West Transport Corridor. That corridor goes through the Chermside Hills Reserve, through it. Not around it, not under it, not above it; through it.

 That corridor goes very, very close to people’s homes and in some cases through existing streets, where the corridor hasn’t in fact yet been preserved. This line on a map should strike fear into the hearts of residents, given the Minister’s repeated refusal to rule out an at-surface option. But what we have heard today is exactly the same response from the Opposition that we’ve heard from the Minister. We haven’t heard the Labor Opposition say we don’t support the destruction of bushland or homes. They have not once said that, so what is okay for Minister Bailey is also okay for the Labor team. They haven’t ruled it out and in fact if Councillor CASSIDY was half as smart as he thinks he is, he would have ruled it out and said look, obviously the Labor team don’t support the destruction of homes and bushland. Did he say that?

Councillors interjecting.

LORD MAYOR: No, so he’s fallen into line with his ministerial colleague up the road and he has refused to rule out the at-surface option. So we see now Labor at the State and Council level, refusing to rule out the destruction of homes and bushland. We see on the State Government’s own website, the corridor clearly marked here, we see the plans for a multimodal road, rail and active transport corridor along that network. It’s all here in black and white. So for anyone to suggest that this is just fearmongering, this is just a political campaign, look at TMR’s website. Look at the website of the Department of Transport and Main Roads today, tonight, and you will see the plan there, not in black and white, but in full colour, in full colour, it is right there.

 So we are simply saying, Minister, rule it out. Labor Councillors, rule it out, and then we can actually work together productively on some real solutions for the north-western suburbs, on some real plans. Now is it possible? Minister Bailey, obviously, can sometimes be difficult to deal with. We saw this with Brisbane Metro, when he deliberately held up the project for political reasons. But guess what? We’re working well with Minister Bailey on the Brisbane Metro project. It is possible. Everyone knows I’ve been working closely with the Premier on the Olympics. We are willing to work with the Labor State Government on important issues for this city, we have proven that repeatedly.

 So it is possible to get good solutions to these problems, it is possible for us to work together, but it won’t be possible until the Minister does two things. (1) Rule out the above-ground option, rule out the destruction of homes and bushland. (2) Come to the table, work with us productively. Learn from what we’ve done with the $10 million Federally-funded study. Help cut down the cost of your own $20 million study and make it a $5 million instead, using the information that has already been produced. We can get good outcomes for the people of the north-western suburbs, we can do that, but it requires Minister Bailey to stop playing politics, to rule out the destruction of homes and business and to come to the table to talk plans for the future.

Chair: Thank you.

 I will now put 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, the DEPUTY MAYOR and Councillor Sandy LANDERS immediately rose and called for a division, which resulted in the motion being declared **carried**.

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 19 - The Right Honourable, the LORD MAYOR, Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER, DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Krista ADAMS, and Councillors Greg ADERMANN, Adam ALLAN, Lisa ATWOOD, Fiona CUNNINGHAM, Tracy DAVIS, 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: 6 - The Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Jared CASSIDY, and Councillors Peter CUMMING, Steve GRIFFITHS, Charles STRUNK, Jonathan SRIRANGANATHAN and Nicole JOHNSTON.

## PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS:

Chair: Councillors, are there any petitions? Anybody on their feet, rather than just sitting down? Any petitions?

Councillor GRIFFITHS.

Councillor GRIFFITHS: Yes, thank you, Mr Chair. I’ve just got a petition from residents regarding King Avenue, at the intersection of Blunder Road and Inala Avenue, Durack.

Chair: Thank you.

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, I have a petition on behalf of Annerley and surrounding—

Chair: Your mic’s not on.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, I have a petition on behalf of Annerley and surrounding suburbs calling for better active transport links along Annerley Road, Annerley.

Chair: Thank you.

Any other petitions?

Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks, Chair, I have a number of petitions. The first one calling on the ramp at the seashore end of Ninth Avenue, Sandgate, not be allowed to fall into disrepair. Two separate petitions regarding a development at 121 Speight Street and 32 MacLean Street, Brighton, the first of which is an ePetition with 1,261 signatures, and the second is a paper petition regarding the same topic.

Chair: Thank you.

Any further petitions?

Councillor LANDERS.

