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## PRESENT:

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

The Chair of Council, Councillor Sandy LANDERS (Bracken Ridge) – LNP

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **LNP Councillors (and Wards)**  | **ALP Councillors (and Wards)** |
| Greg ADERMANN (Pullenvale)Adam ALLAN (Northgate)Lisa ATWOOD (Doboy)Fiona CUNNINGHAM (Coorparoo)Tracy DAVIS (McDowall)Alex GIVNEY (Wynnum Manly)Vicki HOWARD (Central) Steven HUANG (MacGregor) (Deputy Chair of Council)Sarah HUTTON (Jamboree)Kim MARX (Runcorn)Ryan MURPHY (Chandler)Danita PARRY (Marchant) Steven TOOMEY (The Gap)Andrew WINES (Enoggera)Penny WOLFF (Walter Taylor) | Jared CASSIDY (Deagon) (The Leader of the Opposition)Lucy COLLIER (Morningside) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition)Emily KIM (Calamvale)Charles STRUNK (Forest Lake) |
| **Queensland Greens Councillors (and Wards)**Seal CHONG WAH (Paddington)Trina MASSEY (The Gabba) |
| **Independent Councillor (and Ward)**Nicole JOHNSTON (Tennyson) |

## OPENING OF MEETING:

The Deputy Chair (Councillor Steven HUANG) opened the meeting with prayer and acknowledged the traditional custodians, and then proceeded with the business set out in the Agenda.

Deputy Chair: I declare the meeting open.

## APOLOGIES:

Deputy Chair: Are there any apologies?

 Councillor GIVNEY.

**7/2024-25**

An apology was submitted on behalf of the DEPUTY MAYOR (Councillor Krista ADAMS) and Councillor Julia DIXON, and they were granted leave of absence from the meeting on the motion of Councillor Alex GIVNEY, seconded by Councillor Greg ADERMANN.

Councillor CASSIDY: Chair, I have an apology.

**8/2024-25**

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

## MINUTES:

Chair Confirmation of minutes please.

**9/2024-25**

The Minutes of the 4738 (ordinary) meeting held on 11 June 2024, the 4739 (budget) meeting held on 12 June 2024, and the 4740 and 4741 (special) meetings held on 20 June 2024 and 11 July 2024, respectively, copies of which were forwarded to each Councillor, were presented, taken as read and confirmed on the motion of Councillor Alex GIVNEY, seconded by Councillor Greg ADERMANN.

## QUESTION TIME:

Chair: Question Time, are there any questions of the LORD MAYOR or a Civic Cabinet Chair of any of the Standing Committees?

 Councillor GIVNEY.

**Question 1**

Councillor GIVNEY: Thank you, Chair. My question is to the LORD MAYOR.

 LORD MAYOR, the Federal Government has recently announced an inquiry into local government sustainability. Could you please update the Chamber on Council’s submission to the inquiry?

Deputy Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair, and thank you, Councillor GIVNEY, for the question. Because it is something that is particularly important, not just to the residents of Brisbane or to the Brisbane City Council, but the over 500 councils right across Australia who are impacted in a similar way and in a significant way, particularly in recent times, by increased cost pressures. But also a lack of support from the other levels of government, that collect by far the most revenue. I’d like to, Billy, table a copy of our submission to the parliamentary inquiry into local government sustainability.

 This particular submission is very detailed and covers some of the many factors that we’re calling on the Federal Government to consider through this committee of inquiry. In particular, it talks about the investment that Brisbane residents, through their rates, are making towards responsibilities of other levels of government. In particular, investing around $140 million a year in operating and subsidising the cost of public transport in Brisbane. The provision of childhood vaccinations, with Council funding 65% of the cost of the delivery of immunisations.

 We also know that there’s been amendments to legislation for Council to take responsibility of the management of fire ants when it comes to Council land from 1 July. Once again, something that the State always said that they were responsible for. The State said they would eradicate fire ants and they seem to have dropped the ball, given up and handed over to local councils, with no funding support whatsoever. We also know that the Emergency Management Levy, which is included on the rates no less, so it’s a State levy included on Council rates notices and the money goes to the State, has only increased by 10% since 2005, yet inflation has been over 60% in that same period.

 There’s a whole range of things that we have raised in this submission. We’ve talked about our investment in major transport infrastructure and that’s not just projects like the Brisbane Metro, but also new bridges, road upgrades that, anywhere else, would be done by State and Federal Governments. The fact that when there is Federal support for these projects, and we appreciate that Federal or State support, it’s interesting when you see a State and Federal project like say the Coomera Connector, or highway upgrades on the Bruce or the M1, if the project cost goes up due to inflation then the Federal Government stumps up more money to help the State Government deal with that cost increase.

 Yet if it’s a Council project, sorry, you’re on your own. The cost has gone up, our grant stays the same, see you later. But quite happy to turn up to media ops on those projects and claim the credit. So we’re simply asking for the same treatment that State Governments get and other major delivery partners from the Federal Government, where there’s cost escalations and where there are projects that are very important, that are under pressure, that we see appropriate increases in the contributions from other levels of government to those projects.

 Now if you look at the growth in revenue of different levels of government, if you look at the 10 years between 2012-13 financial year to 2021-22 financial year, Australian Government revenues over that 10-year period have grown by 65%. Queensland Government revenues have grown by 74% and council revenues have only grown by 46%. So once again we’re seeing the other levels of government grow their revenue significantly, councils are not doing the same.

 We’re working hard to keep rates low, but we’re not seeing appropriate funding support from those other levels of government to help us with the cost impacts. That includes things like the Financial Assistance Grants which come from the Australian Government. That grant was frozen for a number of years and even since then they have changed the methodology so that Brisbane misses out and has a reduced funding allocation compared to other councils. So there’s a whole range of things that are going on here that are impacting Brisbane and other councils.

 We know that local government collects only three per cent of taxes in the country, with the rest of it being collected by State and Federal Governments. In fact, Federal Government collecting over 80% of all tax revenue. The costs facing local government, just in the last two years alone, so last year and this year, the costs facing local government and this is LGAQ’s (Local Government Association of Queensland) figures—

Deputy Chair: Sorry, LORD MAYOR, your time has expired.

LORD MAYOR: —have been 11.3% increase.

Deputy Chair: Further questions?

 Councillor KIM.

**Question 2**

Councillor KIM: Thank you, Chair. My question is to the City Planning and Suburban Renewal Chair, Councillor Adam ALLAN.

 You’ve said the answer to Brisbane’s housing crisis is to increase density, having released plans for precincts at Stones Corner and Kurilpa. It’s now been 434 days since Kurilpa was announced. As of today, how many new homes have been delivered as part of the changes? Can you confirm it’s reduced rental prices in the area? Thank you, Chair.

Deputy Chair: Councillor ALLAN.

Councillor ALLAN: Thank you, Mr Chair, and thank you to Councillor KIM for the question. In the context of Kurilpa in particular, that is still a matter that we are working with the State Government on. We have a condition on the Kurilpa TLPI (Temporary Local Planning Instrument) that we are negotiating with them in order to provide better clarity around what is to be proposed there at individual development sites. What I can say is we are getting applications through. You have to remember that the Kurilpa TLPI is a relatively new initiative. It takes a long time for a developer to develop a site and also to then put together a planning scheme that actually will give rise to an approval. So the approval process on a new development down there isn’t going to happen in 12 or 18 months. These can take a long time to bring to fruition, so that’s a key consideration at the moment.

 I’m interested that this TLPI is actually a State Government TLPI and Councillor KIM is directing the question to me, asking about a TLPI that is actually the State Government’s TLPI. So we are very, very keen to see additional housing delivered down there, but the reality is that—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Deputy Chair: Councillors, Councillor ALLAN has the floor.

Councillor ALLAN: Look, they don’t want to hear the answer, do they? The truth is hard to bear, but I think that if Councillor KIM waits just a little while she will start to see more applications coming in in that location. As I said, they’re already coming in and the approvals will flow from this particular precinct. But I do think that the timeframe that we’ve had in order to see those applications come through is extremely limited. As I said, it takes a long time to put together an application, not only to work with their planners and the architects to put together a project that works, but also then to obviously bring it through the State and the local government for approval. So I think that in this particular instance Councillor KIM just needs to wait and let things run their course. Thank you.

Deputy Chair: Further questions?

 Councillor DIXON—sorry, Councillor PARRY, Danita PARRY.

**Question 3**

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

 Councillor CUNNINGHAM, following the 2022 flood event we saw a haphazard approach to disaster recovery funding from the State and Federal Governments. Can you please update the Chamber on the increasing cost of disaster recovery now being borne by Brisbane ratepayers?

Deputy Chair: Councillor CUNNINGHAM.

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: Thanks, Mr Chair, and thank you to Councillor PARRY for the question. The 2022 floods were indeed a devastating event for our community. It affected families on many levels, it devastated many community clubs and of course it also had a big impact on the Council infrastructure critical to keeping Brisbane moving. Council mobilised a significant operation to clear our streets, make our roads and bikeways safe and to restore key assets. The State and Federal disaster recovery funding arrangements are there to support the fast and safe recovery of our communities.

 While much of our immediate recovery works were funded by the QRA (Queensland Reconstruction Authority), Council has still been left with a large financial burden and one which has sharply increased since the previous event in 2011. The 2011 and 2022 floods in Brisbane resulted in similar total damage costs to our city, both in the hundreds of millions, both of these were very significant events. However, the proportion of this impact that had to be paid by Council was very different in 2011 than it was for 2022. In 2011 Council was required to contribute just over 33% of rebuilding and recovery costs. In the 2022 event Council’s contribution has almost doubled to more than 65%.

 The approach to roads funding highlights this particularly clearly, Mr Chair. Over 2,700 Brisbane streets experienced flooding in 2022. The estimated damage to Council’s roads amounted to $54 million. Based on the guidelines, we submitted $27 million in claims to the QRA for sections of 71 streets that were 100% inundated by floodwaters. However, of that $27 million only $500,000 has been approved. This compared to $40 million in funding for roads in 2011. Similar challenges were encountered in the cleaning of stormwater drains. Council bears the responsibility of ensuring the functioning of the drainage network post-major floods, to mitigate risks of further damage in the event of another rainfall event.

 In 2022 the estimated damage to Council’s drainage system was $52 million, with $20 million submitted to the QRA, but, Mr Chair, only $5 million was approved. This compares to $20 million for drainage in 2011. This plain and simple is cost shifting and Brisbane ratepayers are paying the price. With weather events becoming more frequent and more severe, this is a big challenge which threatens the financial sustainability of all councils right across Queensland. Increased resilience in local government-owned infrastructure is vital to minimising impacts on our local communities and of course supporting a swift recovery.

 In recent years collectively there has been a push to do more than just recover though, Mr Chair. Build back better was the catchcry of every politician with a microphone after the 2022 floods, but sadly the approach to funding from the State and Federal Governments has not matched this rhetoric. In 2022, $170 million was made available across the entire State for betterment, with funding capped at $5 million for any single project. This low cap for betterment funding means that many assets can only be constructed back to their same vulnerable condition. Given the significant scale of natural disasters right across Queensland in that year, $170 million didn’t go far at all.

 Since then, Brisbane has not been eligible for any further betterment funding. To make matters worse, the current disaster recovery funding arrangements are systematically biased against betterment or improved resilience, instead favouring rebuilding like-for-like infrastructure that may be then destroyed in repeated disaster events. Funding for assets to be built back better should be a core criteria of disaster recovery funding. Mr Chair, we are pushing for reform and advocating for a change in this space. We need the cost shifting to stop and for consistent, clear, reasonable—

Deputy Chair: Councillor CUNNINGHAM, your time has expired.

 Further questions?

 Councillor CASSIDY.

**Question 4**

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Deputy Chair. My question is to the City Planning and Suburban Renewal Chair, Councillor Adam ALLAN.

 Councillor ALLAN, *Brisbane’s Housing Supply Action Plan* was released almost a year ago. The LORD MAYOR said at the time that it would result in more homes sooner, that was his quote. The LORD MAYOR said we needed to see 8,500 new homes built a year to keep up with demand. In this plan sites are identified to accommodate more density, to increase supply and to stop development sprawl into the suburbs of Brisbane, but to date, most of that work remains unfinished. Why is your LNP Council going so slow on the planning changes you announced a year ago?

Deputy Chair: Councillor ALLAN.

Councillor ALLAN: Thank you, Mr Chair, and thank you to Councillor CASSIDY for the question. I would say that we have progressed a significant number of initiatives that were in the Housing Supply Action Plan. Specifically, we’ve brought in a range for incentives to support the industry. We’re also continuing to progress our suburban renewal opportunities. We’re also in the process of looking to reduce the car parking ratios in selected locations around the city, to make it more cost efficient to build. So we are pursuing and pushing ahead with all of those initiatives and a number of them have already been progressed.

 What I would say too to Councillor CASSIDY is that we have a laser focus on what we can do to deliver housing in this city. We are the fastest growing capital city in the country. We have at this stage nine years’ worth of supply, where applications have been approved to build homes and we are continuing to approve DAs (Development Applications) every single week. In fact in Committee this morning we had a presentation which Councillor CASSIDY was privy to, where we outlined a subdivision out in Bridgeman Downs. We are continuing to add to the supply of latent stock around the city, we’re continuing to incentivise the development of one and two bedroom homes and studios.

 We’re continuing to incentivise build-to-rent and as I mentioned, we’re going to look to reduce car parking ratios in certain locations. We are pursuing the precinct planning work. We’ve got a submission that came through Council in the last session, where we’re looking to do a precinct plan in Stones Corner. We’ve been working with the State Government to develop a much more streamlined approval process for that precinct plan and just recently, we’ve received a chief executive notice from the State outlining how that process is going to work.

 All of these things are moving ahead, but it’s all well and good for us to provide latent supply, the real problem here is getting homes constructed. Unless Councillor CASSIDY’s been living under a rock for the last three or four weeks and not reading the newspapers, everybody knows what’s ailing the construction industry in this city and across the country. First of all, we’ve got the State Government’s Big Build program which is limiting capacity to build homes. Why is that happening? Because the State sat on their backside for 10 years and haven’t built the schools and hospitals in Queensland that were needed. Now they’re coming up to an election and they’re quickly trying to build these things and that is taking capacity out of the homebuilding market.

 On top of that, they’ve got the BPIC (Best Practice Industry Conditions) program which is adding costs. It’s adding costs not only to the Big Build projects, it’s adding costs right throughout the industry. Pick up the papers, read them, the industry is telling us that these kinds of things are impacting the cost to build and that impacts the ability to build homes in Brisbane. Then of course on top of all of this we’ve got the CFMEU (Construction, Forestry and Maritime Employees Union), who are driving up the cost of building in this city. Now I speak to the development industry, I speak to the building industry, I speak to the planners, this is not a secret to them. The State Government has conveniently ignored this for years, but it’s come home to roost now. It’s really, really quite ironic that one of Councillor CASSIDY’s backers, one of their backers, is the reason that homes aren’t being built in Brisbane.

 So it’s quite audacious to come in here and pose a question to me, when he knows the answer. So really what Councillor CASSIDY can do is if he wants to see more homes built in Brisbane, he can go and talk to some of his State colleagues, he can talk to some of his union mates and they can start to free up the bottleneck that they’ve created in this city which is stymying the development of houses. We are doing everything we can to make sure that that supply is there, but there are real impediments to the industry in building this. As I said, it’s quite audacious that Councillor CASSIDY should come into this Chamber and pose that question to me, when he knows damn well what the issues are. Thank you, Mr Chair.

Deputy Chair: Thank you.

 Further questions?

 Councillor TOOMEY.

**Question 5**

Councillor TOOMEY: Thank you, Mr Deputy Chair. My question is to the Chair of the Infrastructure Committee, Councillor WINES.

 Councillor WINES, since 2019 Council has been undertaking restoration work on the Story Bridge to ensure its continued longevity. Can you update on the Chamber on support that Council will be seeking for the next stage of the restoration of Brisbane’s most iconic bridge?

Deputy Chair: Councillor WINES.

Councillor WINES: Thank you, Councillor TOOMEY. Thank you, Mr Chair, I should say, and thank you to Councillor TOOMEY for the question. Can I begin by saying that he’s right in identifying that the Schrinner Council has invested heavily in the restoration of the Story Bridge, an iconic structure which has served our city well for more than 80 years and if properly restored will be able to serve this city for another 80 to 100 years. Maintaining our roads and bridges in this city is a fundamental part of our ongoing plan to keep Brisbane moving. Many people may not know this, but the bridge’s construction was completed in 1940 by the Queensland Government and was handed to Council in 1947.

 To speak to the point about recent restoration works, Council has invested approximately $78 million in the Story Bridge since 2019 through the Story Bridge restoration project. This is a massive investment, required to ensure that the longevity and ongoing use of what is not just an iconic structure but an invaluable transport link for South East Queensland. But following a review undertaken last year, it has become increasingly clear that the scope, scale and cost of delivering a fulsome restoration of this bridge will require the partnership of the State and/or Federal Governments to ensure the Story Bridge gets the restoration worthy of its importance.

 The Story Bridge carries more than 100,000 vehicles per day and accounts for about 43% of all free inner city river crossings each day. This heavy usage, combined with exposure to the elements, means that without intervention the bridge’s life will come to its end at the planned 100-year conclusion when it was built in 1940. A comprehensive restoration program that addresses issues such as corrosion, applies protective coatings and replaces aged steel and footpaths, is needed to extend the Story Bridge’s serviceable lifespan for another century. When work started on what was initially planned to be painting and minor repairs, it became apparent that far more extensive work was to be required.

 Of the $78 million which has already been invested since the Story Bridge project began, works have included stripping back the old paint, applying new protective coatings to steel and extensive concrete and steel repairs. The work has been completed largely below the road decking in the Kangaroo Point area. The next sections will be overwater or in the superstructure, which will be far more complicated. While costly, we know delivering a comprehensive restoration program is far more cost effective than the alternative of replacing the bridge to a potential cost of billions of dollars. For comparison, the delivery of these sorts of projects in other jurisdictions, a bridge the size of the Story Bridge is typically the property of a State or Federal Government.

 When it comes to comparable bridges around the world, projects of this scale have had significant national government support. The Story Bridge’s sister bridge, the Montreal Harbour Bridge, or the Jacques Cartier Bridge which opened in 1930, has had a series of major repairs and restorations beginning in the early 2000s, including full deck replacement to extend the lifespan of the bridge. That was funded by the National Government of Canada. That Government, the Canadian Government, not the Quebec Government but the Canadian Government, provided CAD$120 million or AUD$134 million in 2018 to deliver infrastructure improvements around the bridge, in addition to CAD$96 million or AUD$107 million, for reinforcement works on the bridge to extend its life merely to 2027.

 That means the Canadian Government has provided more than $200 million in pre-COVID price escalation dollars to a comparable structural project. Closer to home, the Sydney Harbour Bridge restoration works, which are the responsibility of the New South Wales Government, were the recipient of a Federal grant of $45.2 million in the budget of 2023-24 to deliver restoration works on that bridge. Also by comparison, let us not forget that the Miles Government has committed $700 million to provide an extra two lanes to connect Bribie Island to the mainland, for a cost comparison.

 A full restoration of the iconic bridge will mean another century of life for that critical piece of infrastructure. The Schrinner Council is committed to spending within its means so we don’t add unnecessary costs on to residents now and into the future. We’re committed to getting our fair share for ratepayers by securing a funding partnership comparable to other bridge relationships that I’ve discussed earlier. We have engaged the Federal Government and written to seek $4.5 million of funding through their Major Projects Business Case Fund to develop a further business case for the long-term restoration of that bridge. We are hoping to achieve a partnership with all three levels of government—

Deputy Chair: Councillor WINES, your time has expired.

Councillor WINES: —to restore Brisbane’s most iconic structure and national icon.

Deputy Chair: Councillor CHONG WAH.

**Question 6**

Councillor CHONG WAH: Thank you, Chair. I rise to ask the LORD MAYOR, through the Chair, a question regarding the rehabilitation of Mt Coot-tha Quarry.

 I quote the LORD MAYOR from a 7Newsonline story published on 1 August in response to a design by local urban design agency, PRAX, for the Mt Coot-tha Quarry. This design included both a hotel and zipline, amongst other features. The LORD MAYOR said in response to the PRAX design, we’ve had some amazing suggestions but the ones we get excited about are the ones that create new tourist attractions and things for people to do and also have a way of creating private input into the investment.

 In both *The Courier-Mail* and 7News, the LORD MAYOR’s most common refrain was what a rehabilitated quarry site could be for tourists, for tourism and tourist attractions. This suggests that the LORD MAYOR has a vision for Mt Coot-tha that is primarily for tourists and tourism, with little regard to the local community and the residents of Brisbane. Does the LORD MAYOR now support the privatisation and commercialisation of a rehabilitated quarry, including a hotel and zipline? Or will the LORD MAYOR commit to keeping the quarry site as 100% public space?

Deputy Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: What an extraordinary but predictable question. I like how there’s this suggestion that we need to keep it as public space. It’s a hole in the ground which has big trucks and blasting that happens there, big trucks coming in and out. No members of the public are allowed in there and they haven’t been for decades. The reality is this is classic Greens. I think the best example of this is what happened with Victoria Park. Remember when I first announced the Victoria Park Vision? They said you stole our plan, that was our plan. Then they’ve spent every year since opposing our plan.

 The plan that is supported by the community for Victoria Park, guess what, the local Greens activists don’t support it, they don’t support it. So I can predict safely now that whatever is proposed at Mt Coot-tha Quarry the Greens will not support, because it’s in their DNA to oppose, it’s not in their DNA to actually do anything. They just are a party of opposition, they’re a party of protest, they are a party of opposing good plans. I’m not going to listen to Greens activists when it comes to the future of the quarry, because what do they want? Do they want us to lock the gate?

Councillor MASSEY: Point of order, Chair.

LORD MAYOR: Just lock the gate?

Deputy Chair: Point of order, Councillor MASSEY.

Councillor MASSEY: The question that Councillor CHONG WAH asked was does the LORD MAYOR support—public land, open space, or does the LORD MAYOR support commercialisation of the quarry?

Deputy Chair: The LORD MAYOR has five minutes to answer.

LORD MAYOR: At the moment the quarry is a commercial operation. It’s a bit like the golf course at Victoria Park, it was fully commercialised. We’ve decommercialised it and opened it up to the public and they oppose it. It’s a fully commercialised operation at the moment. No members of the public can go in there and they want to protect what’s there. It’s rock, it’s a hole in the ground. We have a vision that this could be an amazing, amazing attraction for Brisbane residents and for visitors to the city. We know what the Greens want, they want to lock the gate, they don’t want anyone benefiting from it. They just want to oppose whatever is put forward, no matter how good, no matter how green, no matter how spectacular, they will oppose it.

 Look, at least we know where they stand, but I want to know where the people of Brisbane stand. We know where the Greens activists stand, where do the people of Brisbane stand on this? We know with the example with Victoria Park is that while the Greens activists opposed it all the way through and they continue to oppose it, this day the people of Brisbane support the plan for Victoria Park and guess what, in recent weeks the State and Federal Labor Government support our plan for Victoria Park too. We’re simply saying have your say on the future of Mt Coot-tha. That doesn’t mean just Greens activists having their say, it means everyone having their say.