**481/2022-23**

It was resolved on the motion of Councillor Sandy LANDERS, seconded by Councillor Charles STRUNK, that the petitions as presented be received and referred to the Committee concerned for consideration and report.

The petitions were summarised as follows:

| **File No.** | **Councillor** | **Topic** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 137/220/594/196 | Steve Griffiths | Requesting Council install traffic calming measures on King Avenue, between Blunder Road and Inala Avenue, Durack. |
| 137/220/594/198 | Nicole Johnston | Requesting Council provide an extension for safe, physically‑separated bike and scooter lanes on Annerley Road between Gladstone Road, Dutton Park, and Ipswich Rd, Annerley. |
| 137/220/594/194 | Jared Cassidy | Requesting Council repair the stone ramp at the seashore end of Ninth Avenue, Sandgate. |
| 137/220/594/197 | Jared Cassidy | Requesting Council place a moratorium on operation works occurring at 32 Maclean Street and 121 Speight Street, Brighton. |
| 137/220/594/195 | Jared Cassidy | Requesting Council place a moratorium on operation works occurring at 32 Maclean Street and 121 Speight Street, Brighton. |

## GENERAL BUSINESS:

Chair: General Business.

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

No one rising to their feet.

Are there any matters of General Business?

Councillor LANDERS.

Councillor LANDERS: Thank you, Chair. I rise to talk about two International Women’s Day events in my ward. On Sunday morning, first of all, St John Fisher and St Patrick’s College combined to raise awareness for breast cancer and funds for the McGrath Foundation. The walk was organised by the school girl captains together and we walked from the Shorncliffe Pier to Sandgate Pool and back to the pier again. It was a fantastic turnout of students, families, teachers, residents and, also, many fur friends with pink bows on and pink leads. Fortunately, the rain held off and there was great spirit and conversations as we made our way along the foreshore. It was wonderful to see this beautiful sea of pink. I want to thank the captains from both schools and congratulate them on this great event and wish them the best for their future combined projects in 2023.

 I also have the wonderful Bracken Ridge Plaza in my ward, Chair, and they are a great community-focused shopping centre. Again this year, the centre celebrated International Women’s Day by running the Bracken Ridge Woman of the Year. Locals could nominate who they thought should be the Woman of the Year and as somebody who they felt made our community even better. I want to congratulate Kylie Loof, who is President of the Ridgettes Netball Club. Kylie actually was the winner in the Bracken Ridge Woman of the Year. This role that Kylie has as President isn’t just about coaching netball and organising the club, she mentors and nurtures our young women. She offers assistance to help young girls navigate through life, including personal development, training in how to make better decisions at school and in their personal life.

 I also want to congratulate the two runners up. Cate Brickell, who is the President of two school P&Cs and has volunteered in those schools for many years, Norris Road State School and Bracken Ridge High School. In fact, she’s also joined with me and the Lions Club in driving trains every fourth Sunday in our community and the funds raised from those trains go to many projects, so Cate is always willing to get in there and help. She is helping make two of our schools in our community thrive.

 I also congratulate Louise Gordon, who is the President of the Bracken Ridge Central Lions Club, who was the other runner up. Louise works tirelessly with her fellow Lions to make our community better. She helps organise train day, as I said, every fourth Sunday and will drive the trains. If there’s somebody in need in the community, she will round up assistance. She runs food drives; we’re having an Easter drive and people can drop their donations into my ward office, but Louise was particularly wonderful during the flood even last year.

 Obviously, there were a lot of people affected in my ward that I was getting around to and in many cases where there were single women who were unable to—that their insurers said yes, rip up the carpet, but they couldn’t do it and I physically struggled to do it too. So I could just pick up the phone and call Louise as the President of the Lions Club and she would organise the wonderful Lions community to come together and go around and help do that job for our residents. So it was fantastic to have her there.

 We have many incredible women who give to our community in many different ways. These women inspire us and demonstrate to young women and others that nothing is unachievable. I also want to thank Setty from the Bracken Ridge Plaza for giving our community the opportunity to recognise these wonderful women.

Chair: Thank you.

Further speakers?