 Look, if there’s going to be something spectacular happen at Mt Coot-tha, I wonder what the Labor-Greens coalition of chaos would say if we diverted public resources from other parts of Brisbane to build a multibillion dollar facility in the quarry. I wonder what they would say. Do you think they would be for that or against it? They would oppose it. Well who’s going to pay for it? Who’s going to pay for these wonderful plans for the quarry? There needs to be some kind of income source, there needs to be some kind of private investment. They’re going ooh, ooh, just like there was at South Bank, just like there was at Howard Smith Wharves, just like we’ve seen time and time again where great precincts have been created. Just like there was at Roma Street Parkland, where the funding of the parklands was created by the construction of new homes nearby at Roma Street.

 So while this may be an outrageous idea to Greens activists, this is how things actually happen which become some of the city’s most attractive assets for people to use and benefit from. This is called a public-private partnership, this is called how you get a vision for the future without dipping further into ratepayers’ pockets, without putting the city at risk, but actually using the investment opportunities that could be there for something like this to turn a fully commercialised asset into a partially commercialised asset that provides a great community benefit. So I’m really excited to see what comes out of this process, but I do appreciate Councillor CHONG WAH is going to be against whatever happens there.

 I do appreciate that she is spreading mistruths in the community about when the quarry will close down. But look, the reality is we’re going to later on this year release some options for people to consider and we’re looking forward to everyone having their say.

Deputy Chair: Further questions?

 Councillor ADERMANN.

**Question 7**

Councillor ADERMANN: Thank you, Chair. My question is to the Chair of the City Standards, Councillor HUTTON.

 We know that this Administration continues to provide affordable and sustainable solutions for residents’ waste. Could you please update the Chamber on the increasing financial impact of the Queensland Government’s waste disposal levy?

Deputy Chair: Councillor HUTTON.

Councillor HUTTON: Thank you, Chair, and I would like to thank Councillor ADERMANN for the question. As the Deputy Chair of City Standards, you know very well that the increasing financial impact of the State Labor Government’s waste disposal levy, or bin tax, is having an impact on our residents. The Schrinner Council is doing everything we can to keep costs low for Brisbane residents. We know that Brisbane often misses out on support from the State and Federal Government in terms of funding and on top of that we are then subject to the taxes imposed by various legislation.

 Chair, the Labor State Government promised that its waste levy wouldn’t impact residents, but that hasn’t been the case. In an attempt to mitigate the impact on residents, the State Government committed to provide annual payments to local government, but there’s still a gap. Chair, that gap continues to grow year after year. To counteract this we’re making it easier for residents to reduce waste and avoid these additional costs. At the end of last year we launched our landmark *Towards Zero Waste* strategy, featuring enhanced rebates, expanded household collection services and increased public recycling locations, to help residents become more sustainable.

 For those who have not heard of the Labor State Government’s waste disposal levy before, it is a tax that was introduced in 2019 and applies to every single tonne of red-top bin waste that ends up in landfill. The waste levy was introduced to deter the trucking of waste from interstate, where there was a levy charged. So we had a situation where it was more cost effective to transport waste from Sydney to Brisbane to bypass the New South Wales levy. While we support the measures to deter such practices, we must ensure that the costs do not fall unfairly on the ratepayers of Brisbane.

 At the time, Minister Enoch assured residents we are sticking by our commitment that ratepayers will not have to pay more to put their wheelie bins out or to take a load of rubbish to the tip because of the waste levy. However, Mr Chair, it seems to be unclear who the State expected to bear this impact, as our residents continue to shoulder the costs and the burden continues to grow. This year alone residents are paying $115 per tonne of the waste they generate and the gap will be $17.25. Next year the levy will increase to $125 per tonne, with a gap of $37.50. In 2026‑27 it will rise to $135 per tonne, with a gap, wait for it, of $54. This year alone, $7.1 million worth of ratepayers funds will go directly to the State’s coffers.

 Despite these challenges, our Towards Zero Waste strategy is making strides. We are increasing rebates, expanding collection services and boosting public recycling locations, while maintaining weekly red-top bin collections. Yes, Mr Chair, it is this side of the Chamber that is committed to keeping the weekly red-top bin collection. The State Labor Government said that their bin tax won’t cost residents a cent, but we now see their lack of action to protect them from the gap. While this money is going straight to the State coffers, the question we should be asking is how is this money being invested? We recognise that the waste industry requires substantial investment to build the necessary infrastructure for processing recycled materials.

 However, the State Government is missing in action when it comes to supporting these crucial initiatives. In light of these facts, it is clear that the Labor State Government’s waste disposal levy is a significant burden on the Brisbane residents, contrary to its original promise. This levy, which now accounts to an estimated $338 million over the next decade, places an undue strain on households. Chair, we are doing all that we can to shield our residents from this tax and it’s all hands on deck when it comes to reducing the amount of waste going to landfill.

 Our goal to reduce landfill includes many initiatives and trials, including our rollout of larger recycling bins to homes across Brisbane, our discounts and incentives to provide green bins across the city, our rebates for home compost and worm farms, our rebates for InSinkErators and food waste dehydrators and our continued investment in community composting hubs. These initiatives are designed to reduce the financial impact on our residents, while promoting sustainable waste management practices. By investing in these programs we are not only helping to mitigate costs associated with the waste levy—

Deputy Chair: Councillor HUTTON, your time has expired.

Councillor HUTTON: Thank you, Chair.

Deputy Chair: Further questions?

 Councillor COLLIER.

**Question 8**

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

 Underwhelmingly, we’ve received confirmation from the CEO that the first Brisbane Metro stage to be rolled out on 21 October will run on existing route 169 and maintain the same frequency as the current service. Will you now finally admit that this is just another bus, now with less seating, running on a standard timetable for Brisbane?

Deputy Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: I wonder when the Labor Opposition will finally admit that they’ve gotten it wrong on Brisbane Metro. Not just at the last election, but the election before. Not just when they decided to criticise it because it wasn’t their idea and not just when both the—

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

Deputy Chair: Point of order, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, Mr Deputy Chairman, the Meetings Local Law requires the LORD MAYOR to answer the question. He’s not supposed to debate the question.

Deputy Chair: Well the LORD MAYOR has five minutes, so LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: The Labor defence force is in action—

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Deputy Chair: Yes, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: You don’t want to deal with those interjections?

Deputy Chair: They are noted from both sides.

Councillor JOHNSTON: I’m not the Leader of the Opposition.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: You don’t want to deal with those interjections from the LORD MAYOR?

Deputy Chair: No, I didn’t hear that.

 LORD MAYOR, please continue.

Councillor JOHNSTON: No, no, well—

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair.

Councillor JOHNSTON: I’m sorry, I’ve raised—I’ve stood on a point of order.

Deputy Chair: Yes, I feel with that I made my ruling, thank you.

Councillor JOHNSTON: You haven’t even asked my point of order.

Deputy Chair: You raised about that question and I—

Councillor JOHNSTON: No, I just stood up to speak, Mr Deputy Chair, and there was a lot of interjection and I thought you might like to deal with that.

Deputy Chair: I thought you were talking about the interjection.

Councillor JOHNSTON: No, no.

Deputy Chair: All right, please go ahead.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes. I’m seeking a ruling on whether or not the LORD MAYOR is debating the question, which is in contravention of the Meetings Local Law. I appreciate he has five minutes but that was not the point of order that he raised.

Deputy Chair: Yes, it was only less than half a minute when the LORD MAYOR started to answer, so please allow the LORD MAYOR to finish his answer.

 LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Yes, I think I was literally a matter of seconds into the answer and the Labor defence force jumped up to their defence. Look, I have to say it’s not enough that Labor Councillors have opposed Metro over all these years, but right now, after they’ve lost a couple of elections opposing Metro and then the icing on the cake being that both the State Labor Government and the Federal Labor Government support Brisbane Metro and they’re still criticising, it’s quite extraordinary. So look, I don’t know what I can say to change their mind, but the reality is we don’t need to change the people of Brisbane’s mind on Brisbane Metro because people are excited about it coming. I can tell you who else is excited, Steven Miles, Bart Mellish.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: He was, he was doing chin-ups on the Metro vehicle. There’s a lot of excitement out there in the community about Metro services starting. Now they’re starting from mid-to-late October and we put the line in the sand of 21 October for 169 services to be replaced. It’s funny because there’s a little bit of basic maths missing here, so they’re like it’s just replacing one vehicle with another. It’s replacing what is currently articulated buses on that route in the main with a much larger, higher capacity vehicle, with the ability to run—

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —with the ability to run as we gear up services every five minutes to every three minutes, as we progressively gear up the—

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Mr Chair?

 As we progressively gear up to full capacity. So the Labor Party thinks that better public transport is a joke.

Councillor COLLIER: Point of order, Chair.

Deputy Chair: Point of order.

Councillor COLLIER: Chair, I think the LORD MAYOR’s mentioned the word Labor about 15 times in less than two minutes, but will—on relevance will he actually answer the question? Will you finally admit that this is just another bus, with less seating, running on a standard timetable, LORD MAYOR?

*Councillors interjecting.*

Deputy Chair: Look, it’s not the time for the debate. The LORD MAYOR has the floor.

LORD MAYOR: This is extraordinary.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Deputy Chair: Order, order, the LORD MAYOR has the floor.

LORD MAYOR: Look, like I said, I don’t think there’s anything that I could say to convince the Labor Opposition to support Brisbane Metro, but we’ve convinced the State Government to support it and we’ve convinced the Federal Government to support it.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Not just one Federal Government, but two different Federal Governments from both sides of politics and that’s not in addition—that’s in addition to convincing Infrastructure Australia to support it and the RACQ, Engineers Australia and pretty much everyone else.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: So according to Councillor CASSIDY and Councillor COLLIER, they’re all wrong and it’s just a bus. Well I’m excited, I’m excited about this fully electric turn-up-and-go bus service, bus rapid transit, mass transit for Brisbane. That is an exciting thing for our city.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Look, they don’t have to be excited, Mr Chair, but we are, the people of Brisbane are, the State Government is, the Federal Government is, the RACQ is, Engineers Australia are. I have to say even Councillor CASSIDY is welcome to come on those first services when Metro starts operating and maybe then he will finally change his mind. Maybe he will drop his opposition to Brisbane Metro, I don’t know. I predict that one day—

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —he will be asking for Metro services to his ward one day. I think one day he will be asking, he’ll flip the switch and he’ll be asking that. But in the end, I think it’s one of those services that will speak for itself. When people experience it, they will want more of it, they will want more services to more places, more often. In the contrary, we’ve had Labor suggesting that somehow we’ve ordered too many Metro vehicles.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: We’ve just heard the interjection, Councillor COLLIER said we have. I’ll put that on the record, Councillor COLLIER thinks we’ve ordered too many Metro vehicles. It is just quite extraordinary that the Labor Opposition can continue to oppose the most revolutionary public transport project that this city has ever seen. The most game changing project that this city has ever seen.

Deputy Chair: LORD MAYOR, your time has expired.

 That ends Question Time.

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

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

### ESTABLISHMENT AND COORDINATION COMMITTEE (Adoption report)

The Right Honourable, the LORD MAYOR (Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER), Chair of the Establishment and Coordination Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Andrew WINES, that the report setting out the *recommendations* of the Establishment and Coordination Committee during the Winter Recess 2024, on matters usually considered by that Committee, be adopted.

Deputy Chair: LORD MAYOR.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

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

|  |
| --- |
| At that time, Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON rose and requested that Clause C, AMENDMENT TO *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014* – AMENDMENT PACKAGE Q; Clause D, MINOR AMENDMENT TO *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014* – MINOR AMENDMENT PACKAGE R; and Clause E, MINOR AND ADMINISTRATIVE AMENDMENTS TO *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014* – MINOR AMENDMENT PACKAGE S, be taken seriatim *en bloc* for debating and voting purposes. |

**Seriatim *en bloc* for debate and voting - Clauses A, B and F**

|  |
| --- |
| At that time, Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON rose and requested that Clause A, STORES BOARD SUBMISSION – SIGNIFICANT CONTRACTING PLAN FOR LANDSCAPE CONSTRUCTION AND ASSOCIATED SERVICES; Clause B, CONTRACTS AND TENDERING – REPORT OF CONTRACTS ACCEPTED BY DELEGATES OF COUNCIL FOR MAY 2024; and Clause F, REPORT OF THE AUDIT COMMITTEE MEETING ON 6 JUNE 2024, be taken seriatim *en bloc* for debating and voting purposes. |

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

|  |
| --- |
| At that time, Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON rose and requested that Clause G, MEETINGS AMENDING LOCAL LAW 2024, be taken seriatim for debating and voting purposes. |

Chair: Debate on A, B, F, yes.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Sorry, point of order. Just to be clear, all for debate and voting seriatim, thank you.

Deputy Chair: Yes and now we are going to debate on A, B, F.

 LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair. Before I move on to the items in front of us, I wanted to deal with the extraordinary scenes we’ve seen in Council today. Every time there’s a recess of Council, I think that the Opposition will come back with a renewed vigour and a different strategy. Every time I’m disappointed that they double down on the same failed strategy.

*At that time, 1.49pm, the Chair, Councillor Sandy LANDERS, assumed the Chair.*

LORD MAYOR: But what we’ve seen though is something that’s quite new that has—it’s quite alarming, because I think reading into their actions, they think that the State Labor Government is going to lose the election. It’s quite obvious, because in recent times we have seen the Leader of the Opposition and the Opposition Councillors disagreeing quite openly with their own Premier.

 A few weeks ago, the Labor Premier, Steven Miles, when he signed the new deal for public transport in Brisbane, said it’s a good deal for Brisbane and Councillor CASSIDY said it’s a dud deal for Brisbane, disagreeing blatantly and openly with his State Leader, with his State Premier. We see examples raised in this meeting, where Labor criticised the Kurilpa TLPI. This is the TLPI personally introduced by Steven Miles, with the support of his government, to help respond to the housing crisis and Labor’s now criticising that. We’ve seen the State and Federal Labor Governments on board with Brisbane Metro and Labor Councillors continuing to criticise and attack Brisbane Metro.

 This is quite an extraordinary difference of strategy and approach, because in the past whatever they might think on something, they would always fall into line with their State Labor colleagues. We’ve seen that time and time again, where they would never criticise their State Labor colleagues and now Premier Steven Miles calls it a good deal for Brisbane—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —Councillor CASSIDY calls it a dud. Premier Steven Miles brings in a TLPI to support new housing supply in Kurilpa, the Labor Councillors criticise that. Premier Steven Miles and the Labor Party support Brisbane Metro and they’re excited about the opportunity to start running services in October and the Labor Councillors criticise that and call it just a bus. This is really quite interesting and I can only assume that they have given up at the State level.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor COLLIER, calling out across the Chamber is unsuitable meeting conduct. Please stop calling out.

 LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Madam Chair. Well Councillor COLLIER is asking me a question, but we’ve just been through Question Time and she didn’t ask that question. Time and time again, Labor Councillors ask other Councillors questions and not me. There was plenty of opportunity to ask that question—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor COLLIER, I’m cautioning you again.

LORD MAYOR: —but they didn’t and so this is called muddying the waters, Madam Chair, that’s exactly what it’s called. But I really am quite surprised by their strategy in attacking the things that their own State Labor Government and Federal Labor Government support, it is quite interesting.

 As I usually do, I want to talk about the lighting up of assets, as we support a whole range of activities happening in our community and particularly community causes as well. Last night, the Story Bridge was lit up blue, gold and maroon to support our Brisbane Lions women’s team for the launch of the 2024 AFLW women’s season. This week is National Stroke Week and tonight our assets will be lit up in blue and green to show our support for the Stroke Foundation’s annual awareness campaign. This week is also National Eosinophilic Week and on Wednesday and Thursday nights Brisbane City Hall and the Story Bridge and the Victoria Bridge will be lit up in pink and purple to shine a light on this disease, which affects the white blood cells. On Saturday our assets will be lit up in green and gold to support the Wallabies against the Springboks at Suncorp Stadium. On Sunday they’ll be lit up green to support—what’s green? Actually no, that’s the wrong question to ask. What’s coming next week?

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: The Ekka, that’s it. Councillor WINES, well done, so green to support the Ekka. That’s good green, good green. Today we announced the opening of our Safer Suburbs Grants and this is an opportunity for community groups on Council land to apply for funding of up to $10,000 each, for them to bolster their security. We know that many clubs are being impacted by theft and vandalism and this is our way of doing our part to support them. I was out with Councillor PARRY this morning at the Chermside Bowls Club and the Chermside Bowls Club earlier this year was robbed.

 They had money stolen directly from the till and with security, they had six‑year‑old security cameras, so quite old technology, but with that security system they had in place they were able to get footage of the offender, who was then later caught and put into the justice system. Whatever happened in the justice system I’m not sure, but certainly it enabled the police to catch the offender, identify the offender. Chermside Bowls Club is one of many organisations that is looking to the opportunity to upgrade their security further. That could involve newer, more high resolution security cameras. It could involve new locks, screening, improved patrol services and alarm systems, so there’s a range of opportunities there for people to take advantage of in our sports and community clubs.

 I touched on this earlier, but we had a great announcement from the Federal and State Governments on the SEQ Liveability Fund in the South East Queensland City Deal. As a result of our advocacy and—sorry, as our advocacy as part of the South East Queensland City Deal and our application, we were successful in getting $80 million in funding from the State and Federal Governments to put towards Victoria Park, which is a wonderful thing. Now we know that the Labor Party wants to cancel the Victoria Park project. We know that the Greens don’t support the Victoria Park project, but we do and now the State Labor Government does and now the Federal Labor Government does and it will be a wonderful, wonderful thing for the community.

 Together we’ll be investing $40 million three ways, $40 million from Council, $40 million from the State, $40 million from the Federal Government, to roll out our improvements in Victoria Park. This particular funding round will see a significant investment in projects that we’re aiming to complete by mid-2027, so we’re really excited to see that roll out. Thank you to Councillor DAVIS for her stewardship of the project and her passion and for making sure that the documentation we submitted for this was successful in being approved.

 We also had nearly—we had a whole range of Brisbane’s sporting and community clubs here in City Hall recently to celebrate the Lord Mayor’s Better Suburbs Grants program and the funding that has been received through that program since it was first launched, more than $7 million since 2021. Last month, we announced the distribution of another $400,000 to 50 different not-for-profit groups through the Lord Mayor’s Better Suburbs Grants.

 Also, we’ve had CityCat services commence from Howard Smith Wharves in recent times as well and they have been going gangbusters. There’s been an increase in patronage through that terminal of 500% compared to when it was just the KittyCats or the CityHopper. So, people really were demanding CityCat services and it’s been really successful and we’re happy to see that improvement.

 Now in terms of the different items, just confirming, Mr Chair, items A, B and F—sorry, Madam Chair—in the first package, is that right?

Chair: Yes.

LORD MAYOR: Yes, so item A is the SCP (Significant Contracting Plan) for landscape construction and associated services. This is our panel of suppliers that provide hard and soft landscaping services to supplement Council’s internal teams when required. Council typically uses this panel for planned work such as picnic nodes, retaining walls, park furniture and general horticultural activities. The expenditure is anticipated to be in the order of $130 million over the potential maximum eight‑year term. Once again, reflective of our significant investment in our parkland and greenspace network. The current panel of contractors will expire on 30 April next year and obviously we’re seeking to renew that panel.

 Item B is the contracts and tendering report for May 2024, 16 out of 17 contracts were awarded to local suppliers, being 94% of contracts. So far this year, 222 contracts have been awarded to local suppliers, being 87% of all contracts and a total spend of $1.5 billion with local suppliers.

Chair: LORD MAYOR, your time has expired.

**10/2024-25**

At that point, the LORD MAYOR was granted an extension of time on the motion of Councillor Fiona CUNNINGHAM, seconded by Councillor Steven TOOMEY.

Chair: LORD MAYOR. LORD MAYOR, can you put your microphone on, thank you.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you. We’ve ordered $1.5 billion worth of projects with local suppliers so far and that’s in line or exceeding our commitment to award 80% of all contracts to local suppliers. Contracts include pipe relining in Manning Street in Milton, it’s a stormwater drainage program. Packages 20, 21, 22 and 23 of the Voluntary Home Buy-Back scheme, as well as the renewal of multiple insurance policies protecting our CityCats, ferry terminals and public art, amongst other things.

 Just moving through to item F. F is the report of the Audit Committee held on 6 June. This Committee is responsible for reviewing and advising on Council’s internal and external financial reporting, including accounting policies. The scope of work for the performance and action of Council’s internal and external auditors. The identification, effectiveness and maintenance of controls and systems to safeguard operational risks, including its financial and physical resources. This Committee provides independent oversight of Council’s internal controls, a role which it does effectively and a role that we are grateful for. The Committee was briefed by the Acting CEO, the CFO, Chief Internal Auditor and the Chief Information Officer on a range of matters. As always, the Queensland Audit Office was represented at the meeting and provided an update and thanks to the Committee for their continued service.

Chair: Thank you, LORD MAYOR.

 Further speakers?

 Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thank you, Chair. I rise to speak on these three items and just ask that item—actually this is A, B and F? Yeah, that’s fine. Starting with A, the Stores Board submission and B, contracts and then Audit Committee, that’s right. I’m surprised at the LORD MAYOR’s performance, I have to say, during introducing his E&C report today. He only managed to speak about us for three or four minutes, I think. A bit lacklustre, I guess the part-time nature of his role now here in Brisbane has really kicked in. What we’re seeing before us today in these E&C reports, we’re debating A, B and F at the moment, is pretty light on, pretty light on. No E&C meetings in recess, Councillors away on holidays.

 A break is fair enough, that’s why there’s are Deputy Chairs of Committees to be able to attend E&C meetings when the Chair’s not around, but no, they just decided—this LORD MAYOR decided that he didn’t want to have any meetings with other LNP Councillors during recess in E&C and we’re seeing the results of that. There’s no extra recess items coming through here today and as we see with the contracts and tendering documents, which we’re debating from May, this is before, well before the end of the last financial year, this part-time Council has really just run out of puff.

 When it comes to Clause A, the contracting plan for landscape construction and associated services, I think most people would agree that live in Brisbane, one of the great things about the lifestyle nature and the outdoor nature of Brisbane and the amount of greenspace and parks that we do have and people value, is critical and it’s critical that Council performs its basic duty in maintaining those areas. We certainly welcome on this side work in that space, in the landscape construction and associated services space across the city. However, given this is ongoing work we know what projects are coming up, we know what parks need maintenance, we know what greenspaces need maintenance.

 We see even though there’s not enough money put into the budget each year for waterway maintenance, for instance, that happened in our wards. Councillor LANDERS in Bracken Ridge Ward and Deagon Ward, we know that it’s there, right? The LORD MAYOR allocates the $20,000 or $30,000 a year for each of those projects, so we know that work occurs each and every year, the sort of maintenance that’s required in our greenspaces and our parks. This is ongoing work that’s well planned out in advance, so we do have questions around why these contracts again need to be so large, why so much of this work needs to be contracted out.

 The papers before us today say that this work can be done in-house by Council workers, if the political leadership of this Council decided to do so and even decided to do the work of the comparison between what kind of outcome we would get from having secure in-house jobs here in Council that are nimble and able to be deployed where we need them, when we need them. Or contract this work out to the private enterprise, with certain set KPIs which largely don’t meet the expectations of the renters and residents—renters and ratepayers of Brisbane. We know that this can occur in-house, but what we also know is that the ideological position of this LNP Mayor and his regime here in Council is that they don’t like in-house work, they’ve made that very clear. It’s an increasing trend we see in these contracts.