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Thanks, Chair. I rise to speak about East Brisbane State School, some Riverside Drive parking issues and homelessness in my ward. Just first off with East Brisbane State School, I’ve spoken previously about my concerns about this school being shut down. Today in the Chamber, I just wanted to issue a respectful and diplomatic challenge to Councillor ADAMS and to Councillor CUNNINGHAM that the East Brisbane community who live within the Coorparoo Ward are really looking for some leadership from their local Councillor on this issue. My challenge to Councillor CUNNINGHAM is that she should call a press conference with Councillor ADAMS and their LNP State colleagues to clearly indicate that they oppose East Brisbane State School being shut down.

 Councillor ADAMS has been very good about saying in this Chamber that she doesn’t want East Brisbane State School to close, or that she shares the community’s concerns about that, but the LNP hasn’t been vocal enough on this issue. The community needs to see these Councillors speaking up about the need for a new school in the East Brisbane State School catchment. So Councillor CUNNINGHAM, I know you personally have concerns about the loss of East Brisbane State School, all I’m asking is for you to state that publicly and call a press conference and put a bit of constructive pressure on the Queensland Labor Party.

 Because right now their only proposal on the table seems to be to relocate that school to Coorparoo Secondary College’s site, which isn’t a suitable option. The Greens have been quite clear about our position on this, we think we need a new school within the East Brisbane State School catchment if The Gabba is to be redeveloped and the existing school is to shut down. But it’s not enough pressure when the LNP is staying silent on this issue, so if you’re concerned about the loss of that school, now is the time to speak up. I guess I offer that to Councillor ADAMS in her capacity as the Chair of the Olympics Committee and to Councillor CUNNINGHAM as the local Councillor for that area.

 It’s utterly ridiculous that that school is being shut down without any proposals for an alternative in the area and I’m very critical of Grace Grace and the Queensland Labor Party, but I think the LNP is sort of sitting on the fence and trying to have a bet each way at the moment, where they say privately to a couple of residents we don’t think it’s good that the school is going, but they won’t come out and say it publicly to the media and actually draw attention to this issue. So get on the phone to your State colleagues and please join that struggle.

 Just in terms of Riverside Drive, West End, this one, through you, Chair, is for Councillor DAVIS. Councillor DAVIS, your staff have been, I guess to be honest, a little bit slow. I’ve been talking to the NEWS (Natural Environment, Water and Sustainability) team for some time now about redesigning some of the car parking along Riverside Drive in West End and South Brisbane. Councillor DAVIS was kind enough to at least ask her staff to get back to me on that, but we’ve now been waiting months and months for any changes to the Riverside Drive parking rules.

 I don’t understand what the holdup is. When we’re changing parking rules on a street, the TPO (Transport Planning and Operations) guys can get it done within a couple of months, but we’ve been waiting for Councillor DAVIS’s NEWS team to do this for months and months and months now. I just can’t understand why it is so much harder to change parking rules in a public park than it is to change parking rules along a street. I’ve been asking for those parking rules along Riverside Drive to be changed for almost seven years now, since I got elected. That was the first thing—one of the first things I started doing, was to try to get some of those cars out of that park, because it’s so dangerous with all the pedestrians and cyclists moving through there.

 I know a plan has been produced to change some of the signage to short-term parking and to close off some of the parking bays. I know it has the Chair’s support, I know some funding was allocated, I just don’t understand why it hasn’t happened yet. Why haven’t we had those parking signs changed? Every time I’m down there, I see lots and lots of cars sharing a narrow roadway with pedestrians and cyclists and e-scooters, it is a very dangerous environment. I see cars pulling out in the path of cyclists without giving way, I see cars doing awkward three-point turns to try to squeeze into little dinky spaces that aren’t really dedicated car parks, but because they’re not signed appropriately people try and park there.

 I guess I’m just feeling like the NEWS team is deprioritising this issue. I haven’t had any direct communication with them, they’re very slow to reply to my emails. I don’t understand whether that’s a problem within the public service, or that’s because they’re waiting for Councillor DAVIS to sign off on stuff and it’s a holdup in her office, I’m just not sure. I’m feeling frustrated and disappointed at the lack of communication and how slow that’s been, so hopefully we can get some movement on that. I’ve supported it and said I support the changes that have been proposed, I just don’t understand why such a crucial safety issue is taking such a long time to get action on.

 Finally, just a little further north along Riverside Drive, under the Go Between Bridge and the William Jolly Bridge, there’s been quite a few people sleeping rough for some time now. I haven’t been able to get a direct briefing from the relevant Council officers around how they’ve been supported and exactly what accommodation offers have been made to them. I understand a large group of homeless people were forcibly moved on from that area and the Council’s general line has been that they don’t move on rough sleepers. Councillor HOWARD has stood up in this Chamber and said very confidently we do not move on homeless people. But then I hear from local residents and rough sleepers that they have been moved on from Council, so I’m hearing two different stories.

 I’m hearing the Council saying we don’t move people on and then I’m hearing people on the ground in the community saying the Council is moving people on. So I’m just trying to get to the bottom of it, but the Council officers haven’t given me a briefing. I thought I had agreement in this Chamber from Councillor HOWARD and the Mayor previously that before anyone would be moved on from a public park in my ward, they’d give me the courtesy of a heads-up. On a couple of occasions Councillor HOWARD did do that and there was a time when some wet mattresses had to be removed and it was either Councillor HOWARD or Councillor MARX who came and said look, we’re going to have to remove some of this stuff.

 That was good and I appreciated that direct line of communication from the teams, but in this case, it sounds like quite a few people were forcibly moved on, even though the Council says it doesn’t do that. I suspect probably the truth is somewhere in the middle, that Council officers decided that some property was abandoned and decided that some tents were no longer needed and so they threw those tents and mattresses and things into the rubbish, even though they were actually still being used by homeless people. The reality is that if you take all of someone’s stuff and you throw their bedding in the bin, you might not be directly telling them to move on, but it kind of amounts to the same result.

 I think that’s kind of what might be happening at the moment, is that Council isn’t directly telling the people to move on, but if they leave their belongings unattended for a couple of hours the Council chucks them in the bin, even though Council’s Public Space Liaison Officers (PSLO) are still working with those clients and trying to connect them in with other services. So the PSLOs are liaising with these people and making sure they’re on the public housing waiting list, et cetera, but other teams in Council are simultaneously throwing out their tents or sleeping bags. So I just ask Councillor HOWARD to ask her officers to brief me more frequently on this.

 I think we now have about—in Musgrave Park there’s about 20 people sleeping rough every night and I have no concerns about that, I understand the housing crisis. I understand that Council officers are trying to support and work with those people to ensure they can get safe housing as soon as possible and the same is true of Riverside Drive. I’m sure there are one or two residents making complaints, I’m sure there are a few wealthier people who’ve moved in to West End in the last few years who aren’t used to seeing homeless people in public spaces and are calling up Council to complain. But a few phone complaints doesn’t justify moving on rough sleepers, they don’t have anywhere else to go.

 So, hopefully, that’s not happening, hopefully the many residents who’ve told me that’s happening have been misinformed and, in fact, the Council hasn’t moved anyone along. But if it turns out that we have been moving people on, I’ll be very, very angry and will certainly be taking that issue further. Because I think it’s a very cruel thing to be telling people who’ve got nowhere else to go that they can’t sleep in a Council park. That’s literally their last resort. I did also want to flag that I think there’s a case for the Council to start liaising with local community groups, such as sports clubs, community hall operators, et cetera, to allow rough sleepers formal permission to park in those car parks.

 I know already that that’s happening a lot throughout the inner city and the suburbs, that homeless people will park their car in the car park of a sporting club or a bowls club, or in Musgrave Park, we’ve got Jagera Hall and there’s a car park there that some rough sleepers or homeless people are using. I would like the Council to have a bit more of a strategic approach of saying, yes, these are the places where we’ll allow people to sleep in their cars. No one’s saying that’s ideal or that it’s a long-term solution, but I think community groups might appreciate a bit of clarity, because they’re leasing these spaces off the Council and they don’t really know whether it’s okay for people to sleep in their cars on these sites.

 It would be nice for the Council to turn round to those community groups and say look, if you have a homeless person who’s sleeping in your car—in a car, we’re not going to get angry at you as the leasee of that facility. So if we can just give community groups that confidence, that will help manage those relationships between rough sleepers and community organisations.

Chair: Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN, your time has expired.

Any further speakers in General Business?

Councillor OWEN.

Councillor OWEN: Thank you, Mr Chair. Mr Chair, I rise in this General Business to speak on local service firstly, followed by some other citywide events and circumstances. Mr Chair, tomorrow marks a significant day for a number of Councillors in this Chamber, because for the class of 2008 it will be our 15‑year anniversary of elected service. To my colleagues, Councillor WINES, Councillor ADAMS and Councillor HAMMOND, it has been a pleasure and a privilege to serve with you that time, as well as the other Councillors who have been here longer. Importantly, when I look back on the last 15 years, it is a time for reflection to actually look at what it is that has changed in the community and how the improvements have come through.