 We know that Council can’t now provide—can’t now respond proactively when we have a natural disaster, as we heard Councillor CUNNINGHAM talk about that response—that dreadful response that this LNP Council had in the 2022 flood disaster. We know because there weren’t enough staff on hand to do that. The staff that would ordinarily have been on hand in the past were now contractors that couldn’t be called on at short notice to be able to perform that work. We know, as local Councillors, tree trimming jobs, for instance, a 90-day KPI which is often exceeded, that doesn’t meet the expectations of the ratepayers and renters of Brisbane. So it’s no wonder we’re seeing—we’re not seeing work done efficiently across Brisbane. We see that with broken footpaths, the damaged playgrounds, other repair items remaining outstanding. What we also know is that this—we don’t just say this is an increase—

 We’re back on? Over the last four years, $200 million has been spent on consultants, external providers, contractors to Council doing basic ongoing work and $400 million has been spent on labour hire workers performing ongoing work. That can’t be good for—I mean it’s great for people who own these businesses, obviously they’re making a significant profit out of it. Part of the economy, sure, but is it great value for money for those people that otherwise would have a secure and stable job? Is it great value for money for the people of Brisbane? We don’t know. We say it would be having an in-house workforce. The LNP say it wouldn’t, they like a contracted out workforce.

 But this LORD MAYOR and his LNP Civic Cabinet are the ones that have the ability to do the numbers on that. They can make that assessment and they continue to refuse to do that because of their ideological position of contracting work out. That’s 20% of Council’s ongoing funding for ongoing work now is going into external contracts. The growing nature of contracts like this one before us today is going to add to that. It’s pretty clear, it’s pretty clear through this contract that this LNP Council is not interested in protecting internal staff positions and secure jobs, instead they’re spending millions to outsource this as part of their plan.

 So the renters and ratepayers ultimately will pay more, they will pay more because we have to pay not only for these contracts but then for contract management, which inevitably becomes external contract management. More contractors brought into Council to manage external contracts, so they’re paying more but they’re getting less in the suburbs. KPIs are blowing out, jobs are left by the wayside, so they’re not good deals for the people of Brisbane.

 They’re certainly in the short term—I understand why the LORD MAYOR and Councillor CUNNINGHAM like to shuffle numbers around and change the way budgets are presented and where things show up, because on their watch Brisbane is going broke. We understand that they want to do that, but in the long term for the next generation of people who want to work here, who want to live here, who want to enjoy our amazing spaces, it’s going to be bad news for them.

 On contracts and tendering, Clause B, as I said just before, very surprised at the lack of contracts that Council’s entered into as of May. You would have expected to see a lot of evidence that the—of the work that the LORD MAYOR and his part-time Council would have done over recess. We would have had some contracts and tendering reports from June and July coming through to Council surely. No, not when you find out that E&C didn’t meet during the Council recess. So how is it that in August, August, Councillors aren’t privy to the contracts and the work that is being entered into, using the money of the ratepayers and renters of Brisbane, since May? May.

 We’ve been critical, I just have a minute ago, of the level of contracting out versus the level of in-house service delivery, but we would at least like to know what things are being contracted out in a timely manner. Now what’s in this contract and tendering report before us today outlines two projects and some other service delivery things around insurance providers and other stuff that Council’s doing. But two projects, that’s all it is, a pipe relining and a playground and not a particularly big playground, it’s $200,000. I assume that might be a SEF (Suburban Enhancement Fund) and one pipeline relining project.

 So things must be pretty dire, things must be very dire in Council if this Administration can only manage to carry out two projects in the month of May, at the end of the last financial year. We know things were dire, we saw the LORD MAYOR cut $400 million from expenditure, then pretend it never really happened. But the evidence continues to roll out to show that people are definitely paying more in their rates but getting less, given in the month of May only two projects, two contracts, were entered into to deliver projects. Of all the playgrounds that are broken and busted and closed off, of all of the pipes that need to be relined, need to be replaced, need to be upgraded, need to be built, just one in the month of May this year, just one.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: Councillor COLLIER, yes, a playground’s been shut for an entire year, an entire year and in the contracts and tendering report there’s just one contract for a new playground. That’s not good value for money for the people of Brisbane.

 On the Audit Committee report, we remain concerned about how these discussions and decisions are presented to Councillors who are ultimately responsible for good governance here in Brisbane. The purpose of the Committee is to ensure that Council is operating in a regulated way, so it must provide adequate and transparent advice to Councillors. We support the work that those members of the Audit Committee do, but we would just love to know what it is, what are they discussing, what decisions they’re making and what Council, this Administration, is doing in response to those things and again it’s not good enough.

Chair: Further speakers?

 Councillor HUTTON.

Councillor HUTTON: Thank you, Chair. I rise to speak in support of item A, the significant contracting plan seeking approval for a public tender to establish a panel of suppliers for landscape construction and associated services. We just heard Councillor CASSIDY criticise our team in regards to item B for not bringing enough contracts through and then criticising us for contracting out items in item A. So I’m just a little bit confused about what he is actually wanting us to do. We have got this contract before us in item A with specialist services. This is not something within our teams, they cannot—I just hear all this chatter across the room, Councillor.

Chair: Thank you, Councillors, if you have a private conversation please step outside so that Councillor HUTTON can be heard. Thank you.

 Councillor HUTTON.

Councillor HUTTON: Thank you, Chair, but what I did want to say is one thing that we can agree on with Councillor CASSIDY is that in item A it is critical work. But the critical work that we have on offer here is not skills that we have within our current teams. As we understand, Brisbane is Australia’s lifestyle capital and our record of enhancing and maintaining our park assets has shaped our vibrant and accessible landscapes. Team Schrinner is committed to making Brisbane’s lifestyle even better and we know that through our landscaping assets, whether it be garden beds in a park or a much loved DOLA (dog off-leash area) in your community, are vital to provide spaces for recreation, relaxation and for residents to connect with nature.

 This panel arrangement complements our internal workforce, supplementing Council’s capacity when required, particularly with specialist services associated with both soft and hard landscapes. The services required under this contract are diverse, including hard landscaping elements like shelters, paths and street furniture, as well as soft landscaping activities such as the establishment of garden beds or horticultural work. For instance, the construction of the dog off-leash area in Carawa Street, St Lucia, included the installation of a shelter with associated furniture, exemplifies the type of projects delivered under this arrangement. Or the upgrade of the wood barbecue to an electric cooktop at Cawonga Park in Oxley was successfully completed through this panel.

 The current contract is set to expire in April 2025, requiring the establishment of a new arrangement to ensure the continuity of these services. This significant contract plan introduces a more structured and efficient procurement process by consolidating the original four categories into two, Category 1 for landscaping construction and Category 2 for fencing and fence repairs. Category 1 will cover a wide range of landscape construction projects, varying in size and scope. The site specific requirements will impact cost drivers with competitive quoting from a panel of suppliers, ensuring cost efficient solutions. Category 2 will focus on fencing and fence repairs, with price based on a lump sum and a schedule of rates for commonly required services.

 This approach will enable us to manage high volumes of low-value engagements efficiently, improving cost outcomes and productivity. This streamlining will enhance our ability to attract high-quality suppliers and reduce contract management costs. It’s also important to note that this contract also explores the opportunity to reduce construction waste and reuse materials where appropriate. By streamlining our categories, optimising supplier engagement, prioritising efficiencies and environmental sustainability, this contract will ensure the delivery of high-quality, cost-effective services to the residents of Brisbane. I support our vision for a vibrant, accessible and sustainable city, providing the community with well managed and attractive open spaces. I commend this item to the Chamber.

Chair: Further speakers?

 Councillor COLLIER.

Councillor COLLIER: Yes, thanks very much, Chair. I just would love to bring the relevant Civic Cabinet Chair’s attention to point nine in the E&C report, could Council businesses provide the services/works? Yes, and it adds Council does not have the capacity to provide these goods and services.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor COLLIER: I wonder why. I wonder if any of that has anything to do with the LNP’s absolute obsession, obsession with contracting out the entire Council workforce.

Chair: Further speakers?

 Councillor ATWOOD.

Councillor ATWOOD: Thank you, Madam Chair. Today I’m excited to rise to speak on item B in the E&C report, the contract for the Amberjack Street playground in Manly West. Last year we wrote out to residents to see what they loved about their park and what vision they could see as part of a park upgrade. We received 53 responses from local residents and it was lovely to hear what they loved. They told me the park has beautiful trees and wildlife and you can access it from many different street frontages. Lots of space and it feels safe due to being away from the busy main intersection and it has large green open space with lots of shady trees. One of the common themes that residents didn’t like was that balls would roll on to the street, as the open space has like a bit of a hill with the road there.

 So I’m really grateful to our—every resident for having their say, which helped inform our design. I’m grateful to my outcome manager, Shannon Clarke and to Council’s procurement team for delivering a terrific outcome for the Manly West residents. The gorgeous new playground will maintain all of the things that the residents love, the trees, the large open space and will fix the tired old playground and install a fence along the bottom of the hill to prevent balls and children going near the road. Works are starting next Monday, 12 August and will take roughly two-to-three months to complete. I can’t wait to celebrate the opening of this new playground with the residents with a little party. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Chair: Further speakers?

 Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, thank you. I rise to speak on items A, B and possibly F. I’d like to start with item A, the Stores Board submission for landscape construction. It’s interesting to me that there are now two Civic Cabinet Chairmen who don’t really understand what a contract is versus what outsourcing a contract is. But it is very concerning that the person in charge of $130 million of Council expenditure does not recognise that this is a skill set that a service delivery organisation like Brisbane City Council should have. The single worst thing I had thought this LNP Administration had done was City Plan 2014, but that actually comes second to what this LORD MAYOR has done specifically under his leadership in the last couple of years and that is to turn Brisbane City Council into a management organisation, not a service delivery organisation.

 We can see that here again today in this decision to increase the outsourcing of basic Council services, like planting flowers in a garden, installing seats. It might be some big projects that we can’t do, specialised playgrounds, I completely get that and Council does need to enter into contracts and seek expert guidance with respect to delivering Council services from time to time. But the problem is this LORD MAYOR has cut and slashed the skills and experience of Brisbane City Council to the point where there are no parks’ officers for particular areas of Council. There is no one responsible. There’s a secret person somewhere in NEWS (Natural Environment, Water and Sustainability) who is making this decision about what to do in a park. There is someone up there who won’t speak to you, is unaccountable, is not allowed to engage with you.

 There are people like that who are making decisions, but where this Council used to have local Council officers who were invested in caring for the communities they represented in looking after public and open space, in looking after community facilities, they are all gone. Every single last one of them, they no longer exist. What have we got instead? An organisation that now cannot trim a tree in the space of a year, can’t fix a footpath in the space of a year. It can take months and months and months and months to get sign-off on basic approvals, we don’t know if we’re getting value for money. I’m interested in what Councillor HUTTON said, referring to the Cawonga Park project, a small shelter and a barbecue cost $100,000. Now I don’t know if that is actually—yes, $100,000.

 Yes, Councillor STRUNK, I see your incredulation, $100,000. It is extraordinary, you know, putting in a barbecue and a four-by-four picnic shelter and a seat, that’s what it cost, all because it was outsourced. Now we used to have Council officers who would do this, they used to have apprentices who would learn their skills and their trade and come through. We used to have staff in Council who could deliver for local communities. They lived in the community, they worked for the community, they took pride in the work that they did. But instead, this Council has out-skilled, outsourced the basic work of Council, which is delivering for parks and local areas.

 Now we heard Councillor HUTTON’s explanation, these are not skills in our current Council. That is because they have been systematically destroyed by the LORD MAYOR, Adrian Schrinner. The outsourcing we’re doing here is not to supplement Council’s work, it is to replace it. It is to replace the hard work of Council officers who have worked in this organisation for a long time, who are leaving this organisation in droves. They are running out the door. They started working on a park and now they’re in an office, trying to give you an outcome for something that somebody in their own organisation won’t tell them what the answer is. That’s what these poor Council officers are doing every single day.

 Now I just want to just make a few comments, particularly about the strategy behind this. This is what it says on page 3, which Councillor HUTTON referred to as well. Council is going to amalgamate four categories into two, so this means that we’re going to have two panels, not four. I suspect there will end up being less subcontractors on these panels and that means that there are going to be less organisations, with less diversity, who are able to fulfil the services that Council requires in doing this everyday work. Yes, they will charge more, less competition is never a good thing. Heard Rod Sims this morning talking about that. But that’s what this Council is entrenching in its strategy, less competition.

 The other thing that this does, and it was brought home starkly by the storms in December, we don’t have enough contractors at key times to deliver the work. Let alone in-house staff, we definitely don’t have in-house staff in enough numbers to help in times of crisis. We definitely do not have enough contractors in times of emergency and that was the excuse for why the storm in December took so long to clean up, because other councils in other areas also had shortages of workforces. So instead of investing in building the skills, the resources and the capacity of this organisation to address the needs of our city, this LORD MAYOR is not only outsourcing that—and Councillor WINES, it’s a big word but go with me—Council is outsourcing that and they are then reducing or cutting the—they are reducing or cutting the categories and the number of potential suppliers on the panel.

 Does anybody think that’s a good thing? I don’t. I know that this is another loop in the downward spiral that this LORD MAYOR has set Brisbane City Council on and that is to destroy the service delivery function of Brisbane City Council and you can see it every single day. The LORD MAYOR may be proud of the $40 million he’s going to invest in Victoria Park, I’d just like the children’s playground that’s broken at the end of my street to be fixed. I’d like it not to take a year. That’s what we’re experiencing out there and meanwhile we’re going to have to wait. We’ll have to wait until someone goes through a tender process without competition or with little competition. Then maybe there’ll be a contractor and it will take even longer because as we say here, they’re going to, and I quote, bundle up the jobs. Now we’ve seen this in response to the floods. What does bundling up the jobs do?

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: Delay, it delays. So not only will we have to wait longer. So it might be that Councillor COLLIER’s park was damaged a year ago and my park was damaged last week. She has to wait until there’s enough in the bundle for a quote to be sought and we’re not being responsive in respect to the work.

 So I don’t think this Council’s got its approach to managing the resources of this city right. I do not support what the LORD MAYOR is doing. Cutting, rationalising, amalgamating and aggregating are all words that undermine the integrity, efficiency of service delivery in this city. They’re not leading to better outcomes. If you could stand up, hand on heart, and say look, things are getting better out there in the suburbs. We’re more responsive, we’re being quicker, we’re getting things done better, the quality of the jobs is better. Maybe there’d be a little bit of an argument to say yes, this is working.

 But that’s not what’s happening on the ground. Things are taking longer, without question. The follow ups that my staff and other staff have to do because things aren’t being done properly. No one’s checking that the grass is actually mowed where it’s supposed to be, no one’s checking that the work’s actually done. This is where this LORD MAYOR has let people down. So there’s more outsourcing coming, which will have a knock on impact to worse outcomes for residents.

 I do just want to speak very briefly about the contracts. I agree with the Councillor for Deagon. I think that there is a problem with Council failing to bring forward the reports of the contracts in a timely way. It is a statutory requirement and June should be here today, without question. So there is a serious problem with what this LORD MAYOR is doing.

 That is because for the last seven weeks he’s been on holidays. He gets paid an extra $100,000 a year and all the Chairs get extra money. But they’re not meeting, they’ve been on holidays. E&C has not been meeting, Council has not—well, we met once and that was botched. So what are they doing? They’re taking all this money and not doing their jobs, it’s pretty clear.

 I will just say that it is unfortunate because the demolition packages for the Voluntary Home Buy-Back schemes, according to Council officers, are six to eight‑months delayed. Six to eight months delayed. Out in my community there are fences up around properties—

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, your time has expired.

Councillor JOHNSTON: —and they’re not getting help with.

Chair: Are there any further speakers?

 Councillor CUNNINGHAM.

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: Thanks, Madam Chair. I rise to speak just briefly on item F. A considerable amount of work is done behind the scenes by our independent Audit Committee to ensure there is effective management of this Council, on behalf of the ratepayers of Brisbane. The Audit Committee though, Madam Chair, is an advisory committee of Council, bound and established pursuant to the *City of Brisbane Act 2010* and the *City of Brisbane Regulation 2012*. The Audit Committee operates independently and free from any political interference or presence of Councillors.

 One of the functions of the Committee is to consider the continuous improvement of Council systems, processes and controls. The current Audit Committee members were appointed by way of an independent, external recruitment process. There are currently three independent Audit Committee members, including the Audit Committee Chair. There’s nothing secretive about these meetings, like the Opposition suggests. The Committee enforces accountability, every action is identified and it has a clear outcome or process as well as dates, which are mentioned in the report and monitored.

 In reference specifically to Councillor CASSIDY’s comments, you can see from the minutes, representatives from the Queensland Audit Office are always in attendance at the meetings. This is to ensure that the requirements are being enforced and adhered to, as well as to make certain that preparation is occurring for the end of financial year. I don’t know about you, Madam Chair, but personally I couldn’t think of anyone more qualified to observe the workings of the Brisbane City Council Audit Committee than the Queensland Government’s Audit Office.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: I would like to offer my sincere thanks to the Committee for the work they do and for wearing the black hat and provide ongoing assistance to Council to make sure that we get the best outcome for our residents and our ratepayers. I commend the report to the Chamber.

Chair: Further speakers?

 Councillor MASSEY.

Councillor MASSEY: Thank you, Chair. I rise to speak briefly, I will try to be brief, on items A and B. Firstly on item A, the landscape contract associated service. We can see that in this contract Council acknowledges how important this is. Because Council has a responsibility to construct, maintain, make sure that it’s accessible, it’s sustainable, the landscapes that we have across Brisbane. The landscapes that we’re talking about across Brisbane aren’t just the open spaces, they’re the greenspaces also.

 For us in Brisbane, that means over 200 parks, natural areas. We’re talking about median strips, road verges, verges with the houses, suburban villages and any other type of Council land that might actually have open space or greenspace attached to it. For The Gabba Ward, this stuff is really important and the reason it’s really important is because we are under serviced in this area. Our landscapes and our greenspace has become really important to us, especially recently with the density increase.

 What is interesting about item A, of course, as many other Councillors have raised, is the fact that in the paper itself, Council admits in the document, that Council business can provide these services. So as through you, Chair, Councillor HUTTON said—quoted saying that we don’t have these skills at the moment. Well this is an opportunity. Would this not be an opportunity to increase the skills and the diversity of skills within our workforce?

 Noting that Brisbane City Council is not a corporation, as much as the LORD MAYOR and, through you, Chair, and the LNP Administration would like to transform it into. But is a service-based delivery organisation, where the major revenue is from ratepayers. These are the same ratepayers, of course, that use our parks, that use our natural areas, that enjoy our suburban village and our verges.

 I know my experience since the cuts of 2023. You know any time we’ve had an opportunity to see if we can have increased planting on verges, if there is a widening of footpath or any opportunity within our greenspaces to enhance this, we’ve received a firm, we’ll check but probably not. This is not to say that the amazing work of these officers in these spaces that do work really hard for Councillors. I know the operational manager that works with The Gabba Ward and myself does an incredible job.

 However, we know that we can’t get these things in because of the increasing maintenance cost. This increasing maintenance cost, of course, comes with the balance of the fact that we are contracting everything. This in itself is moving towards major contracts. Here in this documents itself, it talks about the major risks and this is something really important to note. There are four risks, two medium, two low. Interestingly, it is Council that takes on three of the four risks itself. With the quality of service being the medium risk rating. That is literally the requirement of materials, designs, delivery time to be specified in the scope of work to meet relevant standards.

 Already we are seeing delays. When we batch, we know we will see more delays. We know that this future contract is ending, here is an opportunity to work with Council to deliver diversified skills. So we can be more efficient in what is a grassroots delivery and a core of our delivery. Instead we are contracting and batching and to the cost of nearly—if it goes to eight years it will be $130 million. Which is a major contract.

 That in itself is a challenge. What I’m saying here is yes, we do have to contract, I think we can all acknowledge that, there’s work to be done. But there are opportunities. I just want to flag also, very quickly that we know where contracting goes. Because when we got the 10% cut in 2023, what were the first jobs lost in Council?

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor MASSEY: It was frontline workers, it was contract workers doing the maintenance in our greenspaces and our roads. Here we are going into the same pattern again. We’re literally going into the same pattern again. I hope I don’t talk off cuff but I expect any Council meeting now will receive another cut to a budget that we just passed seven weeks ago. I wouldn’t be surprised. I think I’ll finish there on A.

 I think there’s a lot of work to go, I’ve got a lot of questions on how we could have considered this differently or what it would actually take to deliver services efficiently in Council. Because we know—and it’s not just me and it’s not just the Opposition Councillors. I’m sure that Councillors from across the way also have multiple projects that sit there, that residents contact them constantly, that we should be able to do internally. I don’t think it’s just us but it is us just speaking.

 I’ll speak very briefly to contracts and tendering report, item B. In The Gabba Ward, we have various projects that are still waiting for some sort of contract. You know the Davies Park skatepark expansion is one of them. There’s other various things that are happening. I think it’s important to reiterate again that we are in August. We are in August and we, as Opposition Councillors, who understand—like I understand the importance of these contracts. That’s why I talked about item A, how important contracting is and that we get it right. To make sure we have delivery for our communities.

 It is incredibly shocking that we are in August and we are not seeing the continuation of other contracts that potentially should have been delivered in June and July. I’m hopeful that we’ll see these contracts. I’m hopeful that the work of Council will continue. I’m hopefully delays to contracts in June, July aren’t connected to my unverified suspicions about budget cuts that might be coming for the 2024-25.

 I am hopeful that we will continue to see more contracts and tendering. So not only will playgrounds, through you, Chair, in Councillor ATWOOD’s ward be fixed. But other playgrounds in Councillor JOHNSTON’s, in Councillor Lucy COLLIER’s. Not just playgrounds also—but you know the buy-backs for the voluntary land buy-backs and various other things.

 We know that there are programs—projects that are coming that are really important that should have contracts and tendering and I hope to see many of those. Because what I wouldn’t like to see is the continuation of contracts not coming through because we are a couple of weeks on the verge of cutting these projects. Thank you, Chair.

Chair: Further speakers? No further speakers.

 LORD MAYOR?

 We’ll now put item A, B and F to the vote.

**Clauses A, B and F put**

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

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

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 16 - The Right Honourable, the LORD MAYOR, Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER, and Councillors Greg ADERMANN, Adam ALLAN, Lisa ATWOOD, Fiona CUNNINGHAM, Tracy DAVIS, Alex GIVNEY, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Sarah HUTTON, Sandy LANDERS, Kim MARX, Danita PARRY, Steven TOOMEY, Andrew WINES and Penny WOLFF.

ABSTENTIONS: 7 - The Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Jared CASSIDY, and Councillors Lucy COLLIER, Emily KIM, Charles STRUNK, Seal CHONG WAH, Trina MASSEY and Nicole JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

**11/2024-25**

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

Chair: All those in favour—oh sorry. Yes, sorry, Councillor JOHNSTON, you have three minutes.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, thank you. I’m rising today to seek Council’s support to move an urgent motion. That motion would be that Brisbane City Council urgently takes all steps necessary to protect the significant native vegetation, including magnificent Hoop pines, from removal at 85A, 85 Bank Road and 19 Bell Terrace, Graceville. It came to my attention late yesterday that there is a problem with the development application that’s been submitted for the retirement village and nursing home proposal in Graceville.