 I would like to say firstly, at the outset, that I wouldn’t be here today if I hadn’t had the support of my family, which I value. There have been many, many projects that I’ve had the opportunity to work on and when I stand in here today in City Hall, this is one of the important projects. The $215 million restoration project that I had the privilege to assist with and, certainly in that final year, making sure it came in on time and on budget was very, very important. I am very proud to say that I had an opportunity to make this wonderful building, the People’s Place, continue for years to come, especially for the future generations.

 Out in my local community, there have been so many things and I would just like to reflect suburb by suburb on—this is not an all-inclusive list, but some of the projects that have been worked on and delivered during my time in office as the inaugural Councillor for Parkinson and the inaugural Councillor for Calamvale.

 I the suburb of Algester, we have the floodlights at the Algester Little Athletics ground at Col Bennett Park, I have made sure that the Scouts had trailers and camping equipment, the Algester Arrows had softball sports equipment, we have permanent SAMs (speed awareness monitors) on Algester Road, Col Bennett Park received a playground upgrade, Timberland Park received a lighting upgrade, Bundabah Park received a park play equipment upgrade, the Algester Sports Club received an additional car park, Algester Road has undergone a significant beautification project, the Algester Scouts den and the Algester Guides hut have both received upgrades, in Silkwood Street, next to Col Bennett Park and Little Athletics, we have recently had a car park finalised, and currently underway is improvements to Pardalote Park and the Algester Sports kitchen is also underway as an upgrade.

 In the suburb of Calamvale, many of you will know that I repeatedly talk about the wonderful Calamvale District Park which was converted from multiple vacant lots into the wonderful thriving park and community events space that it is today, that is home to our Christmas in the Park, Halloween, Teddy Bear’s Picnic and International Yoga Day over the years. The other things that we have done in Calamvale over the past 15 years, include the Calamvale Leopards clubhouse security improvements, the actual delivery of the many, many stages of Calamvale District Park from the play equipment, the shelters, the outdoor gym, the dog off-leash area (DOLA) and also the festival space, we have also seen the Doulton Alfred Park upgrade, the DOLA that’s also gone into that same park, Tuberose Park upgrade, the Peden Court Park upgrade, the DOLA at Ming-Shan Park and, also, we’ve had the ninja warrior course at Doulton Alfred that we spoke about earlier today, also at the Calamvale Leopards, in recent years, we’ve had inclusive seating going in and can I say on Anzac Day we will have the unveiling of a new memorial to honour those who have served our nation in uniform at Calamvale District Park, so that’s going to be a very special Anzac Day for many of my residents.

 In Parkinson, we have the wonderful Parkinson Aquatic Centre and its many iterations of the actual pool going in and then with the gym going in after that, as well as the terracing and the shade sails there. The movie Swimming for Gold was filmed there in recent years, that became an international movie as well. I was the first person to ensure that we had weed removal funding for Lakewood Estate for the stormwater detention basins, permanent SAMS on Algester Road down at Parkinson as well, the absolute upgrade of Greenways Esplanade Park, including outdoor gym, toilets, shelters, the triple dog off‑leash area, so one’s for small dogs, one’s for large run and the other’s agility, as well as the cycleway that is down there. That was done in conjunction with Transurban and we do appreciate their contribution to ensuring that that went ahead. The play equipment upgrade at Lakewood Avenue Park, the Wallum Drive Park upgrade, Ruth Frith Place, which is my zero to 100-plus exercise equipment, there has also been the extra turning lanes to reduce traffic congestion on Algester Road turning into Beaudesert Road, as well as the Parkinson Aquatic Centre car park extension.

 Over at Stretton we have had the installation of SAMs at Stretton State College, the dedication of Ian Lynas Memorial Park, which I know Councillor MARX started the process off and when that particular area was transferred between our wards we continued on with his family. The delivery of fitness equipment in Stretton Community Park, Regency Place Park upgrade, safer routes to school along Gowan Road outside Stretton College, improved road conditions for Compton Road and also underway is the Hawthorn Avenue Park upgrade process.