 Residents have advised me that the State Government has not approved removal of the trees on the block, which include 124 significant and 100 year old trees, 75% of which are slated for removal under the proposed demolition currently with Council. Now, the DA, as submitted to Brisbane City Council, states that they have approved State Government exemptions for the removal of all vegetation on the site.

 So either the State has got it wrong or Council has got it wrong. But either way, currently there are 124 magnificent trees, magnificent trees, providing wildlife with homes, shade, just—they are huge, there are 12 huge, 130-year-old Hoop pines that this developer wants to remove from this site. So there is a problem here. Whether or not the State has approved this or whether or not Council is aware of the approval. I am, after checking the residents’ advice, clear that it does not appear the State exemptions are part of the development application documentation submitted to Council.

 So it is urgent that we protect these trees. They are listed in an area of significance, this is a riverside site in Graceville. It is incredibly urgent that Brisbane City Council takes all steps necessary to protect this significant vegetation on this site. I urge all Councillors to suspend standing orders so we can debate this motion now.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor JOHNSTON.

 We will now put the motion to the vote.

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

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

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 7 - The Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Jared CASSIDY, and Councillors Lucy COLLIER, Emily KIM, Charles STRUNK, Seal CHONG WAH, Trina MASSEY and Nicole JOHNSTON.

NOES: 15 - The Right Honourable, the LORD MAYOR, Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER, and Councillors Greg ADERMANN, Adam ALLAN, Lisa ATWOOD, Fiona CUNNINGHAM, Tracy DAVIS, Alex GIVNEY, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Sandy LANDERS, Kim MARX, Danita PARRY, Steven TOOMEY, Andrew WINES and Penny WOLFF.

Chair: We will now move to items C, D and E.

 LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Madam Chair. These three items are planning scheme amendments. Before I deal with them specifically, I wanted to make some comments in relation to Labor’s line of questioning this afternoon in Question Time about the new housing. So the team, together with the Greens, the coalition of chaos, that has spent their entire time in public life opposing new housing, have a new found interest in housing.

 What’s quite extraordinary is that they have spent their entire political capital trying to suggest that somehow our Administration is too pro-development. We’re too pro-development, we’re too pro-building. That’s the claim that they have been making. On a dime they’ve switched to say we’re not doing enough to support development and housing. Once again, an extraordinary turn of events.

 So we know, we know what the Labor Party’s record is on housing and that is opposing over 80% of all new housing opportunities that have come to this Council. Through neighbourhood plans, through planning scheme amendments, through changes. They oppose almost all of it and now they say they care about housing. They’ve never cared about housing.

 The only way in which they’ve cared about housing is caring about opposing housing whenever it is proposed. That is their record and suddenly they’re trying to switch to being advocates of new homes. We know they are not, we know their record is clear. This Administration has been consistent, all the way through, in getting the balance right when it comes to planning for a growing city. Making sure that new growth happens in the right areas, with good infrastructure and that we provide opportunities for urban consolidation in areas where there’s great infrastructure and the ability to accommodate more homes.

 So we will continue to do that. We’re also being very clear in making sure that we protect low-density areas from inappropriate development. Why? Because that’s what the community wants. They understand that those inner city areas like Kurilpa, like we see in the city and Fortitude Valley and Newstead are appropriate to house more homes because they are close to facilities and infrastructure. Whereas we see the Labor-Green coalition of chaos opposing homes at every opportunity.

 They oppose homes in Kurilpa, the oppose homes wherever they are put forward in neighbourhood plans. Then they want to tell people that they care about new homes being built. As Councillor ADAM ALLAN pointed out, they’re also in the pockets of the unions, who are making it more costly and harder to build new homes as well. They have never said anything about that. They’ve never said anything about what that does to drive up the cost of new homes for people. Because they’re not interested in that. They’re just interested in playing politics and same with the Greens.

 Item C before us is some amendments we’re bringing through to make sure that building design in Brisbane reflects our subtropical climate. This is something that we’ve been very, very focused on as an Administration for many years. Because we acknowledge that Brisbane is not the same as Sydney or Melbourne, it’s not the same as other cities around the world that have different climates. We have a subtropical climate here and it’s appropriate that building design is designed for a subtropical climate.

 So these planning scheme changes are all about making sure that we translate our Buildings that Breathe design guide into the City Plan. So this provides further information and guidance on how subtropical design outcomes expressed in the Buildings that Breathe guide are sought by the City Plan and achieved. It also broadens the application of the subtropical design guidance, expressed by the Buildings that Breathe principles, to a wider range of building typologies.

 If supported, these amendments will become part of the City Plan effective from 13 September 2024. So we’re to just about building more homes or supporting more homes being built. We’re also making sure that they are built in a way that is sustainable and appropriate for our subtropical climate as well.

 Item D is specifically related to the new homes that are coming on, or the new land that’s coming on to Council’s books from the Voluntary Home Buy-Back program. You’ll remember, Madam Chair, that Council led the way many years ago by introducing a Voluntary Home Buy-Back scheme. We then suggested that this needed to be supplemented by funding from the State and Federal Government. They agreed and they put a significant amount of funding into Voluntary Home Buy-Back.

 These properties then come into Council ownership and our job is to remove the homes, because obviously they’re not suitable for habitation, given their flood risk, and to make sure that they become part of our open space network in the city. So what this amendment does is it identifies 125 properties, or over 10 hectares of land, so this is a significant amount of land in total, that will become part of our open space network. So we’re re-zoning the properties to Open space to make sure that they become part of that great open space network that we have. So this rezones those properties.

 Item E is a minor administrative amendment to the City Plan, Package S. This aims to bring the planning scheme up to date with development approvals and other updates like our new subtropical design planning scheme policy I mentioned before. It also seeks to update 73 Brisbane standard drawings in the Infrastructure design planning scheme policy to provide consistency and align with industry best practice.

 The amendment also includes changes to 14 properties under the pre-1911 building overlay map to reflect development approvals. All of these properties are zoned for high density or higher density than a single dwelling house. In most cases, homes that are in—it’s effectively a pre-1911 home that’s on a high density or a higher density site. The planning scheme allows for the home to be relocated to another part of the city.

 So there’s some examples here where pre-1911 houses have been retained but relocated from one suburb to another within the City of Brisbane, which is obviously a possible outcome that they’re remaining part of Brisbane’s built environment, but obviously not standing in the way of more homes being built. So if this amendment is supported it will take effect from 13 September 2024. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Chair: Further speakers?

 Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks, Chair. I rise to speak on all three of these items before us today. Clause C, this amendment around amendment to Package Q around subtropical design. This report before us today details the responses to public consultations, submissions received during public consultation. The changes before us today convert the subtropical design outcomes of the *New World City Design Guide - Buildings that Breathe*, into the planning scheme policy itself. Then obviously package E is related to updating the planning scheme.

 The design, as reported here, is unique in that ventilation, climate control, natural landscapes and floor plans must suit human climates, or a human climate. Something that we support. Strange that in 2024 we’re having the discussion and debate around updating the planning scheme to reflect the fact that Brisbane is a subtropical city. Erring more and more towards tropical city conditions, particularly with the effects of climate change in the effects we’re seeing with increased rainfall in shorter periods of time, that areas in the tropics experience.

 So this is an important, important change to make, I think around the liveability of places that people call home and will call home for generations to come. Important to note that the subtropical planning scheme does not override requirements of other planning scheme policies, it’s in addition to. Something we support.

 I think we all probably have seen examples. Whether they are 1960s, late 1966 packs in the avenues of Sandgate, square brick buildings that face the wrong way, have little ventilation, very small outdoor balcony space, no planting, poorly located on the block. Or whether it’s more modern examples built to a price point and built using outdated and antiquated design principles that are not really very well designed for Brisbane and a modern Brisbane lifestyle and community that people want to live in.

 So yes, designing buildings and having buildings built for generations to come, certainly should reflect that. If they are standardised then they become more affordable to deliver, if that’s the product in which that should be delivered, is being delivered, across the board, across Brisbane. Rather than some of those examples being the exception, then being more expensive to construct, as compared to other styles of buildings. So we will support Clause C and Clause E, which I’ll come to in a moment.

 I’ll just talk briefly on Clause D, the amendment to Package R. There’s a few, as the LORD MAYOR said, re-zoning of properties. I believe one of those is— well might be not this package but certainly last package in Shorncliffe it was a house from Clayfield that was relocated to a block in Shorncliffe because someone was very passionate about retaining that building—that was no longer going to be retained in Clayfield is now in place on Friday Street. They’re very proud of having a pre-1911 home there.

 So in those certain circumstances, that is a good outcome for retaining that tin and timber in a suburb that is almost exclusively tin and timber and to be retained that way. The bulk of the properties that are being rezoned and changed, 134 properties across a number of suburbs, Ashgrove, Auchenflower, Bardon, Boondall, Carina, Clayfield, Corinda. East Brisbane, Fairfield, Graceville, Herston, Kenmore, Oxley, Red Hill, Rocklea, Sherwood, West End. Wilston, Windsor, Wynnum West, Yeerongpilly and Yeronga. From A to Y, not quite to Z, none in Zillmere this time.

 Obviously properties that were bought back under that scheme to ensure that people got a fair outcome for vacating their property. To be able to start their lives over again in somewhere that is free from the threat of constant and regular flooding which has been traumatic for a lot of people who had vacated these particular 134 properties and were supported through that State and Federal Government program.

 Clause E the minor administrative amendments to the planning scheme and the design planning scheme, which is primarily related to Clause C, the amendments around subtropical design principles. So actually putting them into the planning scheme itself and into the documents and those standardised drawings for those things. So that they are directly related so we’ll also be supporting that item before us here.

 I’ll add, that the last time these amendments came through to Council last year, Clause C and E, I made the point that in the midst of a housing crisis, to be discussing—what we should be discussing when it comes to planning scheme amendments. You would think we’d be doing this week-by-week, month‑by‑month, particularly given the importance, apparently, last year that the LNP Administration, the LORD MAYOR and Councillor ALLAN put on addressing Brisbane’s housing crisis through the new action plan. We would be discussing more urgent actions. Rather than just taking a business-as-usual approach.

 We’ll support these items today but they are very much a standard planning scheme change process. Yes, some things are tidying up certain things in terms of definitions and grammatical changes and points, subpoints being changed and the normal day to day process of changing the City Plan. This—today in August 2024 it’s just as important, if not more important than it was in November last year when we were discussing these things, to highlight the need of broader change. So by account there are 14 specific sites under consideration for precinct planning or zoning changes and a further 10 centres being investigated and considered for re‑zoning.

 What we’ve seen in the last year, since that was announced, is Stones Corner, as we heard from Councillor ALLAN. That’s it so far. So where is the urgency from this LNP Administration when it comes to those planning scheme changes. You know we just have to take the LORD MAYOR’s words for apparently how important it was 12 months ago when he said that the Supply Action Plan would see more homes sooner, fast tracking the delivery, the delivery, of thousands of new homes and improving housing affordability in Brisbane was apparently being delivered a year ago by this LORD MAYOR.

 By my account it’s getting worse. Rents are going up, house prices are going up. Supply is not meeting the demands of the community. The LORD MAYOR, 12 months ago, said that he had a big role to play in this space. Fast forward to today and we get Councillor ALLAN, the Chair of the City Planning Committee saying Council has almost no role to play in this space.

 So they say one thing when it’s politically important and another when they just couldn’t be bothered and today is a case of that. So that’s deeply disappointing that we see business-as-usual amendments coming to Council that take a long time to progress through. They’re good and important. But when we see the critical changes that we need to see and the discussion that the community needs to have, with their Council and their elected representatives, being put on the back burner, being done behind closed doors and inevitably don’t have the support of the community, that’s a bad outcome for Brisbane and our future.

Councillor GIVNEY: Point of order, Chair.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

|  |
| --- |
| **12/2024-25**At that time, 3.02pm, it was resolved on the motion of Councillor Alex GIVNEY, seconded by Councillor Greg ADERMANN, that the meeting adjourn for a period of 15 minutes, to commence only when all Councillors had vacated the Chamber and the doors had been locked.Council stood adjourned at 3.07pm. |

**UPON RESUMPTION:**

Chair: Further speakers?

 Councillor ALLAN.

Councillor ALLAN: Thank you, Madam Chair. I rise to speak on three items today, items C, D and E. These are the three City Plan amendment packages. As the LORD MAYOR stated earlier, amendment Package Q was the subtropical building design planning scheme policy, and this planning scheme policy seeks to translate the subtropical design elements, sub-elements and associated principles of the *New World City Design Guide - Buildings that Breathe* into City Plan. The Buildings that Breathe guide was first introduced in 2016 and the information included in the new planning scheme policy has been updated to reflect built form trends and to ensure the guidance provided is up to date with current development practices.

The guidance provided by the new planning scheme policy will encourage the subtropical design of buildings and outdoor spaces to be a core principle of development in Brisbane. This will clarify design expectations for applicants and provide Council with further detail to achieve climate-responsive design outcomes. The information provided in the new planning scheme policy can be applied to development being assessed against the subtropical design assessment benchmarks of key development codes. It is certainly not intended to place additional requirements on new development, and it does not require any additional documentation, other than what is already required under City Plan.

This does, however, encourage good design and it’s certainly one of the things that we’re wanting to see across the city in the building of both residential and commercial developments, that we get great design outcomes and that the Buildings that Breathe elements are incorporated where they make sense. I’ve been fortunate to visit a number of buildings where these principles have been delivered and it really does make quite a difference.

Moving on to item D, which is the minor amendment R, this is the second amendment to update the zone mapping and overlays with regards to properties purchased under the Voluntary Home Buy-Back program. As the LORD MAYOR has outlined, Council administers the Voluntary Home Buy-Back program within Brisbane on behalf of the State Government’s Queensland Reconstruction Authority. This responsibility includes facilitating the purchase, clearing or rehabilitation and change of zone of the sites identified. Despite the registration for the program commencing in May 2022, it was not until August last year that the State provided a streamlined process to undertake the necessary zoning changes to ensure the properties were retained as open greenspace.

This change, through the *Minister’s Guidelines and Rules*, enables this process to occur through a minor amendment process as we have before us today. Through this amendment, a further 125 properties have been identified and will now be rezoned to open space. Rezoning of properties and converting them to open space ensures the surrounding community has flood risk minimised, as well as delivering additional open space supporting local amenity.

Moving on to item E, minor amendment S, this is a minor and administrative amendment to reflect development approvals within the pre-1911 building overlay mapping, and also to update 73 Brisbane standard drawings. As the LORD MAYOR said, that includes changes to 14 properties under the pre-1911 building overlay mapping to reflect development approvals and other activity. Madam Chair, it should also be noted that, in the context of these impacted properties, most of them or all of them are actually zoned for a higher density than a single dwelling house, and the majority of the pre-1911 houses have been relocated to different sites within the Brisbane LGA (Local Government Area).

Further changes have also occurred due to private certifiers approving demolition prior to the overlay coming into effect. Now, I believe that with these amendments, we have struck the right balance between development and protection of the heritage. Whilst many of the pre-1911 houses have been retained, we have also sought to unlock the sites on which these houses sit in order to provide additional housing. The updates to the Brisbane standard drawings are occurring within the Infrastructure design and planning scheme policy to provide consistency and align with industry best practice and Council standards. The updates to the standard drawings are needed to reflect changes in standards, manufacturing of products, and to provide suppliers in the industry with timely notice to adapt business practices, to changing requirements and industry standards.

Madam Chair, these three amendment packages are examples of how Council is ensuring the City Plan is robust and resilient and reflects changes over time in line with community and industry expectations. I did want to comment quickly on the points that Councillor CASSIDY raised, specifically just the volume of amendments that are coming through the Chamber. Typically, the amendment process is quite arduous, depending on the type of amendment. Significant city plan amendments like neighbourhood plans are a long process. We go through that process and, more times than not, the Opposition Councillors oppose them. We heard from the LORD MAYOR earlier today that this is par for the course for them. So, it’s somewhat academic how much stuff we bring through the Chamber because they’re not going to support it, anyway. However, we—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Councillors.

Councillor ALLAN: However, what we are doing—

Chair: Councillor COLLIER, that is the third time this meeting that I have cautioned you.

Councillor ALLAN: However, what we are doing, and I touched upon it earlier, we have worked with the State to develop a streamlined process to support a number of our amendment processes. So, I’m hopeful that when these amendments start to come through this Chamber, that the Labor Opposition support our amendments. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Chair: Further speakers?

 Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, thank you. I rise to speak on items C, D and E. Firstly, can I start with respect to item C which is Package Q? This is a joke. Package Q, which is the amendments for sustainability in City Plan to the sustainability policies of City Plan 2014. This is essentially a lost opportunity for Brisbane City Council. Oh sorry, I’ll be speaking on all items, but I’ll start with item C. This is essentially a lost opportunity for Brisbane City Council to achieve real and meaningful change to the way in which development happens in our city. You can currently build houses, apartments that don’t include any sustainability measures. You can have huge apartment blocks built without water reticulation, without solar panels on the roof, not oriented north-south. Council approves units without cross-ventilation.

All of these things are happening every single day. So, there is both a policy failure under this Administration and a failure of the development assessment team to actually enforce good sustainability measures when they are approving new buildings in this city.

In addition to that, we see, of course, Council agreeing to the complete demolition of vegetation on blocks. We see Council agreeing to remove trees and we just saw earlier today the LNP refuse to support an urgent motion to protect trees where they are at risk from a developer knocking them all down. These are 130-year-old Hoop pines that are magnificent and form an important part of the Brisbane River corridor, as well as the suburb of Graceville’s environmental and cultural heritage, but this Administration is doing very little to protect trees on private property. Developers are given the green light and, in response, developers essentially say, we’ll plant some tube stock.

So, in go the little tubes, the tiny little trees that can’t replace 130-year-old trees. This is just a wet lettuce leaf. We’re not going to see real change here until we see change both at the state and Council level. That should be, without question, every single new home built in Queensland should include solar panels. It should include water tanks. In significant buildings where there is capacity, we should be looking at water reticulation, as well. Obviously, that’s more difficult and costly, but the amount of water that runs off huge buildings that have been built is contributing to localised flooding in communities right across Brisbane.

Where once we had grass around a house, we may now have a six-storey building or a 50-storey building, and we’re not seeing stormwater being managed in a way that is beneficial for our community. Instead, the 70-year-old stormwater pipes can’t cope with the runoff and it causes localised flooding. This is happening right around Brisbane, and if we put better sustainability requirements into our planning scheme, we would get better outcomes.

Now, of course, we hear all the complaints from the LNP. Oh, it’ll cost the developers too much. They can’t do it. Well, this is just not an excuse that washes anymore. Councillor CASSIDY mentioned it. Continuing to build the old six‑packs, the equivalent of the six-pack is being built today. It is the square five‑or‑six-storey unit block with very little vegetation, no cross-ventilation, no solar panels, no other—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: No deep planting, yes. Thank you, Councillor CHONG WAH. No deep planting, minimum landscaping requirements barely met. There are real problems with Council’s policy and I don’t think this goes far enough. It is both a combination of a weak policy and then the failure of Council to meaningfully hold developers to account when it comes to protecting environmental values and sustainability principles in this city. This Council likes to stand up and say it’s planted two million trees or it’s reached its 40% bushland cover, but every single day, we all know Council is knocking down hundreds, if not thousands of trees, or allowing others to knock them down. So, in my view, this is not the right policy.

I also want to speak on item Package R, which is the rezoning. Firstly, I would like to acknowledge that both the State and Federal Government have significantly contributed to enable buy-back in Tennyson Ward. There are many houses now that are either demolished or—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: —fenced up and to be demolished which have experienced severe flooding, right through from the 50s—a lot of these homes were there in the 50s. There were certainly a lot there in the 70s and that flood—but also 2011 and 2022. However—I’m happy that these are being rezoned for parkland uses—however Council’s creation of park jails in these suburbs in my ward—and there are 56 properties out of the 125 that are in Tennyson Ward. If you drive out into my ward and look at any of the flood buy-back streets—

Chair: Councillors. Councillors, if you are having conversations, can you please go outside?

 Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: If you drive out to any street in my ward where there’s been buy-back, it looks like park jail. Council has badly levelled the blocks and, in some cases, not properly levelled them. If we’ve had two or three buy-backs in a row, if one of the houses had filled and then built their house, that sits up higher than the block next to it which didn’t fill. So, it’s not like this can actually be usable open space, either. The bollards have gone in that make it look like park jail. These are bad outcomes for our community because the trauma that the residents have experienced in these areas is really significant.

Instead of getting something that looks like it’s part of the local neighbourhood and is part of the streetscape, what they’ve got is stark, uninviting and, in my view, looks like park jail. This Council is doing nothing about it, so it’s left to me. We are starting with the process of looking at how to revegetate these blocks along with OCCA (Oxley Creek Catchment Association) and our local bushcare groups, because this Council has essentially failed these residents. When I tell them, no, Council has created the parkland, they look at me with shock and say, but hang on, that’s not parkland. Now, I’ll also be adding, well, yes, there’s $120 million being spent on parkland at—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, at Victoria Park, but Brisbane City Council can’t invest any money in creating some decent parkland for you. So, we’ve still got bits of fences up in some places. We’ve got dodgy retaining walls left in some places. We’ve got—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: —yes, I know. They’re ignoring her ruling, but that’s fine. She’s not interested, either. It doesn’t matter. The rules don’t apply.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, the rules don’t apply. It’s fine. They’re the LNP. They can do whatever they want.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, yes.

Chair: Don’t refer to me as she, thank you.

Councillor JOHNSTON: I’m sorry, they? No? Do you prefer they?

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: No, I’m asking. I don’t want to be inappropriate.

Chair: Yes, and I don’t need to be debated.

Councillor JOHNSTON: I wasn’t—

Chair: I will caution you. That is one. Do you want to speak—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: I was—

Chair: Do you want to speak on this?

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, I do, but—

Chair: Great. Please do.

Councillor JOHNSTON: —Councillor WINES and Councillor ALLAN were continuing their discussion in the Chamber in contravention of your ruling.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor JOHNSTON. I am the Chair and it wasn’t at a high level that you could not be heard. We could hear you—

Councillor JOHNSTON: I know, but—

Chair: —loud and clear, thank you.

Councillor JOHNSTON: That’s good. Right. I’m just not sure what I was cautioned for. Can you just be clear? I’d just like to know so I don’t do it again. What was I cautioned for?

Chair: Unacceptable behaviour. Thank you.

Councillor JOHNSTON: What was unacceptable?

Chair: Again, Councillor JOHNSTON, that’s a second warning. I will not be debated.

Councillor JOHNSTON: I am simply asking you a question.

Chair: I will caution you—

Councillor JOHNSTON: Don’t know.

Chair: —that you are showing unsuitable meeting conduct. I can’t be any clearer than that. Thank you.

Councillor JOHNSTON: I would just like to know what the unsuitable meeting conduct is, please.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, debating the Chair and referring to the Chair inappropriately. Would you like to continue speaking? That is three cautions.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Are you serious? I didn’t refer to you inappropriately. This is a joke. Righto.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, your time has expired.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Further speakers?