 In Drewvale: the Habitat Place Park upgrade, the SAMS in Trinity Way, the Macquarie Way play upgrade and outdoor gym, the half-basketball court in Nigella Circuit, the rehabilitation of Scrubby Creek at Waterbrooke Circuit, Macquarie Way footpath and nature play are underway and coming up very soon.

 Over in Heathwood: the Matthew Conwell Sporting Fields, the change room facility, the cricket nets floodlights, and also the shelters and upgrade to the play equipment has been a significant contribution for that local community, as well as the car parking. The $55 million Blunder Road upgrade, the $18 million Stapylton Road upgrade, the Rotary Park play equipment upgrade, the Dunvegan Street Park upgrade, the pedestrian refuge on Wadeville Street and there are many more opportunities for us to keep improving in that local community as well.

 In Pallara there is the Pallara Parklands, which I started doing the master planning and then had the privilege to open, the Sweets Road stormwater infrastructure, the 803 school bus going into Heathwood and now the 803 and 804 services that both service the Pallara State School, connecting Gooderham Road on to Learoyd Road, which opened up the whole suburb for the residential development, the stormwater drainage processes that we are implementing through Vied Road and Sweets Road to manage a lot of the overland flow, the $10 million upgrade to Ritchie Road, Wadeville Street and Parkwood Drive, where Stage 1B is currently underway, the 126 bus servicing Pallara, which started last year. As we go into Larapinta, there’s the $15 million Paradise Road realignment, the $18 million Johnson Road traffic lights at the intersection, also the Paradise Road safety upgrade, the Oxley Creek Transformation project and Warril Parklands.

 When we look at Forest Lake, now I know Councillor STRUNK now represents the bulk of Forest Lake, I still have a small part, but the Forest Lake District Junior Sports Facility, the Forest Lake Memorial and Amphitheatre upgrade and the Forest Lake Community Hall were all delivered during the time that it was in my area, also, as you drive down Blunder Road, you will see the murals outside Doolandella, which were a project I embarked on with the Neighbourhood Watch. They are just some of the few projects I’m very proud of.

 Can I just say in my remaining 30 seconds, congratulations to the First VIII from BBC (Brisbane Boys College) who won the O’Connor Cup on the weekend, very proud of my nephew, who is Captain of the Boats.

 To the Indian community who is mourning the loss of Dr V. P. Unnikrishnan OAM (Medal of the Order of Australia), it was a privilege to speak at his memorial service on Sunday. He is a stalwart of community service; he has contributed to so much and he will be sadly missed. He was a very good friend and I honour his service. Thank you.

Chair: Any further speakers?

Councillor TOOMEY.

Councillor TOOMEY: Thank you, Mr Chair. I rise tonight to speak with a very heavy heart on the continued fight to breathe for cystic fibrosis sufferers. As this Chamber knows, at the height of the COVID pandemic, my nephew was born with cystic fibrosis (CF), one of the most common genetic disorders in Australia. One in 25 Australians carry the defective gene that can cause cystic fibrosis and one in every 2,500 babies born each year in Australia, are born with cystic fibrosis and there is no cure.

 Sufferers of cystic fibrosis live every day with the progressive and genetic disease that causes persistent lung infections and defects that limit the flow of chloride and water through the cell membrane. This causes a thick sticky build-up of mucus in the lungs, pancreas and digestive systems, which limits children’s and adults’ ability to digest food, breathe and make it much easier for germs to grow in their lungs. While Australian medical researchers partner with scientists across the globe looking for a cure right now, the best we can hope for, for our sufferers, is to manage symptoms with medication.

 With all this medication, life expectancy of Australians born with cystic fibrosis, on average, is 47 years, significantly lower than any other demographic measure in our country. Sufferers can take up to 80 pills a day to help digest food, that’s roughly a wheelie bin a year of medication and four hours of physiotherapy a day, just to help clear the airway of mucus and to reduce the chance of infection in their lungs. Long and extended hospital stays are common and the highest incidents of lung transplants in Australia are for cystic fibrosis sufferers.