 Councillor DAVIS.

Councillor DAVIS: Thank you, Madam Chair, and I rise to speak on item D, the proposed minor and administrative amendment to the City Plan. As we’ve heard, Madam Chair, this amendment is an important step towards ensuring we continue to deliver the Voluntary Home Buy-Back program, especially in the character suburbs of Brisbane. Our delivery of this program is well advanced, but it is a huge undertaking. In total, we’ve nearly 400 properties in the Brisbane LGA which have been identified by the state for voluntary buy-back, but Madam Chair, delivering a program of this scale has come with some challenges.

The tin-and-timber streetscape of Brisbane’s historic suburbs is something which is iconic to our city, perhaps as much as the river itself, but many of these older suburbs were developed long before we had a good understanding of flood risk in Brisbane, so sadly it’s not uncommon to see many of these suburbs heavily impacted during flood events. So, a great number of residents in these suburbs are putting their hands up for voluntary acquisition and we are committed to assisting them with keeping their lives and their livelihoods safe from floodwaters. Part of this is to break the cycle of flooding, house raising, and often redevelopment which leads to flooding again. This is achieved by clearing the properties we acquire under the program and transforming them into park and open space.

This supports the safety and security of these residents which have sold their homes to us, as well as improving the flood resilience of the entire neighbourhood. To achieve this, it’s necessary to remove some of the existing planning controls like the Traditional building character and Dwelling house character overlays which make it very challenging to remove pre-1946 homes from flood affected blocks. This is a challenge that we identified early on in the program because we know from experience it’s simply not practical to undertake individual development assessments for every property that is brought back. It’s a time-consuming process, and meanwhile, unsafe dwellings sit dilapidated on the residential block.

So, we’ve been advocating to the State Government for nearly a year to address this challenge with their program. What this has led to is a change to the *Minister’s Guidelines and Rules* so that we can make this amendment to the City Plan and, at the same time, rezone these properties as open space. This isn’t a decision that is taken lightly, and we are committed to protecting Brisbane’s suburban character, but we must strike a balance between improving flood resilience and protecting architectural heritage. For many of these homes, the features of Queenslander architecture allows them to be removed and relocated so that they can have a fresh lease of life somewhere else, and that is our preference to do so.

Of the dwellings so far that have been removed, more than a third of them have been able to be relocated and preserved. That’s a great outcome, not just for the preservation of our city’s history, but also to help avoid further pressure on housing stock during the current supply shortage. We are looking to preserve as much housing stock as possible through the way that we are delivering the program and we will continue to work to ensure that the homes are removed, retained where possible, and that the parkland is available to local residents for use. Thank you very much.

Chair: Any further speakers?

 LORD MAYOR?

 We’ll now put items C, D and E to the vote.

**Clauses C, D and E put**

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

Chair: We’ll now move to item G.

 LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Madam Chair. Item G is the Meetings Amending Local Law, otherwise known as the modernisation of the local law to generate or to bring in family-friendly hours and modern meeting practices in place at other levels of government. This reflects the amendments that the State Government made to their model meeting procedures, a set of rules which was updated in March this year and also needs to be reflected in our Meetings Local Law, but also to bring it in line with other State Government practices, such as their family-friendly hours. This is something that was adopted by the State Parliament back in 2018 with the support of the Labor Party and also the Greens.

It isn’t just about elected representatives like the Councillors that I’m referring to. It’s also those that are associated with either the running of the meeting, such as our fantastic clerks, also the many officers in Council who, as part of their role, are required to know exactly what’s going on in a Council meeting, and there are many of those. In fact, there are more than 70 Council staff who would fit that category. I know some Councillors often say, ‘for those listening along at home.’ Well, the majority of those are actually not at home most of the time. They’re Council officers, as part of their job keeping in touch with what’s going on in this place and the democratic forum that it is.

There are also, in terms of those listening along at home, some former Councillors. You know who you are. Stop watching. Give it up. Councillor McLachlan, former Councillor McLachlan, give it up. Councillor Bourke, give it up. There are some former Councillors watching, as well, and also some interested residents, too, but we’re grateful for the dedication of our staff and the Council employees who do support the work that we’re doing and make it part of their role to be up to date with exactly what is happening. Now, that changes from time to time, and so, for example, today we had various different submissions coming through. We’ve just talked about three submissions that relate to planning matters, and so you could imagine, the officers in that section will be paying attention very closely to what was said, so it varies, as well.

So, sometimes there are different Council officers listening to the meeting, as well as, we know, different residents and community members, as well. This also, I guess, reflects the situation that they are effectively on ratepayer funds here, doing their job, and if they’re listening to a Council meeting at 1am in the morning, you’d have to question whether that is the best use of ratepayer funds and Council officers’ time. Now, everyone will have a different opinion on that, but I think that in the main, people would question whether that is a good use of anyone’s time, staying in this place or listening online until 1am in the morning.

So, these new rules put reasonable limits on the E&C report and Committee reports, a maximum of three hours, which I think is ample time to say what needs to be said. After that time, all remaining items outstanding after the three hours will be put to a vote. That doesn’t include, obviously, Question Time, which is a separate section in itself, that the time limit is unchanged. Time limits for Councillors speaking will, in general, be for a maximum of five minutes, unless Council resolves to extend the time. So, that is the opportunity that is there if Council wishes.

Myself and the Leader of the Opposition will be excluded from the five-minute rule, and instead will have 10 minutes when speaking to the matters within the E&C report. Once again, that can be extended, and as you know, sometimes there is a call for that extension to occur. Also, we are—I’m struggling to think of a time when we have refused to extend the Leader of the Opposition’s time when he’s speaking on E&C. We are always happy to extend the Leader of the Opposition’s time if he wants to spend longer talking on the E&C report and we’ll continue that practice, as well.

In regard to notified motions, the ability for majority Councillors to lodge notices of motion has been removed. This is something that we have at the moment that we’re giving up. We obviously have the ability to put through submissions. Instead, we’re providing a dedicated opportunity for minority Councillors to debate notices of motion, and so these will be allocated on a pro rata basis between the different Opposition groups, just like in Question Time. Importantly, any notice of motion appearing on the agenda will be automatically removed after 30 calendar days from the day on which the notice was lodged, and this is a Queensland Parliament rule which we are adopting here.

Suspending standing orders by way of a motion will now be treated as a procedural motion. Again, another Queensland Parliament rule. Further, there is now a prohibition on points of order being raised during any debate, address or respond to a public address during the meeting. These changes will support a modern Council meeting practice, reflecting modern standards, and most importantly, reflecting what happens in the main up in the State Parliament. I commend this item to the Chamber.

Chair: Further speakers?

 Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks, Chair. I rise to speak on item G, the Meetings Amending Local Law that is back before us today. It’s no secret, obviously, Labor Councillors all spoke on this when it came through the last session. We were disappointed with these changes when they first came to light. The proposed changes, most of the proposed changes the LORD MAYOR has just outlined, will limit the ability to introduce notified motions, particularly for LNP Councillors who represent communities around Brisbane. The LORD MAYOR and his regime is limiting the ability of Councillors to raise important local issues, limit how long Councillors can speak during Council meetings, and limiting longstanding conventions of democratic debate here in Council.

I’ve seen in the submission that Councillor CUNNINGHAM put in to mop up some of the mistakes that the LNP made in their first round, some of the changes which had to be made—and I assume the Lord Mayor’s Office drafted that submission up and had Councillor CUNNINGHAM submit that. The term around longstanding and conventions and things like that are used when it’s convenient for the LNP to argue something, but when longstanding conventions which are not required by the model meeting procedures at the State Government level to be removed have been removed by the LNP, so they have picked and chosen things that they want to add or remove from the Meetings Local Law that were not required as a result of those changes for the model Meetings Local Law.

So, we know those changes, which the LORD MAYOR has outlined, the limiting the ability for local Councillors to raise local issues, limiting the ability for Councillors to speak in an open and robust political environment here in the Council Chamber, and limiting the time in which Council can discuss matters, were not recommended by anyone. They weren’t brought to Council’s attention by anyone. Another level of government did not say to Council, you should make changes to limit the ability for Councillors to speak. The LGAQ didn’t do that. This Administration wasn’t lobbied by anyone to bring those changes in. They were all cooked up in the E&C Committee, a Committee exclusively made up of LNP Councillors.

Brisbane’s Council, as we know, has always been different. It wasn’t as politically divided, I guess, in 1925, in terms of the party representation that we have today, but clearly, going back to the start, there were groups of Councillors who were associating with each other and forming Administrations and, eventually, Opposition. We are a politically divided Council. The Meetings Local Law, the fact that we have a separate City of Brisbane Act, all of that longstanding convention dictates that this Chamber is a place of robust political debate unlike any other council Chamber anywhere in Queensland.

The contest of ideas where we have an Administration—a government, essentially, that is fast turning into a regime here in Brisbane—and an Opposition and a crossbench suggests that we have to have rules which enable local Councillors from all sides to have robust political debate in an environment that allows that to happen, which has been the case for a very long time, until the LNP got sick of working.

So, we just heard from the LORD MAYOR that the reason which he wants to become a part-time LORD MAYOR and his LNP regime want to have all of the trappings of office, but only work part-time, is because a Council meeting went to 1am. Now, how many Council meetings, Chair—or through you, to the LORD MAYOR—in the last nine years, have gone to 1am? Anyone want to shout out—I’ll take an interjection—how many? It was two.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: Two. Yes, two, and one was in the last session and the other one was back way, way, way back. They’re the only two times that the Council meeting has gone to 1am.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: Yes. Well, certainly in the last nine years in which I’ve been a Councillor here in this place. When it last went to 1am, not the one in the last session, but when it last went, we didn’t see the LORD MAYOR jumping up and saying that that was a ridiculous situation and he cared about Council staff and he didn’t want them to suffer through a Council meeting that went past midnight, but it’s become politically expedient for this LORD MAYOR to want to bring these changes in now. He cited the Council clerks, of which I know some in the past—I’m not sure the employment arrangements of the current ones who are short-term contracts, of which this Administration would cancel and sack people at their own whim. They certainly didn’t care much about those Council Committee clerks when they got rid of them.

So, I don’t accept that argument from the LORD MAYOR that he is actually concerned about the employees here in Brisbane City Council. Instead of making cutbacks and shaving back staff budgets here and there in the Committee clerks’ area, maybe support them in the work they do and give them some more colleagues, so they can keep up with the workload, because God knows we need to be doing more as a Council. We need to be doing more as a Council to address the wicked problems that are facing Brisbane at the moment, the congestion crisis, the housing crisis, the cost-of-living crisis that this LORD MAYOR is imposing on people through his enormous rates increases on his time in office.

This Council needs to be doing a lot more work. When we started to introduce things to the Council Chamber like motions around housing and homelessness, motions around domestic violence and reproductive leave and basic maintenance contracts and local infrastructure upgrades, that’s at the point—that was at the point which this LORD MAYOR said, no, no more. He wants to be a part-time LORD MAYOR. He didn’t like that. He didn’t like that. I don’t know why he didn’t. He didn’t bother to stick around. As he said, he only stays for the good bits. I notice he—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: He did say that. He said he only stays for the good bits here in Council. He often gets up and leaves when the DEPUTY MAYOR speaks, but given she’s still away on the business-class trip today, he’s obviously stayed for more of the meeting.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: Strange, that. What we have before us here is a regime here in Brisbane now, and they’re fundamentally becoming that, using their majority to silence important debate here in the Council Chamber so there is less of a record for the decisions which they are making on behalf of the people of Brisbane. This LNP regime are more interested in themselves and their power and the exercise of their own power than discussing important issues. If we were under these new rules, four minutes ago, debate would have stopped on the E&C. This isn’t a particularly heavy workload. We’re talking—this is a post-recess meeting, so you would expect an awful lot. There really wasn’t much. There were three very simple, business‑as‑usual planning scheme amendments, one contract and some out‑of‑date contracts and tendering documents which hardly any LNP Councillors spoke on at all.

So, the debate would have stopped already, and that’s just the normal business of Council. We would have a situation in which Councillors who represent their communities would not be able to contribute to the debate. Our position is clear on this. These are bad changes to the Meetings Local Law. It’s going to limit what we do in the Chamber here, but that’s not really the important bit and that’s not really what we should be focusing on, because limiting our ability to do our jobs in here ultimately impacts the people that we represent. That’s the point here. The LNP Councillors in this Chamber don’t seem to really care about that. Maybe they do and they were told to shut up and keep their mouths shut and not pop their heads up during this debate and say, actually, they decided they actually wanted to raise local issues here in the Council Chamber, perhaps.

The LORD MAYOR has now said the only way for LNP Councillors to raise local issues in the Council Chamber here and get a vote on them is a submission through E&C. That’s what he just said before in his opening remarks. So, a local Councillor, an LNP backbencher, or even a Chair of a Committee, if you want an important local project or an important local issue raised in the Council Chamber, it has to come through E&C as a submission now. Now, you might be all right with that, and it doesn’t affect us as Councillors that you can’t raise issues on behalf of your community, but it’s bad for your residents.

It’s bad for the ratepayers and renters that you represent because when they come to you, I’m sure you’re not going to say, oh no, the LORD MAYOR banned us from raising these issues in the Chamber, because mostly, you never really did it. You always had the ability to do it there, but it limits your ability to represent your communities and you seem to be okay with it. That’s all the evidence you need to suggest that this has gone from a political Administration to a political regime here in Council now. More interested in the exercise of their own personal power in controlling what happens in this Chamber environment than actually what happens out in the community. I guess that’s what happens after 21 years of an LNP regime here in Brisbane. It’s disappointing.

Chair: Further speakers?

 Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, thank you. I rise to speak on item G, the Meetings Local Law. I’ll start by also acknowledging the extensive and comprehensive public consultation that the LNP undertook with respect to the Meetings Local Law. Certainly, of course, when this matter came to the last meeting of Council—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, on 11 June, there were no dates put in there for public consultation. There was no notice to Councillors about the public consultation. I mean, we get emails from Council about there’s a grant announced today, but we don’t get an email about public advertising of a Meetings Local Law. I had a bit of a look on the website just over the break to see, because I thought, oh, they’ll probably sneak it out at some point and not tell us. I couldn’t even find it, so it wasn’t anywhere that was obviously available to people, even if it was on the website. I don’t know if any other public advertising was done. It certainly wasn’t in the *Living in Brisbane* magazine. It wasn’t in the—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: Newsletters, sorry. It wasn’t in any of the emails Council sends out. It wasn’t on any of the internal intranet emails Council sends out. So extensive was the public consultation that the only person who made a submission was the person responsible for them, Councillor Fiona CUNNINGHAM, and that was to fix mistakes.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: Well, they sent it to the State Government, so they did consult with the State Government. They did send it to the State Government, so yes, the extensive public consultation was Councillor Fiona CUNNINGHAM and the State Government. Well, that’s going to make for a great Meetings Local Law. Now, I’m sure they’ll get up and say, well, you should have known. Well, okay. How about an email saying, we’re going out to public consultation? That’s what Council does with everything else.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, everything else. The amount of emails we get from Council, either because we’re signed up to email lists or because the CEO’s office advises us of things or whoever is extensive, but apparently, this wasn’t that important.

So, let’s get to why they don’t want to talk about it. Far from the LORD MAYOR’s, I’ll say, fake excuse for family-friendly hours—we know this is a fake excuse because of the way in which this Administration structures the Council meeting day. So, let’s take the LORD MAYOR’s stated purpose of these laws, which are we’re reflecting what they do at the State and we’re creating family-friendly hours. Well, the State Government doesn’t have Committee meetings on sitting days. Their Committees meet for dozens of days a year. They are not tied to 30 minutes maximum because there’s another Committee coming straight in the room after you and they’re not held on the same day that Parliament is sitting.

When the LORD MAYOR stands up and claims, we want to be like the State Government, he can’t even get that right because that’s not what the State Government do. So, you’ve got to look at why the LORD MAYOR is doing this. Now, Council was required to update its Meetings Local Law to reflect the model Meetings Local Law, and I actually think there are a few problems with what Council has proposed to do. I suspect that we’re going to have some fun with this, as well, but essentially, approximately 50% of the changes that are being made to the Meetings Local Law are a statutory requirement of the State Government.

Fine, we’ve got to do that, but then, what did this LNP Administration do? They brought forward changes to the Meetings Local Law that disenfranchise elected representatives from conducting the business of their constituencies. That is what they have done. They have introduced time limits that mean some Council business will never be debated. They have introduced rules that prevent motions from being debated because of strict time limits and then disallowing them off the agenda if they’re not done. They have brought in rules that limit time to speak. The LORD MAYOR has stood up and very magnanimously said, oh, but we always approve an extension of time for the Leader of the Opposition. They’ve never approved an extension of time for me, never.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Councillors.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, that was the LORD MAYOR interjecting.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, thank you. That was the LORD MAYOR interjecting. They have never approved an extension of time for me. This is designed as an antidemocratic local law to stop Councillors from scrutinising the business of this Council and holding this tired, lazy, out-of-touch LNP Administration to account. Now, we will have to deal with this, right? The LNP have the numbers. As the LORD MAYOR has been pointing out in recent weeks, hey, I got re-elected. I’m doing what I want to do. Here is the sole outcome of his maniacal attachment to trying to control what happens in a democratic place, and that is to restrict people’s ability to engage in debate.

That is what he is doing. Not only that, it means that some of the work of this Council will never be publicly scrutinised. It is the sign of a LORD MAYOR who has lost confidence in his own agenda. It is the sign of a LORD MAYOR who cannot stand people other than his own team having a point of view or running an agenda. The LORD MAYOR stands up, week after week after week, and he hasn’t done it recently, but I’ve been here 16 years and he’s done it over and over again and his predecessors. What’s your agenda? What are you doing? Well, from now on, there are 26 days a year where there’ll be one hour for everybody who is not a member of the LNP to try and run their agenda. One hour.

This is how scared the LORD MAYOR is of five Labor Councillors who—with no disrespect, they’re lovely people—can’t manage to increase their numbers, two Greens, and myself. This is what somebody with a massive majority and unfettered power now does, unfettered power. The LORD MAYOR completely controls what happens at Brisbane City Council. He can direct the CEO to do anything, anything.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: Including not telling us about things, who knows, but what this LORD MAYOR has done instead of nurturing democracy, nurturing discussion and debate, nurturing good governance, he stood up and said, oh, the clerks are here and they need family-friendly hours. Well, LORD MAYOR, how about you have them on rotation like the State and Federal Parliaments, seeing you want to do what they do? They rotate their staff in and out, so they’re not sitting here the whole time, but for you to stand up and say that we’re not going to debate the issues of the day for the City of Brisbane because a staff member has to be present is a dereliction of duty.

It is appalling that the LNP think that the dictatorship that they have established in this place should be the subject of a rule change that further entrenches their own power and limits an elected Opposition from carrying out their business. As an Independent, I’m at the bottom of that food chain because everybody else gets priority over me. So, I’m a bit like Martin Luther King on this one. Yes, I am. I had a little bit of a look. I wanted a quote. I want to leave people with a little bit of a quote. “There are two types of laws. There are two types of laws.” This is Martin Luther King.

There are just laws and there are unjust laws. I would be the first to advocate obeying just laws. One has not only legal but moral responsibility to obey just laws. Conversely, one has a moral responsibility to disobey unjust laws. Now, his speech goes on. His speech is obviously about segregation, but if you read his speech, it is smack on about the abuse of power. It is about when people in positions of power use their position to change the rules to entrench a majority view at the expense of a minority.

That’s what his speech is all about. That is what this LORD MAYOR is doing. He is entrenching his power at the expense of a democratically elected Council. It will not lead to good outcomes for the residents of Brisbane. It will diminish scrutiny and accountability, and that is what this Council needs because it is not doing a good job and it is not acting in the interests of the City of Brisbane and its residents.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, your time has expired.

 Further speakers?

 Councillor MASSEY.

Councillor MASSEY: Thank you, Chair. Brisbane City Council is massive. It’s a massive, massive, massive area, and in a previous career, I did work for another big South East Queensland Council, and I know that the way that that Council operates is very different from this one, simply because of our size, and not just the size geographically, because of course that means that we are dealing with really diverse issues geographically, right, but also because of the population, 1.2, 1.4 million people that we service who are ratepayers, who are renters. That is a huge population that we have the privilege here in this Chamber of being representatives of, particularly in our own areas.

The issues that are being faced now by communities across Brisbane—not just in The Gabba Ward, but across Brisbane, in every—on all 26 wards, are diverse and very serious. For many people, the cost of living challenges are increasing. We know the rate of homelessness and rough sleeping are also increasing. We know that people are doing tough, and we as a Council not only have responsibilities at a very basic and grassroots level—I talked about this earlier when we talked about maintaining greenspaces—but also, we have taken a responsibility to deliver more to our communities than just the three R’s, and because of that, our budget reflects that. Yes, it’s contracted from 2023-24, but it is still $4 billion. That is what this Council, right, is responsible for.

That is what the mega majority that the LNP have is responsible for, and in a place for debate, debate must happen. That debate is not always going to be pretty. It’s not always going to be—well, sometimes it’s not always factual—but it will happen, and most of us in here take it on, right, with an understanding of what our role is, which is, I hope, not only to fight for a better Brisbane but also to fight for our communities to try to get deliveries for our communities. What these meetings local law changes that the LORD MAYOR is saying is under the gaze of making it aligned to State Government does a disservice to debate. It does a disservice to the fact that while debate isn’t always pretty, it is still always needed. It’s not just needed by myself, but it’s also needed for all the Councillors in here.

There will come a time, surely, where there are statements that the Administration Councillors want to make. There should be opportunities for Administration Councillors to move motions that are specific to their local constituents. The truth of the matter is, reducing this opportunity for debate with the limits of three hours for Committees, with the reduction of speaking time, and everything else every other Councillor, through you, Chair, and the LORD MAYOR have talked about today, particularly actually penalises certain Councillors, and that is specifically all Councillors that aren’t the Opposition Leader, who gets the 10 minutes. I know when we were here last time debating this, I was not awarded even an extra minute to continue to speak to what I think was an important, important, important thing to speak about.

We can go on. We’ve talked about the fact—there was three submissions. One was from, through you, Chair, Councillor Fiona Cunningham, another one through the State Government and a random person. We’ve heard that it was apparently in the paper and it was in a website on one of our thousands of websites. Again, let me reiterate. There are so many things that I as a Councillor am informed of, because of their importance, because it’s important for us to be able to give feedback. I just think of, most recently, the amendments to the heritage package, and apparently that heritage package, which is very important that we should give feedback, is more important to inform Councillors about than how we meet in this space. That’s a real shame.

We know that this will pass. We know that the LNP Administration will do what they need to do to make this happen, will believe the LORD MAYOR—it’s up—I don’t believe it’s based on the fact that it’s family-friendly hours. We’ve heard, through you, Chair, Councillor JOHNSTON talk about the differences in Chambers. The simple difference that we only receive our papers on Thursday afternoon and then have to come here on a Monday. That is not how State Government works. So, nonetheless, this will come through, and this will come through at a time when the city is really challenged, where our residents are really doing it tough, and where more than ever, residents across the city need voices of representation here in this Chamber. This is happening while there is a mega majority, which to me is even crazier, because anything the LNP want to pass will pass.

But of course, the reality is, we will adapt. This is not something that will disturb me in a way that will stop me from standing and speaking. I think I say that particularly to the Greens Councillors. We will continue to be a voice for our residents. We won’t stop. In fact, this will motivate us more. This motivates me more, because we will adapt, and what we want, of course, what everyone wants, is to represent their communities. So, even with these arbitrarily draconian rules that will undeniably reduce debate transparency and equal less for residents of Brisbane, I do know that we will adapt and we will continue fighting, searching, bringing this LNP Council to account, because that is the role that we have to deliver, because someone has to do it, right?

Because someone has to do it, because the LNP Councillors, through the law that is being made silent even more. Their speaking time is reduced. If they do want to speak to anything, they can’t bring any motions up. We know that silence will continue. So, someone has to do this, speak up for those communities, and I know that residents across Brisbane are reaching out to me. I have residents in Stafford. I have residents deep—oh, gosh, Holland Park just this week. I had lots of phone calls from Holland Park. Residents in Coorparoo. Residents across the city are still reaching out to us to fight for them, and we will continue that, even with these terrible laws being passed.

Chair: Further speakers?

 Councillor Cunningham.

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: Thanks, Madam Chair. I rise now to speak on item G. As we heard last session, the *Meetings Local Law 2001* has undergone amendments as a result of various changes to State legislation and regulation. Although more than half the amendments reflect the State changes, we on this side of the Chamber have sought to introduce family-friendly hours at the same time. Following the period of public consultation and a State Government interest check, before the Chamber today is the final Meetings Local Law for debate. Council received a submission from the Department of Local Government. After it was discussed with our drafting officers, it was mutually agreed that no changes were required from their perspective. The submission that I made ensures existing custom and practice is maintained when it comes to the E&C debate and to allow Councillors giving their maiden or valedictory speech 10 minutes, something which we should all agree on.

But the fact that no submissions were received from those opposite is actually case in point as to why these changes make sense. All they care about, Madam Chair, is political theatre. When it comes to actually engaging in a way to get things done, they’re missing in action and they have no interest. Instead of advancing a submission during the public consultation period, the Leader of the Opposition took to X 10 minutes before this meeting. Last I checked, Elon Musk isn’t in charge of putting together local laws. Now, I’d also like to remind the Chamber that in the last session, Councillor COLLIER made some remarks. She said, and I quote, “on this side of the Chamber we will be encouraging all people to have their say”.

So, the Opposition, I put to you, Madam Chair, either didn’t do what they said they were going to do, or perhaps they did, people took a long look at this, and decided that the changes were perfectly reasonable and didn’t take any action. Over the course of the last few years, Labor Councillors have talked about how they want Council to be a progressive organisation, one that reflects a modern Brisbane. However, when this item came before Chamber last session, the Opposition labelled these amendments an assault on the work of local Councillors. Ironically, Councillor CASSIDY had the temerity to say the amendments were a result of a so-called allergy to hard work. Madam Chair, the Opposition have said they were bringing important issues to the Council Chamber last session.

So, let’s take a look at what those important issues were, then. Over the course of four weeks last session, the Labor Party advanced 24 motions. That is more than double the 10 that Labor had put forward in the last four years. Six of those motions were budget submissions that had actually already been provided to the LORD MAYOR. Four of them—and this is where it gets quite funny—were to praise other politicians, and one called for an upgrade that we’d already committed to deliver. During this four-week period of motion chaos, Council sat between eight to 12 hours. We are not serving the residents of Brisbane if we are spending eight to 12 hours watching those opposite generate data for lame Instagram memes. This is about making sure we’re operating in an efficient and a transparent fashion.

This is precisely why we have made a point of using the same reforms which were adopted by the Queensland Parliament in 2018, reforms which I note had the full support of the Greens at the time, and obviously the Labor Party, which brought them through. These are not ground-breaking changes. They simply aim to streamline meeting procedures, manage conduct and conflicts more effectively, and they set clearer guidelines for debate and for handling of motions. Madam Chair, the Opposition say they want modern. They say they want progressive, and that’s exactly what we’re delivering. The changes before us will strengthen and improve our Council meetings. They will ensure that we get the business of Council done. They ensure we provide Councillors with opportunities to discuss local issues, and they even provide the Opposition with a dedicated session every meeting to progress their so-called alternative agenda for Brisbane, and at five minutes, I commend it to the Chamber.

Chair: Are there any further speakers?

 Councillor COLLIER.

Councillor COLLIER: Thanks very much, Chair. Some days, it feels like it is only getting harder for women in politics, and today is absolutely one of those days. Councillor CUNNINGHAM just used the words efficient and transparent and I hardly think—I hardly think that the way in which the LNP have engaged in their absolute fake consultation with anyone, no notification whatsoever, is efficient or transparent. I’m taking this opportunity to yet again raise my objection to the LNP’s changes, because that’s what they are. These changes are the LNP’s changes to the way in which this Council runs, and do not for one second believe anything that the LORD MAYOR or Councillor CUNNINGHAM says when they say, it’s just like the State Government does, because it fundamentally couldn’t be further from the truth, and they know it.

The LNP Council like to pretend that they are family friendly. They like to pretend that they are progressive. But when the LNP have the opportunity, the numbers and the power to take the lead and make real changes, they make the choice not to, and every time this sort of stuff comes up, not only do they make the choice not to make change, they like to rewrite history while they’re doing it. The LNP have demonstrated over the past few months, in the motions that Councillor CUNNINGHAM, through you, Chair, just mentioned—this is what the LNP’s record was from that. They have demonstrated, over the past few months, they do not support reproductive leave for Council employees. They do not support more funding for organisations that deal with people who are homeless.

They do not support ending period poverty. They do not support family-friendly working hours in this place. If the LNP were actually committed to family-friendly hours today, we would be looking at a very different proposed Meetings Local Law. Councillor CUNNINGHAM and the LORD MAYOR in their speeches both referred to the conventions of the State Government. What they failed to mention is that State Government Parliament sittings go over three days and start at 9.30 in the morning. That is extremely different to what is being—what occurs in this place, Council meetings start at 1pm and they have often gone late. So, if Council was genuinely committed to making this place family friendly, you would think that they would do what the LORD MAYOR just said and emulate what the State Government’s family-friendly hours were doing. You would think—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor COLLIER: You would think that that’s the case, but you peel back behind the surface just a little bit more, and you see what this really is about. They’ve slapped the family‑friendly sticker over it as an absolute mirage for what they’re trying to achieve, which is stopping mostly LNP Councillors from having a say and representing their communities, and I think that’s really sad.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor COLLIER: I believe the only way to make Council meetings genuinely family friendly is make these meetings start much, much earlier than 1pm and putting Committee meetings on another day like the State Government does. This would have been modelled off those family-friendly changes. I also would like to remind, through you, Chair, the LORD MAYOR and Councillor CUNNINGHAM—they might want to make a phone call to David Crisafulli, who has publicly committed to repealing those family-friendly laws in the State Parliament.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor COLLIER: We might have to change the Meetings Local Law again if it’s modelled off the State, as the LORD MAYOR has said.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor COLLIER: Yes, and I’ll just also refer to the LORD MAYOR’s remarks earlier today. He was very, very upset that apparently Labor at a Council level and a State Government level all don’t think and feel the same way. So, I don’t know. Maybe the LORD MAYOR will think differently on this one. I certainly would love to know, LORD MAYOR, what you think about nuclear power as well. But I might leave that for another day. It is great that—it is a testament to this place—it is great that in this Council, in this Chamber, from all political parties, there is a good representation of women in this place. We all know from research that of course, when women are involved in decision-making, better decisions do get made. As politicians, of course, we all know what we sign up for when we choose to put our hand up for elected life and represent our communities.

We are not working 9am to 5pm jobs. We have to be available to attend Council meetings and attend community events, and often for people like myself who have a young child, it means we don’t get the time that we want to spend with our families. When you make changes like these, the hours that you’re about to mandate and push through mean that you are putting up more barriers for women who might be making a decision to put their hand up. I know for me, it was pretty—it was actually something that I really deeply considered. When I became a Councillor, my daughter was, I think, seven months old. She was just a little baby, and for me, I knew I had a good support network around me and I would be lying if I didn’t say it hasn’t been hard, but I’ve been able to make it work.

I obviously come from an amazing position of privilege where I have this support network around me. The Council is only a better place when we welcome women from all different backgrounds. Culturally, different levels of society, all of that. This place is better and more robust for it. But if there are more barriers in the way for women with children in particular making decisions to not participate because of the demands of this job, that’s a bad thing. So LORD MAYOR, when you first flagged these changes, through you, Chair, I asked you to consider making the meetings start at 9am as an option to be truly family friendly, as you have stated that you desire it to be, for Councillors and, of course, the hardworking staff, many of whom I know do have children as well.

I’m really disappointed, LORD MAYOR, through you, Chair, that you haven’t listened. I am a working mum. I have a two-year-old now at home. I’m a working mum, like so many women are in Brisbane. In the community that I represent, we want our workplaces to be modern and reflect the lives that we are living. But through you, Chair, the LORD MAYOR has chosen to double down and not listen. So today, we will not be supporting the LNP’s changes. They are not good for women, and they are not good for the people of Brisbane.

Chair: Further speakers?

 Councillor CHONG WAH.

Councillor CHONG WAH: Thank you, Chair. I’m speaking on the local amendment. Look, I also object to this LNP under instruction amendment. I think it’s disgraceful, and I will also support what Councillor JOHNSTON and Councillor MASSEY said on all the different elements that are changing these local laws that are undemocratic. Also, we didn’t receive any notification for community consultation, which is absolutely appalling. Our communities deserve way more. Limiting speaking time—our residents deserve way more. They deserve a robust debate on important issues like unsustainable development, pedestrian crossings, safe streets for people. They deserve a lot more, and I think it’s shameful that you think that it’s okay to shrink our democracy right here in this space in our Council Chambers, absolutely shameful.

So, I’d also like to say that, yes, it is a fake family-friendly hour. It’s an absolute farce. An absolute farce. Our communities deserve full transparency and accountability, and as a representative of the Paddington Ward, our community deserves more. They’re in crisis on so many different issues, from unsustainable development in flood-prone areas, from safe streets for people with—we only have one new traffic-calming project for the entire city, and yet having to debate on that will be shrunk. So, I am definitely not supporting this amendment, and I’ll keep it brief now, but I just wanted to say that. Thanks so much.

Chair: Further speakers?

 No further speakers.

 LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you to the Councillors who have contributed to this debate. Well, we’ve heard some really over-the-top claims today, and disappointed but not surprised by those claims, particularly the claims that somehow something that’s going on here is anti-democratic, particularly straight after we’ve had a democratic election which has re-elected this Administration democratically. So, the will of the people has been exercised just recently, a matter of months ago, and Opposition Councillors might not like it, but we didn’t put ourselves here. We didn’t somehow seize power. This is a democratically elected Administration, just like it has been right from the beginning. So, Labor Councillors, Opposition Councillors might not like the outcome, but it is the outcome that the people of Brisbane have delivered.

So, it’s a ridiculous claim, straight after we’ve had a democratic election, that somehow this is anti-democratic. The reality is—Councillor CASSIDY in particular, his language is really quite offensive. Have you noticed that he’s started to use the term regime, and he thinks he’s real clever, as though we’ve seized power in a coup, as though the tanks have rolled in and the soldiers have rolled in, and that’s how we came to be here. Well, actually, every person in Brisbane who’s enrolled to vote got the chance to vote and they voted, and they supported this team to be in Administration. Why? Was it because they weren’t paying attention to what was going on? Was it because they don’t know what’s going on in Brisbane City Council, and somehow they made a mistake?

Maybe that’s what Opposition Councillors like to think, but the reality is our people did what they’ve done consistently now for many elections and they supported us because they think overall we’re doing a good job. Now, I’m the first to admit we need to continue to double down and do better in a whole range of areas, and there are some pressing challenges our community needs. So, I’m not going to suggest in any way, shape or form that everything’s perfect and that we’ve done a perfect job. Of course we need to do better. But the reality is, people have democratically supported us to be here. Now, one of the major claims, which I found to be incredibly misleading and disingenuous, that Councillor CASSIDY made, was that Councillors won’t have any opportunity to raise local issues. Did anyone hear that claim being made?

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: There’s no opportunity to raise local issues, according to Councillor CASSIDY. Well, let’s put this to the test. Start off the meeting. We do the Acknowledgment of Country and the Prayer. We do the Apology and the Minutes of the meeting, and sometimes we have a public speaker, and what happens next? Question Time. Does any Councillor have an opportunity to raise a local issue in Question Time?

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Well, in fact, everyone does except for myself and the Chairs, because they’re the ones getting asked the questions. So, week in, week out, what do we see happen? Do Labor Councillors ask questions about local issues?

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Okay. Well, look, let’s see what happened today. The newly elected Councillor for the southern suburbs in Calamvale Ward, Councillor KIM, did she ask about a local issue? Did that Councillor ask about a local issue? She asked about the Kurilpa TLPI. So, had the opportunity to ask about a local issue, didn’t. Tried to make a political point instead. Now, Councillor COLLIER asked me a question. Did she ask about a local issue? Obviously, nothing going on in her ward, nothing important that she would want to raise? No, she made a political point about the Brisbane Metro, and we see this happening week in, week out. In fact, I have to say, the only Councillor who consistently raises local issues is Councillor JOHNSTON. All the rest of you should be ashamed of yourselves because you’re grandstanding and you’re making political points. The reality is, Opposition Councillors claim—

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Opposition Councillors claim that they want to raise local issues, but in the fact what they do is raise political issues and make political points, and that has been their consistent—

Councillor CASSIDY: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor CASSIDY.

 One moment, LORD MAYOR.

 Point of order, Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Claim to be misrepresented.

Chair: I note your claim.

 LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: And that has been their consistent position. Week in, week out, year in, year out. They’re quite quick to forget local residents and they always go for the political angle. They’re also quite quick to forget local residents and support their union mates. So, everyone can see through the ridiculous claims that are being made. But Question Time is only one part of the meeting. Is there any other opportunity to raise local issues? General Business, absolutely. Any Councillor, including myself, including the Chairs, every single Councillor can raise an issue, a local issue, in General Business. In fact, they can raise any issue about anything in General Business. They could speak on any issue they want. That hasn’t changed. General Business still gives everyone the opportunity to speak on any issue they want, and in fact the changes proposed will potentially allow more people to speak in General Business because it will be more succinct.

So, no denying of people to use their General Business opportunity. That General Business opportunity exists now and it will continue to exist going forward. A further opportunity to raise local issues, Committee reports and E&C. If any aspect of a Committee report or an E&C report relates to an issue in their ward, they can raise an issue in that Committee as well. So, take for example today, contracts and tendering. Various contracts, various proposals across the city. Any Councillor that has a local issue impacted by that E&C can speak on the reference of that E&C submission or that contract to their ward. Another opportunity to speak on general local issues. But if that’s not enough, we’re actually giving Opposition Councillors an advantage that they don’t have at the moment. We’re setting aside a guaranteed time each meeting for them to raise the issues that they want to raise.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, you’ve already been warned. Please do not call out while another Councillor is on their feet speaking.

LORD MAYOR: And so, there’s actually more opportunity for Opposition Councillors to raise local issues, and as I said, what do they do? Most of the time, particularly Labor Councillors, they spend most of their time making political points. So, they say they care about local issues, but really, they just care about politics. We’ve seen it time in—and anyone who wants to verify this just has to go back and watch the meeting, and see the minutes of the meeting and they’ll see that this is the fact. Now, in terms of putting forward general issues, the Labor Party Councillors suddenly, after their crushing defeat in the recent election, decided that they might try something different. So, in the four years from 2020 to 2024, a four-year term, they put forward 10 notified motions. Ten in four years.

They had the opportunity to do it, any of those meetings. They didn’t. Suddenly, after the last election, in just four weeks, they’ve put forward 24 motions. Now, were these about important local issues that they couldn’t raise anywhere else? Well, six of the motions were budget submissions, and Councillor CUNNINGHAM has already mentioned this, which they’d already made through the budget process. Four of the motions were praising other politicians, and one called for an upgrade of a commitment that we had already made to deliver. So, it was literally quite extraordinary to see. But if you compare the opportunities that people have to speak, there are plenty of opportunities now, and there will be plenty of opportunities going forward to raise local issues.

There will be plenty of opportunities to debate. But what we’re simply seeing here is the modernisation of the meeting rules. Now, it’s interesting that Councillor COLLIER made some comments about family-friendly hours and about encouraging more women to be involved. Well, this team sets the benchmark not for Queensland but for the entire nation in female representation; 65% of my team is female and many of them have small kids. A record number, in fact, in the history of the whole city. So, I won’t be lectured by Councillor COLLIER about this. This Administration is dedicated to a modernised meeting rule, and dedicated to family-friendly hours.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Thank you.

 Councillor CASSIDY, your point of misrepresentation.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much. Good Lord, he whinges sometimes, this LORD MAYOR. I clearly said—I clearly said that LNP Councillors already don’t raise local issues, and Question Time was a good example of that today, and they’ll have even less opportunity to do it under these changes that are being brought in today.

Chair: Councillors, I will now put item G to the vote.

**Clause G put**

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

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

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 17 - The Right Honourable, the LORD MAYOR, Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER, and Councillors Greg ADERMANN, Adam ALLAN, Lisa ATWOOD, Fiona CUNNINGHAM, Tracy DAVIS, Alex GIVNEY, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Sarah HUTTON, Sandy LANDERS, Kim MARX, Ryan MURPHY, Danita PARRY, Steven TOOMEY, Andrew WINES and Penny WOLFF.

NOES: 7 - The Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Jared CASSIDY, and Councillors Lucy COLLIER, Emily KIM, Charles STRUNK, Seal CHONG WAH, Trina MASSEY and Nicole JOHNSTON.

The report read as follows⎯

#### A STORES BOARD SUBMISSION – SIGNIFICANT CONTRACTING PLAN FOR LANDSCAPE CONSTRUCTION AND ASSOCIATED SERVICES

 **165/830/179/1002**

**13/2024-25**

1. The A/Chief Executive Officer provided the information below.

2. The A/Chief Executive Officer and the Stores Board considered the submission, as set out in Attachment A (submitted on file), on 1 July 2024.

3. The submission is recommended to Council as it is considered the most advantageous outcome for the provision of the required goods/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. That the Stores Board recommends approval of the procurement strategy for:

Contract title: Landscape Construction and Associated Services

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

Categories/portions: Category 1 – Landscape construction

Category 2 – Fencing and fence repairs

Market engagement strategy: Seek offers publicly

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

Price basis: Category 1 will not include rates, pricing will be sought via competitive quotations from the panel for each project. Category 2 will be on a lump sum and schedule of rates basis.

 Background/business case

6. Council has a responsibility to construct and maintain attractive, accessible and sustainable landscapes in Brisbane’s open and green spaces, including more than 2,000 parks, natural areas, median strips, road verges, suburban villages and other Council land. The services provided typically include hard landscape (e.g. shelters, tennis rebound walls, path or track construction, picnic nodes, minor fencing supply and installation, retaining walls and street/park furniture) and soft landscape (e.g. garden beds and general horticultural activities).

7. The CPA will contain two categories:

- Category 1: Landscape construction. The works vary considerably in size and scope, with site‑specific requirements affecting cost-drivers for different suppliers. Pricing will be based on competitive quoting from a panel of suppliers.

- Category 2: Fencing and fence repairs. Pricing will be based on a lump sum and schedule of rates for frequently required services.

Policy and other considerations

8. Is there an existing arrangement for these goods/services/works?

Yes. CPA 511132 for Landscape and Associated Services, which expires on 30 April 2025.

9. Could Council businesses provide the services/works?

Yes. However, Council does not have the capacity to provide all of these goods/services. This arrangement is to complement Council’s existing resources and for specialised services.

10. What policy, or other issues, should the delegate be aware of?

Nil

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

No

12. Does the proposed contract involve leasing?

No

Market analysis

13. According to IBISWorld industry’s Landscaping Services in Australia report (November 2023), the industry revenue is forecast to climb at an annualised 1.6% over five years through 2028-29, to reach $8.4 billion. The market is relatively stable yet impacted by labour costs and the current shortage of experienced labour supply. It is incrementally influenced by innovation and technology. The industry features a low market share concentration due to low capital intensity. A significant number of suppliers, large and small are operating in South East Queensland. The larger suppliers typically have the capability to deliver complete turnkey projects, including investigation, design, earth works, construction of structures, drainage and minor road construction, supply and installation of fencing. The smaller suppliers tend to provide a more limited range of services, specialising in services such as soft landscaping or minor construction.

Procurement strategy

14.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Procurement objective: | To procure the goods and services in a way which complies with the Sound Contracting Principles set out in section 103(3) of the *City of Brisbane Act 2010* and provides the most advantageous outcome for Council.The achievement of the above procurement objective will be measured in the post-market submission. |
| Title of contract: | Landscape Construction and Associated Services |
| Type of procurement: | Establishing a CPA in the form of a Panel Arrangement |
| Categories/portions: | Category 1 – Landscape constructionCategory 2 – Fencing and fence repairs |
| Process to be used: | Request for Proposals |
| Tendering standards to be used and any amendments: | Council’s corporate standards with no amendments. |
| Contract standard to be used including any amendments: | Construction Works Panel ArrangementNo changes have been made to the standard. |
| Market engagement: | Offers are to be sought publicly via Council's supplier portal. |
| How tender documents are to be distributed: | Via Council’s supplier portal |
| How tenders/proposals are to be lodged: | Via Council’s supplier portal |
| Part offers: | Part offers will be considered. |
| Contract duration: | An initial term of three years with options to extend for additional periods of up to five years, for a maximum term of eight years. |
| Insurance requirements: | Public and product liability of $20 million, motor vehicle insurance of $20 million (including supplementary bodily injury) and workers compensation insurance as per legislated requirements. Professional indemnity may be required where appropriate. |
| Price basis: | Category 1 – Pricing will be sought via competitive quotations from the panel for each project. Category 2 – Lump sum and schedule of rates. |
| Price adjustment: | Price adjustment not applicable for Category 1.Prices for Category 2 are expected to be subject to adjustment using a rise and fall formula to be agreed during negotiations based on relevant wage and consumer price indices. |
| Liquidated damages: | Where required, liquidated damages will be reflected in the respective contracts made under the CPA. |
| Security for the contract: | Not applicable |
| Defects liability/warranty period: | Defects liability provisions are addressed in the contract standards to be used under the panel arrangement |
| Other strategy elements: | Amalgamate the four categories in the current arrangement into two to reduce contract management cost and attract quality suppliers (Current CPA has Category 1 – Landscape construction minor less than $2 million, Category 2 – Landscape construction major more than $2 million, Category 3 – Fencing and fence repairs, Category 4 – Minor design of landscape construction less than $20,000).Rationalise the number of suppliers for each category to attract commitment from the suppliers. Aggregate, package and bundle jobs where appropriate to increase efficiency, save overhead costs and attract competitive quotes. Explore competitive quoting for low value jobs, where the benefits of reduced pricing exceed the additional costs of the quote evaluation process. Explore the opportunity to make the evaluation of quotes (for jobs under the panel) more efficient, e.g. fewer non-price deliverables/criteria.Obtain assurance from suppliers that landscape materials provided are free from contaminants and biohazards. Explore opportunities to reduce construction waste and reuse materials where appropriate and possible, e.g. use of recycled materials.Explore the opportunity during negotiation with tenderers for landscape construction panel suppliers to receive the same rates offered to Council via other CPAs (subject to agreement from those other CPA suppliers) for use on Council landscape construction activities. For example, whether Council CPA arrangements with suppliers for landscape and turf materials, premix concrete, plants, public space and bus stop furniture, etc could be leveraged to achieve cost savings for landscape construction worksEuro Emission Standard 5 or higher will be preferred for vehicles and plant. |
| Alternative strategies considered: | A cost plus pricing model was considered for Category 1. Lump sum quoting from the panel suppliers was considered to represent better value for money to maximise price competition and minimise costs associated with work supervision. |

Anticipated schedule

15. Pre-market approval: 6 August 2024

Date of release to market: 12 August 2024

Tender closing: 6 September 2024

Evaluation completion (including formalised contract offer(s)): 20 December 2024

Post-market approval: 24 February 2025

Contract commencement: 1 May 2025

Funding and budget considerations

16. Estimated expenditure:

Estimated expenditure is anticipated to be in the order of $130 million over the potential maximum eight‑year term.