 In 2021, the Pharmaceutical Advisory Committee assessed Trikafta. They estimated that it could give people living with cystic fibrosis 27 more years of life when compared to supportive care, and 21 more years of life for patients compared with previous types of medication. The Federal Government at the time supported the PBAC (Pharmaceutical Benefits Advisory Committee) recommendation and listed Trikafta on the Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme (PBS) to be eligible for sufferers from 12 years of age. Since that time, other countries around the world have made Trikafta available to children aged six years and up. Early intervention is always best and research shows that the structural failure of lungs is reduced in paediatric patients prior to any external presentation of symptoms, a very promising result.

 In December 2022, the PBAC recommended Trikafta for listing on the PBS for our littlest sufferers and many of the cystic fibrosis community saw the light at the end of the tunnel get that just little bit brighter. Unfortunately, the Albanese Government stalled supporting the PBAC recommendation and Trikafta funding for paediatric CF patients remains out of their reach. The availability of Trikafta for children six years of age and up would add 12,500 years of life to young Australians suffering with cystic fibrosis at this time. Only yesterday, children living with cystic fibrosis were dealt a devastating blow with the news that Trikafta had been referred back to the PBAC for further review, after talks between the Federal Government for Health and Vertex came to a standstill.

 The heart of our nation is not measured by monuments or buildings, it is measured by how well it cares for the most vulnerable. However, yesterday the heart of our nation got a little bit smaller and a little bit softer, and the future of 500 young Australians fell back into the bureaucrats’ too-hard basket. This is personal to me and the residents of my ward that have friends and family and people living with cystic fibrosis. I am calling on the Albanese Government to do all that it can to expedite the review and approve Trikafta for CF kids six and up. Give each of them the extra 25 years of life they deserve. Show that our nation’s heart beats big and loud.

 I would like to thank my Liberal colleagues in Canberra who are fighting for those who are fighting to breathe and also to the Leader of the Opposition in Queensland, David Crisafulli, for his support at this time and taking up the fight. I also wish to express my gratitude to the LORD MAYOR, Adrian Schrinner, and the Lady Mayoress and also to Councillor ALLAN, for their continued support of the cystic fibrosis community.

 Finally, I wish to thank Cystic Fibrosis Queensland (CFW) CEO, Petrina Fraccaro, and her team at CFQ. They are the leading advocacy group in Queensland for this disease and I’m fortunate to say that they are in The Gap Ward, a local charity based in Ashgrove. I would like to thank them for all they are doing for the cystic fibrosis community. It can be a lonely fight for many sufferers and their advocacy can help make life just a little bit easier for those with cystic fibrosis and their loved ones. Thank you, Mr Chair.

Chair: Any further speakers in General Business? No further speakers?

I declare the meeting closed.

## QUESTIONS OF WHICH DUE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

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

**Submitted by Councillor Jonathan Sriranganathan (received on 3 March 2023)**

**Q1.** How many properties in Brisbane are currently categorised for council rates purposes as ‘Vacant Urban Land’?

**Q2.** How many properties with an area of more than 1000m2 are currently categorised for council rates purposes as ‘Vacant Urban Land’?

**Q3.** Please list the total area of all properties categorised as Vacant Urban Land in each of Brisbane’s 26 wards.

**Q4.** Please list the total rates revenue collected from properties categorised as Vacant Urban Land in each of Brisbane’s 26 wards.

**Submitted by Councillor Nicole Johnston (received on 8 March 2023)**

**Q1.** Please provide a list, in table format as noted below, outlining the funding for Brisbane City Council creeks under the Commonwealth/State DRFA arrangements as part of the Flood Risk Management Program announced in February 2023?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Creek Name** | **Grant Amount $** | **Location** | **Description of Project** |
|  |  |  |  |

**Q2.** Did Brisbane City Council apply for any Commonwealth/State DRFA Creek funding for Brisbane’s largest tributary, Oxley Creek?

**Submitted by Councillor Steve Griffiths (received on 9 March 2023)**

**Q1.** What were the total number of complaints received by Brisbane City Council regarding domestic smoke issues in the following financial years:

a. 2018-19

b. 2019-20

c. 2020-21

d. 2021-22

e. 2022-23 to date

**Q2.** Please provide the amount budgeted, spent to date, and expected completion date, for the below parks install and upgrade projects?