17. Sufficient approved budget to meet the anticipated expenditure under this CPA?

Establishing the CPA will not commit Council to any purchases. Funding is only required when an appropriately delegated Council officer approves placing orders under the CPA, subject to approved funding availability.

18. Anticipated procurement benefits (if any):

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

Procurement risk

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

No

20. Summary of key risks associated with this procurement:

| **Procurement risk** | **Risk rating** | **Risk mitigation strategy** | **Risk allocation** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Quality of product and services | Medium | - Requirement for materials, design, and delivery time to be specified in the scope of work to meet the relevant standards. | Council |
| Contamination or other environmental risk | Medium | - Evaluation of quality and environmental systems and track record during the tender evaluation. - Requirement for materials to be free from contaminants and bio-hazards (e.g. asbestos) is included in the specification. | Contractor and Council |
| Volatility of cost inputs leads to higher pricing | Low | - Quotes will be competitively sought for Category 1. For Category 2, the most frequently purchased goods and services will be on a schedule of rates fixed for the first 12 months and reviewed on subsequent anniversaries based on an agreed price variation methodology. | Council |
| Risk of supplier insolvency or withdrawal from CPA | Low | - Having a number of suppliers on a panel arrangement will mitigate the risk. The contract contains the provision to add additional suppliers to the panel. | Council |

Tender evaluation

21. Evaluation criteria

(a) Mandatory/essential criteria:

- Has an active ABN

- Has required insurances or has commitment to obtain such insurances if successful

- Has satisfactory responses relating to legislative and regulatory obligations (e.g. fair work, safety).

(b) Non-price weighted evaluation criteria:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Weighted Evaluation Criteria** | **Weighting (%)** |
| Capacity, capability and track record | [Commercial-in-Confidence] |
| Local benefits | 30 |
| Systems (quality assurance, workplace health and safety and environmental) | [Commercial-in-Confidence] |
| **Total:** | **100** |

(c) Price model (to establish a comparative price):

Category 1: Not applicable

Category 2: Basket of commonly supplied services.

22. Evaluation methodology:

(a) Evaluation plan and shortlisting:

Tender responses to Category 1 will be evaluated based on the non-price weighted evaluation criteria. Council's standard evaluation plan including the standard shortlisting methodology will be used to evaluate tender responses to Category 2.

(b) Negotiations:

Negotiations are not anticipated but may be undertaken if required.

The Manager, Category Management, SPO, OS, or a nominated delegate, will provide advice and any negotiation lead as required.

(c) Value for Money (VFM):

For Category 1, VFM index will be based on scoring of the non-price weighted criteria. Council’s standard VFM method for Category 2.

23. The A/Chief Executive Officer provided the following recommendation and the Committee agreed.

24. **RECOMMENDATION:**

**That the Stores Board recommends approval of the procurement strategy for:**

**Title of contract: Landscape Construction and Associated Services**

**Type of procurement: Establishing a Corporate Procurement Arrangement in the form of a Panel Arrangement.**

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

**Price basis: Category 1 will not include rates, pricing will be sought via competitive quotations from the panel for each project. Category 2 will be on a lump sum and schedule of rates basis**

**ADOPTED**

#### B CONTRACTS AND TENDERING – REPORT OF CONTRACTS ACCEPTED BY DELEGATES OF COUNCIL FOR MAY 2024

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

**14/2024-25**

25. The A/Chief Executive Officer provided the information below.

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

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

28. The *City of Brisbane Regulation 2012* (the Regulation) was made pursuant to the Act. Chapter 6, Part 4, section 227 of the Regulation provides that:

1. Council must, as soon as practicable after entering into a contract worth $200,000 or more (exclusive of GST), publish relevant details of the contract on Council’s website.

2. The relevant details must be published under subsection (1) for a period of at least 12 months.

3. Also, if a person asks Council to give relevant details of a contract, Council must allow the person to inspect the relevant details at Council’s public office. ‘Relevant details’ is defined in Chapter 6, Part 4, section 227 as including:

a. the person with whom Council has entered into the contract

b. the value of the contract

c. the purpose of the contract (e.g. the particular goods or services to be supplied under the contract).

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

30. The A/Chief Executive Officer provided the following recommendation and the Committee agreed.

31. **RECOMMENDATION:**

**THAT COUNCIL NOTES THE REPORT OF CONTRACTS ACCEPTED BY DELEGATES OF COUNCIL FOR MAY 2024, AS SET OUT IN ATTACHMENT A**, hereunder.

**Attachment A**

| **Report of Contracts Accepted by Delegates of Council for May 2024** |
| --- |
| **Contract number/contract purpose/successful tenderer/comparative tender/price value for money (VFM) index achieved** | **Nature of arrangement/ estimate maximum expenditure** | **Unsuccessful tenderers/VFM achieved** | **Comparative tender price/s** | **Delegate/****approval date/start date/term** |
| **BRISBANE INFRASTRUCTURE** |  |  |  |  |
| **1. Contract No. 512185****GEOTECHNICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL DRILLING SERVICES*****Category One – Geotechnical Drilling Services*****Pacific Geotech Pty Ltd – $4,854**Achieved the highest VFM of 19**Schneider Drilling Pty Ltd trading as Schneider Drilling – $4,565**Achieved VFM of 18**Soil Surveys Engineering Pty. Limited – $4,991**Achieved VFM of 17**Redlands Drilling Services Pty Ltd – $5,616**Achieved VFM of 15**Legion Drilling Pty Ltd as trustee for the Legion Drilling Trust – $8,201**Achieved VFM of 11***Category Two – Environmental Drilling Services*****Pacific Geotech Pty Ltd – $2,665**Achieved the highest VFM of 34**Mapstone Holdings Pty Ltd trading as Mapstone Geotechnical Services Pty Ltd – $2,870**Achieved VFM of 30**Legion Drilling Pty Ltd as trustee for the Legion Drilling Trust – $3,003**Achieved VFM of 30**Soil Surveys Engineering Pty. Limited – $3,264**Achieved VFM of 27**APOD Soil Testing Pty Ltd – $3,639**Achieved VFM of 22 | Corporate Procurement Arrangement (CPA) (Panel Arrangement).Schedule of rates**$5,000,000** | ***Category One – Geotechnical Drilling Services****Shortlisted offers not recommended*Mapstone Holdings Pty Ltd trading as Mapstone Geotechnical ServicesAchieved VFM of 9APOD Soil Testing Pty Ltd#*Offers not shortlisted*Macquarie Geotechnical Pty LimitedRockwell Drilling Services Pty LtdMK Drilling Contractors Pty LtdNicholas Stewart Pty Ltd as trustee for the Davies Family Trust trading as All‑Tech Drilling Services*Non-conforming offer*Tier 1 Drilling Australia Pty Ltd***Category Two – Environmental Drilling Services****Shortlisted offers not recommended*Schneider Drilling Pty Ltd trading as Schneider DrillingAchieved VFM of 16Redlands Drilling Services Pty Ltd#*Offers not shortlisted*Rockwell Drilling Services Pty LtdMK Drilling Contractors Pty LtdNicholas Stewart Pty Ltd as trustee for the Davies Family Trust trading as All‑Tech Drilling Services*Non-conforming offer*Tier 1 Drilling Australia Pty Ltd*#Comparative price and VFM not applicable as only some items on the schedule of rates were tendered for*.*\*Comparative price and VFM not applicable as offer did not meet minimum quality requirements.* | $9,478N/A#N/A\*N/A\*N/A\*N/A\*N/A$5,318N/A#N/A\*N/A\*N/A\*N/A | **Delegate**Chief Executive Officer (CEO)**Approved**13.05.2024**Start**18.05.2024**Term**Initial term of three years with a maximum term of five years. |
| **2. Contract No. 512388****PIPE RELINING AT MANNING STREET, MILTON****Pipe Lining Pty Ltd as the trustee for Pipe Lining Trust trading as Pipe Lining Pty Ltd – $289,882**Achieved the highest VFM of 321 | Lump sum**$289,882** | Interflow Pty LimitedAchieved VFM of 290*\*Comparative tender price normalised to include traffic control, concrete removal and grouting works.* | $270,272\* | **Delegate**Executive General Manager (EGM), City Standards (CS)**Approved**09.05.2024**Start**13.05.2024**Term**Six weeks |
| **3. Contract No. 533998****DEMOLITION VOLUNTARY HOME BUY‑BACK PACKAGE 20****W J & M Allendorf trading as WMA Demolition – $367,495**Achieved the highest VFM of 23.65 | Lump sum**$367,495** | Logan City Demolitions Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 21.96Paterson Demolition & Recycling (Brisbane) Pty Ltd as trustee for Paterson Demolition & Recycling TrustAchieved VFM of 16.03DEMEX Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 15.36Rosenlund Contractors Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 11.24 | $323,000$460,069$485,981$695,690 | **Delegate**EGM, City Projects Office (CPO)**Approved**21.05.2024**Start**24.05.2024**Term**14 weeks |
| **4. Contract No. 533999, 534010, 534036****DEMOLITION VOLUNTARY HOME BUY‑BACK PACKAGE 21, 22, 23*****Package 21*****W J & M Allendorf trading as WMA Demolition – $354,101**Achieved the highest VFM of 24.51***Package 22*****Logan City Demolitions Pty Ltd – $325,950**Achieved the highest VFM of 23.16***Package 23*****W J & M Allendorf trading as WMA Demolition – $479,425**Achieved the highest VFM of 18.10 | Lump sum**$1,159,476** | ***Package 21***Logan City Demolitions Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 22.21Paterson Demolition & Recycling (Brisbane) Pty Ltd as trustee for Paterson Demolition & Recycling TrustAchieved VFM of 16.96DEMEX Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 12.92***Package 22***W J & M Allendorf trading as WMA DemolitionAchieved VFM of 23.09Paterson Demolition & Recycling (Brisbane) Pty Ltd as trustee for Paterson Demolition & Recycling TrustAchieved VFM of 17.63DEMEX Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 13.79***Package 23***Logan City Demolitions Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 17.72Paterson Demolition & Recycling (Brisbane) Pty Ltd as trustee for Paterson Demolition & Recycling TrustAchieved VFM of 14.43DEMEX Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 12.54*^Price does not include discount of approximately 5% for all three packages.*  | $339,840$416,270$491,201^$375,900$400,440$460,231^$426,060$489,180$506,050^ | **Delegate**EGM, CPO**Approved**24.05.2024**Start**05.06.2024**Term**20 weeks per package |
| **5. Contract No. 534023****AMBERJACK STREET PARK – PLAYGROUND UPGRADE (MANLY WEST)****a\_space Australia Pty Ltd – $200,000 (Offer 1)**Achieved VFM of 36 | Lump sum**$200,000** | Bespoke Playgrounds Pty Ltd (Offer 1)Achieved the highest VFM of 38Bespoke Playgrounds Pty Ltd (Offer 2)Achieved VFM of 36Austek Constructions Pty Ltd (Offer 1) Achieved VFM of 34Willplay Pty. Ltd.Achieved VFM of 33Austek Constructions Pty Ltd (Offer 2)Achieved VFM of 324park Pty Ltd trading as ForparkAchieved VFM of 32a\_Space Australia Pty Ltd (Offer 2)Achieved VFM of 25Proludic Pty LtdAchieved VFM of 23 | $199,627$249,944$216,000$251,396$250,000$275,000$320,000$278,840 | **Delegate** EGM, CS**Approved**24.05.2024**Start**27.05.2024**Term**Three months |
| **CITY ADMINISTRATION AND GOVERNANCE** |
| **6. Contract No. 510812****RENEWAL OF COUNCIL’S 2024-25 CORPORATE INSURANCE PROGRAM – ANCILLARY LINES**Fine Arts* **XL Insurance Company SE**

Marine Hull* **Allianz Australia Insurance Limited by its agent Allianz Marine & Transit Underwriting Agency Pty Limited**

Marine Hull – Removal of Abandoned Vessels* **Allianz Australia Insurance Limited by its agent Allianz Marine & Transit Underwriting Agency Pty Limited**

Marine Liability Protection and Indemnity – Decommissioned Terminals* **The Shipowners’ Mutual Protection and Indemnity Association**

Marine Liability Protection and Indemnity – Recreational Pontoons* **The Shipowners’ Mutual Protection and Indemnity Association**

Marina Operators Liability* **Allianz Australia Insurance Limited by its agent Allianz Marine & Transit Underwriting Agency Pty Limited**

Combined General Liability* **QBE Insurance (Australia) Limited**

Performers Liability* **Sportscover Australia Pty Ltd**

Business Travel* **AIG Australia Limited**

Group Personal Accident – Lord Mayor and Councillors* **AIG Australia Limited**

Group Personal Accident – Voluntary Workers* **AIG Australia Limited**

Umbrella Liability* **Berkshire Hathaway Specialty Insurance Company**
 | CPA (Preferred Supplier Arrangement)Lump sum premium and schedule of rates deductables**$799,558** | Not applicable as insurance contracts are negotiated on Council’s behalf by its insurance broker, Marsh Pty Ltd. | N/A | **Delegate**Chief Procurement Officer**Approved**15.05.2024**Start**31.05.2024**Term**One year |
| **7. Contract No. 510812****RENEWAL OF CORPORATE INDUSTRIAL SPECIAL RISKS INSURANCE POLICY 2024-25****AIG Australia Limited****XL Insurance Company SE****HDI Global SE trading as HDI Global SE, Australia****AAI Limited trading as Vero Insurance****Zurich Australian Insurance Limited****SCOR UK Company Limited****Insurance Australia Limited trading as CGU Insurance** | CPA (Preferred Supplier Arrangement)Lump sum premium and schedule of rates deductables**$5,876,004** | Not applicable as insurance contracts are negotiated on Council’s behalf by its insurance broker, Marsh Pty Ltd. | N/A | **Delegate**CEO**Approved**13.05.2024**Start**31.05.2024**Term**One year |
| **CITY PLANNING AND SUSTAINABILITY** |
| Nil |  |  |  |  |
| **LIFESTYLE AND COMMUNITY SERVICES** |
| Nil |  |  |  |  |
| **ORGANISATIONAL SERVICES** |
| **8. Contract No. 511008****UNADDRESSED DIRECT MAIL SERVICES*****Category 1 – Citywide Distribution*****Australian Postal Corporation** ***Category 2 – Localised Distribution*****Australian Postal Corporation** **Iris Brooks Leaflet Distribution Pty Ltd** | CPA (Panel and Preferred Supplier Arrangements)Schedule of rates**$588,500** | Arrangement entered into under Exemption 9 of Council’s *SP103 Procurement Policy and Plan 2023‑24, which allows for extension of contracts while Council is at market.* | N/A | **Delegate**Chief Procurement Officer **Approved**29.05.2024**Start**01.07.2024**Term**Six months |
| **9. Contract No. 534011****ONLINE LEARNING CONTENT PLATFORM****LinkedIn Singapore Pte. Ltd. – $927,500**Achieved the highest VFM of 63.01 | Schedule of rates**$927,500** | *Offers not recommended*Go1 Pty. LtdAchieved VFM of 62.14Coursera, Inc.Achieved VFM of 18.26*Non-conforming offers*Global Vision Media Pty Ltd as trustee for Global Vision Media Trust Webqem Pty LtdSkillsoft Asia Pacific Pty Ltd | $997,500$2,660,000N/AN/AN/A | **Delegate**Chief Procurement Officer **Approved**01.05.2024**Start**01.07.2024**Term**Initial term of three years with a maximum term of five years. |
| **TRANSPORT FOR BRISBANE** |
| Nil |  |  |  |  |

**ADOPTED**

#### C AMENDMENT TO *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014* – AMENDMENT PACKAGE Q

 **52/160/1218/551-002**

**15/2024-25**

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

33. At its meeting of 14 November 2023, Council resolved to prepare a new Subtropical building design planning scheme policy for Schedule 6 of *Brisbane City Plan 2014* (the planning scheme). The planning scheme policy (the proposed PSP) was progressed to support the subtropical design outcomes already sought by the planning scheme.

34. Public consultation on the proposed PSP was undertaken from 17 November to 15 December 2023 in accordance with the *Minister’s Guidelines and Rules* (the Guideline). Council received 11 submissions (all of which were properly made) on the proposed PSP. Key issues raised in the submissions related to consistency with building legislation, subtropical design principles and overall support for the proposed PSP.

35. A consultation report has been prepared that summarises the matters raised in the submissions received and how they have been addressed (refer Attachment B, submitted on file). In response to the submissions received, minor changes to the proposed PSP are recommended, including:

- Update proposed terminology and introduce additional terminology to clarify subtropical design principles.

- Clarify guidance provided about subtropical design principles, including energy and technology.

- Refinement of supporting figures to clarify subtropical design principles.

36. The proposed changes in Attachment C (submitted on file) do not result in the proposed PSP being significantly different to the version released for public consultation.

37. Should Council decide to progress with the proposed changes and resolve to adopt the proposed PSP and include it in Schedule 6 of the planning scheme, it is planned the proposed PSP and associated minor amendment to the planning scheme (to incorporate the new PSP) would take effect from 13 September 2024.

38. The proposed PSP and associated minor amendment to the planning scheme, inclusive of the proposed changes, are set out in Attachments D and E (submitted on file).

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

40. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A**

**Draft Resolution**

**DRAFT RESOLUTION TO DECIDE TO MAKE CHANGES TO AND ADOPT A NEW PLANNING SCHEME POLICY AND MAKE A MINOR AMENDMENT TO INCLUDE IN *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014* - AMENDMENT PACKAGE Q**

As Council:

(i) decided, pursuant to section 2.1 and 2.2 of Part 1 of Chapter 3 of the *Minister’s Guidelines and Rules* made under the *Planning Act 2016* (the Guideline), at its meeting on 14 November 2023 to make a new planning scheme policy – Subtropical building design (the proposed planning scheme policy) to be contained in Schedule 6 of *Brisbane City Plan 2014* (the planning scheme) to maintain its effectiveness and the currency of the planning scheme policies

(ii) has, pursuant to section 3.1 and 3.2 of Part 1 of Chapter 3 of the Guideline, undertaken public consultation on the proposed planning scheme policy

(iii) has, pursuant to section 3.3 and 3.4 of Part 1 of Chapter 3 of the Guideline, considered the submissions on the proposed planning scheme policy and prepared a consultation report (refer Attachment B, submitted on file)

(iv) decides, pursuant to section 5.1 of Part 2 of Chapter 2 of the Guideline, to make a minor amendment to the planning scheme to include the proposed planning scheme policy (the proposed planning scheme amendment)

(v) has, pursuant to section 5.2 of Part 2 of Chapter 2 of the Guideline, prepared the proposed planning scheme amendment,

then Council:

(i) directs, pursuant to section 3.4 of Part 1 of Chapter 3 of the Guideline, that each person who made a properly made submission be provided with a copy of the consultation report and that the consultation report be made available to view and download on Council’s website

(ii) decides, pursuant to section 4.1 of Part 1 of Chapter 3 of the Guideline, to make changes to the proposed planning scheme policy (refer Attachment C, submitted on file), which do not result in the proposed planning scheme policy being significantly different to the version released for public consultation

(iii) decides, pursuant to section 5.1 of Part 1 of Chapter 3 and section 6.1 of Part 2 of Chapter 2 of the Guideline, to adopt the proposed planning scheme policy and the proposed planning scheme amendment (refer Attachments D and E, submitted on file)

(iv) directs, pursuant to section 5.2 of Part 1 of Chapter 3 and section 6.2 of Part 2 of Chapter 2 of the Guideline, that a public notice be published in accordance with the *Planning Act 2016* and the requirements prescribed in Schedule 5 of the Guideline

(v) directs, pursuant to section 5.3 of Part 1 of Chapter 3 and section 6.3 of Part 2 of Chapter 2 of the Guideline, that a copy of the public notice and a certified copy of the proposed planning scheme policy and the proposed planning scheme amendment be given to the Chief Executive of the Department of Housing, Local Government, Planning and Public Works.

**ADOPTED**

#### D MINOR AMENDMENT TO *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014* – MINOR AMENDMENT PACKAGE R

 **152/160/1218/576**

**16/2024-25**

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

42. A minor amendment is proposed to *Brisbane City Plan 2014* (the planning scheme) to implement agreed Council actions for the Queensland Reconstruction Authority’s Voluntary Home Buy-Back program (VHBBP).

43. Under the VHBBP, Council administers the process of purchasing homes within its local government area and requires all sites to be cleared and the zone changed to an appropriate non-residential zone (to ensure non-habitable uses only).

44. The proposed amendment will change zones and remove overlays to enable the VHBBP to be implemented over 134 properties (125 properties under the current VHBBP and nine sites from a previous Council buy-back scheme).

45. The proposed amendment includes changes to the zoning for these properties from various residential zones and the Environmental management zone to the Open space zone; and removal of these properties from the Dwelling house character and the Traditional building character overlays, to enable removal of existing houses from the properties (refer Attachments B and C, submitted on file).

46. An amendment to the *Minister’s Guidelines and Rules* (the Guideline) in August 2023 provided for the change of zone and removal of certain overlays to be undertaken through a minor amendment process. The new zone is to be a zone from the list outlined in the Guideline.

47. Should Council resolve to make and adopt the proposed amendment, it is planned the proposed amendment will take effect from 13 September 2024.

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

49. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A**

**Draft Resolution**

**DRAFT RESOLUTION TO DECIDE TO MAKE AND ADOPT MINOR AMENDMENTS TO *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014*** – **MINOR AMENDMENT PACKAGE R**

As Council:

(i) decides, pursuant to section 5.1 of Part 2 of Chapter 2 of the *Minister’s Guidelines and Rules* (the Guideline) made under the *Planning Act 2016*, to make minor amendments to *Brisbane City Plan 2014* (the planning scheme)

(ii) pursuant to section 2.1 of Part 1 and section 5.2 of Part 2 of Chapter 2 of the Guideline, has prepared the proposed minor amendment to amend the planning scheme in the manner stated in section 1 of Attachment B (submitted on file) and as identified in the Schedules in Attachment B and set out in Attachment C (the proposed amendment, submitted on file)

then Council:

(i) decides, pursuant to section 3.1 of Part 1 and section 6.1 of Part 2 of Chapter 2 of the Guideline, to adopt the proposed amendment

(ii) directs that notice of the adoption of the proposed amendment be given in accordance with section 3.2 and section 3.3 of Part 1 and section 6.2 and section 6.3 of Part 2 of Chapter 2, and Schedule 5 of the Guideline.