| **PARK PROJECT** | **AMOUNT BUDGETED** | **AMOUNT SPENT TO DATE** | **EXPECTED COMPLETION DATE** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Thrush Street Park, Inala |  |  |  |
| Major Drive Park, Rochedale |  |  |  |
| Fallon Park, Everton Park |  |  |  |
| Gus Davies Park, Bald Hills |  |  |  |
| Keralgerie Park, Morningside |  |  |  |
| Downey Park, Windsor |  |  |  |
| Bradbury Park, Kedron |  |  |  |
| Murarrie Recreation Reserve, Murarrie |  |  |  |
| Grinstead Park, Alderley |  |  |  |
| Shand Street Park, Stafford |  |  |  |
| Corbett Park, Grange/Stafford |  |  |  |
| Colmslie Beach Reserve, Murarrie |  |  |  |
| Brighton Foreshore, Brighton |  |  |  |
| Nudgee Waterholes, Nudgee |  |  |  |

## ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS OF WHICH DUE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

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

**Submitted by Councillor Steve Griffiths (from meeting on 7 March 2023)**

**Q1.** Provide the total spent on catering for E&C meetings in the following financial years:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Financial Year** | **Catering Expense** |
| 2022-2023 (to date) |  |
| 2020-2021 |  |
| 2019-2020 |  |
| 2018-2019 |  |
| 2017-2018 |  |

***A1.***

| ***Financial Year*** | ***Catering Expense*** |
| --- | --- |
| *2022-2023 (to date)* | *$604.95* |
| *2020-2021* | *$14,209.97* |
| *2019-2020* | *$9,769.67* |
| *2018-2019* | *$7,977.38* |
| *2017-2018* | *$5,523.46* |

**Q2.** Provide a list of all overseas trips taken by Councillors on Council business, including the dates, reason, any guests/colleagues accompanying the Councillor using BCC funding, and total amount spent by Brisbane City Council to facilitate each trip.

***A2.*** *It is unclear from the question how far back the information is sought. For example, would the timeframe extend as far as 2002 when Labor Lord Mayor Jim Soorley flew out of Brisbane on a European and American trip, one year before stepping down as Lord Mayor, costing ratepayers $86,600 in today’s dollars.*

**Q3.** Provide the total number of inappropriate conduct complaints which have been investigated by the OIA and then referred back to Brisbane City Council for investigation.

***A3.*** *Since 30 March 2020, when the Office of the Independent Assessor (OIA) became responsible for assessing Council’s Councillor conduct complaints, the OIA have assessed 16 inappropriate conduct complaints which were subsequently referred back to Council for investigation.*

**Q4.** Provide the categories used to describe the types of harassment and bullying complaints received and investigated by Brisbane City Council, eg. Physical assault, Racism, Sexual misconduct, etc.

***A4.*** *See A5.*

**Q5.** Provide the number of complaints regarding any and all workplace bullying and harassment (including but not limited to, for example, physical assault, racial, ableist etc) received from Brisbane City Council staff, contractors, and any other stakeholders Brisbane City Council is responsible for, broken into categories, and per financial year:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type of Bullying or Harassment** | **2022-2023 (to date)** | **2021-2022** | **2020-2021** |
| Bullying (general) |  |  |  |
| Racism |  |  |  |
| Ablism |  |  |  |
| Sexism |  |  |  |
| Sexual Misconduct |  |  |  |
| Physical Assault |  |  |  |
| etc. |  |  |  |

***A5.***

| **Type of Bullying or Harassment** | **2022-2023 (to date)** | **2021-2022** | **2020-2021** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Assault* | *8* | *10* | *12* |
| *Bullying* | *19* | *46* | *36* |
| *Discrimination*  | *9* | *9* | *9* |
| *Domestic violence* | *3* | *1* | *3* |
| *Inappropriate behaviour towards a Council employee* | *1* | *0* | *0* |
| *Sexual assault* | *4* | *5* | *4* |
| *Sexual harassment* | *3* | *6* | *7* |

*Note: The above figures represent matters referred to Council’s Ethical Standards Unit*.

**Q6.** Please provide a list all external legal firms and individuals who provide legal advice to Council when engaged in legal matters?

***A6.*** *There is no change to the response previously provided.*

**RISING OF COUNCIL: 5.49pm.**

**PRESENTED: and CONFIRMED**

 **CHAIR**

**Council officers in attendance:**

Dorian Maruda (A/Senior Council and Committee Officer)

Ashley Bailey (A/Council and Committee Officer)

Billy Peers (Personal Support Officer to the Lord Mayor and Council Orderly)