**ADOPTED**

#### E MINOR AND ADMINISTRATIVE AMENDMENTS TO *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014* – MINOR AMENDMENT PACKAGE S

 **152/160/1218/575**

**17/2024-25**

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

51. Council is committed to facilitating economic growth and maintaining prosperity in Brisbane through sustainable development regulated by *Brisbane City Plan 2014* (the planning scheme). This requires a robust and resilient planning scheme that reflects changes over time, in line with community and industry expectations. Minor and administrative amendments are proposed to the planning scheme and the Infrastructure design planning scheme policy (the proposed amendment) (refer Attachments B and C, submitted on file) to maintain their effectiveness and currency.

52. The proposed amendment will achieve the following outcomes.

- Update the Pre-1911 building overlay to reflect development approvals.

- Update key development codes to include additional notes referring to the proposed Subtropical building design planning scheme policy.

- Update Brisbane Standard Drawings in the Infrastructure design planning scheme policy to align with industry best practice and Council standards for infrastructure design.

53. Should Council resolve to make and adopt the proposed amendment, it is planned the proposed amendment will take effect from 13 September 2024.

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

55. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A**

**Draft Resolution**

**DRAFT RESOLUTION TO DECIDE TO MAKE AND ADOPT MINOR AND ADMINISTRATIVE AMENDMENTS TO *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014* AND A PLANNING SCHEME POLICY – MINOR AMENDMENT PACKAGE S**

As Council:

(i) decides, pursuant to section 5.1 of Part 2 of Chapter 2 of the *Minister’s Guidelines and Rules* (the Guideline) made under the *Planning Act 2016*, to make minor and administrative amendments to *Brisbane City Plan 2014* (the planning scheme)

(ii) pursuant to section 2.1 of Part 1 and section 5.2 of Part 2 of Chapter 2 of the Guideline, has prepared the proposed minor and administrative amendments to amend the planning scheme in the manner stated in section 1 of Attachment B (submitted on file), and as identified in the Schedules in Attachment B and as set out in Attachment C (the proposed amendment, submitted on file)

(iii) decides, pursuant to section 2.1 of Part 1 of Chapter 3 of the Guideline, to make minor and administrative amendments to a planning scheme policy contained in Schedule 6 of the planning scheme (the planning scheme policy amendment)

(iv) pursuant to section 2.2 of Part 1 of Chapter 3 of the Guideline, has prepared the proposed minor amendments to amend the planning scheme policy in the manner stated in section 1 of Attachment B, and as identified in the Schedules in Attachment B and as set out in Attachment C,

then Council:

(i) decides, pursuant to section 3.1 of Part 1 and section 6.1 of Part 2 of Chapter 2 of the Guideline, to adopt the proposed amendment

(ii) decides, pursuant to section 5.1 of Part 1 of Chapter 3 of the Guideline, to adopt the proposed planning scheme policy amendment

(iii) directs that notice of the adoption of:

(a) the proposed amendment be given in accordance with section 3.2 and section 3.3 of Part 1 and section 6.2 and section 6.3 of Part 2 of Chapter 2, and Schedule 5 of the Guideline

(b) the proposed planning scheme policy amendment be given in accordance with section 5.2 and section 5.3 of Part 1 of Chapter 3, and Schedule 5 of the Guideline.

**ADOPTED**

#### F REPORT OF THE AUDIT COMMITTEE MEETING ON 6 JUNE 2024

 **109/695/586/6-003**

**18/2024-25**

56. The A/Chief Executive Officer provided the information below.

57. Section 201 of the *City of Brisbane Regulation 2012* requires that as soon as practicable after a meeting of the Audit Committee, Council must be given a written report about the matters reviewed at the meeting and the Audit Committee’s recommendations about the matters.

58. The Chief Executive Officer is to present the report mentioned in section 201(1)(c) of the *City of Brisbane Regulation 2012* at the next meeting of Council.

59. The A/Chief Executive Officer provided the following recommendation and the Committee agreed.

60. **RECOMMENDATION:**

**THAT COUNCIL NOTE THE REPORT OF THE AUDIT COMMITTEE MEETING ON 6 JUNE 2024, AS SET OUT IN ATTACHMENT A**, submitted on file.

**ADOPTED**

#### G MEETINGS AMENDING LOCAL LAW 2024

 **137/268/608/9**

**19/2024-25**

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

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

63. Amendments to the *City of Brisbane Act 2010, City of Brisbane Regulation 2012* and *Local Government Act 2009* necessitate updates to the *Meetings Local Law 2001* (the Local Law) to ensure it continues to be a consistent and comprehensive reflection of the standing rules applicable to Brisbane City Council and Standing Committee meetings. Additionally, the Queensland Government occasionally issues revisions to its Model Meeting Procedures that may also require updates to the Local Law.

64. On 11 June 2024 Council resolved to propose to make the Meetings Amending Local Law 2024 (the proposed local law).

65. In accordance with Council’s Local Law Making Procedure, Council undertook public consultation on the proposed local law from 17 June 2024 until 12 July 2024. At the same time, in accordance with section 31(3) of the *City of Brisbane Act 2010*, Council undertook consultation with Queensland Government departments which concluded on 12 July 2024.

66. Council received one public submission and one response from a Queensland Government department. Submitters raised the following matters:

- the suitability of references to prescribed conflicts of interest in relation to councillor voting powers

- the scope of speaking to matters within committee reports

- time limits for the delivery of maiden and valedictory speeches.

67. A summary of the public submission and Queensland Government department response is set out in Attachment D (submitted on file).

68. Subsequent to consultation being undertaken, further minor amendments were proposed to address the matters raised in the public submission. Following engagement with the submitter on the Queensland Government response, written confirmation was received that no amendments were required to address matters raised in its submission. Minor amendments were also made to the proposed local law to address administrative drafting issues.

69. The proposed local law as amended following public consultation and consultation with the Queensland Government department is set out in Attachment B (submitted on file).

70. A consolidated version of the Local Law incorporating those amendments is provided at Attachment C (submitted on file).

71. An analysis of anti-competitive provisions of the proposed local law in accordance with section 41 of the *City of Brisbane Act 2010* resulted in no anti-competitive provisions being identified.

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

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

74. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A**

**Draft Resolution**

**DRAFT RESOLUTION TO MAKE THE MEETINGS AMENDING LOCAL LAW 2024**

As:

(i) Council resolved on 11 June 2024 to propose to make the Meetings Amending Local Law 2024 as set out in Attachment B (the proposed local law, submitted on file)

(ii) relevant Queensland Government departments were consulted about the proposed local law in accordance with section 31(3) of the *City of Brisbane Act 2010* between 17 June 2024 and 12 July 2024

(iii) public consultation on the proposed local law was undertaken in accordance with Council’s Local Law Making Procedure between 17 June 2024 and 12 July 2024

(iv) Council received one submission from a Queensland Government department and one submission during the public consultation stage

(v) amendments have been made to the proposed local law in response to the public submission

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

then Council:

(i) resolves to make the Meetings Amending Local Law 2024 as set out in Attachment B, to commence on gazettal

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

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

(iv) authorises the A/Chief Legal Counsel, City Legal, City Administration and Governance, to undertake all relevant activities required to inform the public that the Meetings Amending Local Law 2024 has been made.

**ADOPTED**

## PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS:

Chair: Councillors, are there any petitions?

## GENERAL BUSINESS:

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

 Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: In accordance with the CCT (Councillor Conduct Tribunal) Order of 18 June 2024, I apologise.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor.

 Are there any matters of General Business?

 Councillor HUANG.

Councillor HUANG: Thank you, Madam Chair. I rise to speak on the ALGA (Australian Local Government Association) AGM (Annual General Meeting) I attended with Councillor MARX and Councillor COLLIER at the beginning of the recent recess. Madam Chair, ALGA, which is the Australian Local Government Association AGM, was held between 2 July and 5 July in Canberra. Madam Chair, may I say, winter in Canberra was far from pleasant. As soon as I arrived at the Canberra Airport, I started to miss Brisbane’s subtropical weather. This was my first time attending the ALGA conference, and it was an eye-opening experience for me.

 The theme of this year’s AGM was building community trust. However, my observation was that the focus for most delegates was on cost shifting from the State Government to local government, and further discussions of lobbying the Federal Government to increase Financial Assistance Grant—which the Association tried not to refer to as FAG—for an additional one per cent. As we all know, the functions and compositions of local governments are very different between each state, and each state and LGA is facing different issues. Even in Queensland, there are significant differences between metropolitan to regional and rural Councils. In many ways, Brisbane is more like a city state compared to all other local government areas across Australia. The conference was opened by the new Governor General, Her Excellency, the Honourable Ms Sam Mostyn AC.

This was her first public event as our new Governor General. Then there was the address by the Minister and Shadow Minister for local government. The conference split into several sessions and I chose to attend the very interesting roads and transport session. I understand Councillor MARX and Councillor COLLIER chose different topics, giving Brisbane City Council strong representation at the conference, and to help bring back different ideas to share with the Chamber.

As I was new to the conference, I was surprised that the roads and transport session was primarily a regional forum, and the main discussion points were about heavy vehicle regulations. The participants mostly discussed impacts of heavy vehicle regulations and road quality on the vibrancy and health of our regions. However, I promoted Brisbane’s work on the Metro at the forum when several interstate Councils raised questions and concerns about the future of public transport in Australia.

Madam Chair, it was a four-day conference and it was divided into seminars in the morning and at the early afternoon, and the delegates debated the motion for the rest of the afternoon. At these forums and motion debates, we saw that there are significant differences between the metropolitan and regional councils, as well as councils in different states. For example, there are several interstate councils that are addicted to forcing all new dwellings to ban gas stoves, and those LGAs moved a number of motions to try to push this policy through the conference. However, all motions of this type were voted down by regional Council delegates due to impracticality.

Other than the conference programs, delegates were also invited to dinners hosted by multiple different organisations. The most impressive one was the dinner at the Parliament House, where they presented a number of national and local government awards. The reason this impressed me so much were the winners of these awards. Take the Waste Management Award winner, for example. This award went to Inner West Council in New South Wales for the CRC (Community Recycling Centres) rap video project. That was the first time I learned you can win an award in waste management by doing a rap video.

Another example was the Productivity through Infrastructure Award, for which Brisbane Metro was one of the entrants, but the award went to the City of Stirling in Western Australia for their trackless tram trial. To be honest, I really question the credibility of these awards under the Federal Labor Government when a trial has received a higher accolade than a $1.5 billion project that will have a much greater impact on productivity for Brisbane. Madam Chair, this conference provided us with an opportunity to share our experiences and broaden our horizons and network with other local authorities across Australia. I look forward to hearing from Councillor MARX and Councillor COLLIER about their perspectives on the conference. Thank you.

Chair: Further speakers?

 Councillor COLLIER.

Councillor COLLIER: Thanks very much, Chair, and just one item of General Business, the Australian Local Government Association Conference and National Assembly. It was amazing to have the opportunity to attend the Conference and National Assembly in Canberra alongside representatives not only from our Council but hundreds of local councils across the country. It was amazing actually to network with other councillors, and hear about our many differences, I guess, but also our many shared challenges that we’re all trying to address together, and the shared care for the communities that we represent, so whether you’re like us, the largest local government in the country, or if you’re from a council with a budget of $2 million and a ratepayer base of 600 residents.

On the Tuesday and the Wednesday, I attended sessions on housing and community infrastructure, politics and civic engagement, a local government report, intergenerational equity and fairness, and community trust in the built environment. There were many insights we can take away from these presentations and panel discussions. In particular, on the housing front, it was really important to note that right now in Australia, we’re currently at the lowest number of completions of dwellings in a decade, and a mere 13% of properties are affordable to those on a middle income.

Housing was, I’d say, a huge focal point of the conference, and one of the top issues discussed amongst delegates and observers at the conference. It was a common belief, from the people that I spoke to, that all local governments have a massive role to play in addressing housing supply and the infrastructure required to support new homes. Private markets certainly aren’t going to be able to deliver it alone. Most of the feedback that we collected talked about everyone working collaboratively, all levels of government, to address housing. Certainly, it’s on the agenda at the National Cabinet level, and the ALGA has done a great job so far at bringing our voice, as councils, to the national conversation.

This resulted in the announcement at the conference of a new $450 million community-enabling infrastructure stream that is accepting applications from State, Territory and local governments. This funding is the second stream of the Commonwealth Government’s Housing Support Program. It was amazing to hear Her Excellency, the Honourable Sam Mostyn AC, Governor General of the Commonwealth of Australia, officially opening the proceedings in what was Her Excellency’s first official public appearance. We were all very inspired by her words. Across the few days of the conference, we had an amazing opportunity to not only hear from but ask questions of Federal Government Ministers relating to local government infrastructure and the like, and Shadow Ministers too.

There were a record number of motions put up for debate by Council this year, and lots of interesting debate for me to listen to as an observer; not vote on as a delegate, like Councillor HUANG and MARX were. There was debate on issues like rural infrastructure, Commonwealth funding for smaller councils, guaranteeing super for Councillors—this one was interesting as well because this issue is predominantly affecting women for the non-payment of super—insurance, public transport, and many, many, many more. I’m sure that Councillors HUANG and MARX voted in support of motions that benefit the residents of Brisbane.

We also paid tribute to outgoing ALGA President Linda Scott, Councillor Linda Scott, who’s done an outstanding job, really, and is respected across the political divide in her work in leading the charge to represent local governments on a national stage. We all wish Councillor Scott the best, as she has announced that she will not be standing at the upcoming New South Wales local government elections, and her term as ALGA president will end shortly. I hope whoever decides to step up and nominate to be the next ALGA president might be from the amazing state of Queensland.

The other part of the Canberra trip, of course, was Friday’s Australian Council of Local Government. The Prime Minister especially mentioned that he wanted to reconvene this because he, as a former local government minister himself, really did place high value on the importance of local councils coming together and having that direct line to the Commonwealth. We heard at the Council from the Prime Minister. Other ministers, again, relevant to local government, were in attendance, and were able to engage in really meaningful and quite frank discussion, which I thought was amazing.

It was great to have Ministers Kristy McBain, Chris Bowen, Catherine King, Murray Watt, Senator Anthony Chisholm and more. It was a great opportunity for local representatives to hear about topics on service delivery, housing, infrastructure, disaster recovery and climate change. In summary, it was an amazing opportunity. I’m so grateful that I had the chance to attend. These events really are vital for all of us to connect with other local governments from across the country, and make our views known in the nation’s capital, advocate hard for better funding, and share our experiences. I do thank Brisbane City Council for the opportunity to attend, and I look forward to attending the LGAQ Conference later this year.

Chair: Further speakers?

 Councillor ADERMANN.

**Procedural motion – Notified motion be taken off the table**

**20/2024-25**

At that juncture, Councillor Greg ADERMANN moved, seconded by Councillor Alex GIVNEY, that the notified motion submitted by Councillor Emily KIM at the meeting on 21 May 2024, be taken off the table.

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

Chair: The motion from 21 May 2024 has been taken off the table, and I will restate the motion for the Chamber while it is being redistributed to Councillors.

 This Council calls upon the LORD MAYOR to upgrade Benhiam Street, Ormskirk Street, and areas surrounding Calamvale District Park in the upcoming 2024-25 Council budget.

 Councillors who have already spoken are Councillors KIM and Councillor GIVNEY. Debate now resumes from where it left off on 21 May 2024.

Chair: Is there any debate?

 Councillor ADERMANN.

Councillor ADERMANN: Thank you, Chair. Despite being on different sides of the river and different sides of this Chamber, Councillor KIM and I do share some similarities with our wards in that they have rural and semi-rural environments. Environments that have seen much growth over the last decade or so. I also know that Benhiam and Ormskirk Streets have seen their fair share of traffic in recent years, thanks to the ever‑popular Calamvale District Park. This is an incredible space, as Councillor KIM rightly said. It’s becoming a real drawcard for the local area. The former Councillor should be credited for her vision to deliver this park for residents, as more development was taking place, and more families were moving in.

 Chair, when you talk about congestion as a result of growth from outer suburbs, I can sympathise. As you know, residents from Bellbowrie, Moggill, and Karana Downs have no choice but to use Moggill Road to get to work and school. You’ll recall on that section of Moggill Road, managed by the State Government, the former main roads Minister shamefully withdrew funding that had been set aside to improve congestion at the Kenmore roundabout. His successor, ‘Big Bucks’ Bart, has given no indication of a change in attitude from this tired and inept State Government. Thankfully, on that section of Moggill Road that we control, the Schrinner Council is investing in the Indooroopilly roundabout upgrade that will help ease some of the congestion issues—

Councillor CASSIDY: Point of order, Chair.

Councillor ADERMANN: —my residents face each day.

Chair: One moment, Councillor ADERMANN.

 Point of order, Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Just on relevance, I’m not sure if Councillor ADERMANN’s picked up the wrong speech, but I understand this motion is about Calamvale, not Moggill Road.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor CASSIDY. Thank you.

 Councillor ADERMANN, you have eight minutes.

Councillor ADERMANN: Thank you, Chair. Chair, the correct process to advocate for capital funding is through a budget submission, which will be considered against all other requests citywide on a cost versus community benefit basis. I should point out that this area has acreage properties that are transitioning to urban allotments. As part of that, roads get upgraded when development occurs. This work, such as road widening and curb and channelling, is delivered through development. Some of this work has already happened, but I must let Councillor KIM know that the cost of this work shouldn’t be worn by Council alone.

Developers who are creating the new allotments have a role to play. This is a factor in determining the priority for roads to be upgraded. Through you, Chair, it did concern me that Councillor KIM mentioned that there had been potholes there for months. I know that when I’m out and about in my ward, if I see a pothole, I take a pic, and have it called in immediately for repair. To the credit of our Asphalt and Aggregate team, they are very quick to fix them. I did so on Ironbark Road, Chapel Hill, only a week ago, and noticed yesterday it had already been fixed. I’d encourage Councillor KIM to consider doing the same. At the end of the day, if they don’t know about them, they can’t fix them.

While Ormskirk and Benhiam Streets have not been funded in this financial year, Councillor KIM can still ensure her streets are maintained to improve safety. Chair, in closing, let me assure Councillor KIM that this Council is absolutely committed to balancing our budget to keep pressure off rates and rents, improving public transport and, importantly, building better roads to keep Brisbane moving. Sadly, this view has not been shared by those opposite in the recent election campaign, where their Lord Mayoral candidate said that building roads was not the answer. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you.

 Further speakers?

 Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: I just rise to speak on this motion while I can because there won’t be much time in the future. It might be the last time. Who knows? But I just want to thank Councillor ADERMANN for his extensive consideration of Councillor KIM’s amendment that was put forward here today. I wasn’t aware he was the chair of any of the Committees of Brisbane City Council, or on Civic Cabinet. I think, during the budget debate, he maybe spoke once or twice. I’m not sure that he particularly has any responsibility when it comes to this. We just know that Councillor—

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, are you going to talk on the motion or just about Councillor ADERMANN? Please go to the motion.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Do you mean Moggill Road or Bark Street or—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor JOHNSTON: —or the Council budget motion that’s before us that I’m speaking to? Which one would you like me to talk about? Because I’m happy to do it.

Chair: Let’s stick to the motion that’s before us, please—

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, I was.

Chair: —Councillor JOHNSTON.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, how nice. I don’t recall Councillor ADERMANN having any responsibility in this area. I don’t recall him even making much of a contribution during the budget debate. However, as a new Councillor, Councillor KIM has put forward an issue in her area that requires Council’s attention and consideration. What is it that the LNP do? We heard the LORD MAYOR here today. According to him, the ALP doesn’t raise local issues. According to him, the ALP couldn’t be bothered with local issues. What exactly has been going on? Councillor GIVNEY, the Councillor for Wynnum Manly, blocked Councillor KIM’s motion months ago. Now they’ve sent out Councillor ADERMANN to talk about Moggill Road upgrade in her motion about Calamvale.

That’s how the LNP run their agenda. That’s how the LNP respond to a local Councillor standing up in her area, advocating for an outcome for her local community. That’s what they do. The best that Councillor ADERMANN’s got to offer is he understands congestion because there’s a problem on Moggill Road. I just say through you, Madam Chairman, that that was a surprisingly relevant part of the motion debate before us today. What I would say to Councillor KIM is, don’t be discouraged. The LNP do not listen. They have a tin ear. The LORD MAYOR couldn’t be bothered to be here. You need to continue advocating for your local community, and I support your efforts to improve your local suburbs.

Chair: Further speakers?

 No further speakers. We’ll put the motion to the vote.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: Of course, right of reply.

 Five minutes, Councillor KIM.

Councillor KIM: Thank you, Chair. Well, I have to say this is the first time that I’ve ever had anything like this happen to me in the Chamber before. Ultimately, the main point that I really just wanted to reinforce was the fact that today I’m not here to play political games. I’m here to reflect our residents who live in Calamvale around the park, who have been asking for this resurfacing and the repair of these roads to be done for a very long time, which also includes the submission of the potholes that they already find very regularly, which is why they keep complaining about it because it’s something that locals constantly have been contacting Council about.

They haven’t been repaired on time, and I’m sure that’s because of the $400 million cuts that the LORD MAYOR announced previously, which definitely affected us throughout the election. That’s why we saw a change in the Calamvale Ward because residents out that way felt the change, and they were very hurt by that as well. That’s probably the main point to really relay, other than just in regards to the comment about credit with the former Councillor. Just yesterday, I actually caught up with the former Councillor before the previous Councillor, Councillor Kevin Bianchi, who did a lot of work in securing the land for Calamvale District Park.

He gave me a lot of really good tips to think about when it comes to improving our local area. We’re both really ecstatic to make sure that we return residents the justice that they deserve with their Council rates that they’re paying, because what residents told me again and again—and I’d personally doorknocked all of the townhouses around this to Calamvale District Park as well—they told me that we’re paying more but getting less in return, with all of their council rates, every single quarter, and everyone’s just getting sick of it. Today I’ll definitely be letting our residents, who live all around this area, know about how disappointing it is that the LNP Council have decided to pull off a very important motion about an issue that people have been complaining about for a long time.

There’s lots of residents who will also get there by Christmas at the end of this year, because there’s a really great Christmas light show that one of the residents do along one of these streets. This area is used by hundreds and hundreds of residents. It’s a very popular area. It’s very disappointing to see that this has happened. As a new Councillor, I was very excited to work together. I can definitely say though that the Council officers have been extremely cooperative there from Brisbane City Council, and have provided me with a lot of advice to try and get a good outcome. It’s a shame that here in City Hall with the LNP Council, there’s always games being played.

Unfortunately, residents are just getting sick of the politics going on. It’s a shame, and I’m really relieved that there was a change in Calamvale Ward, at the very least, at this last election, and residents have also expressed that to me as well. We won’t give up on the improvement of this street. I know that you might take this down. I did find that it was a little bit ironic that the LORD MAYOR just previously, just about 10 minutes ago, said that I didn’t talk about local issues, and simultaneously pulled a motion off the table, which had everything to do with local matters in our area.

I won’t stop continuing to bring these issues up. They can keep taking it down. At the end of the day, it was a democratic election, which put us right here. This is my job, to reflect residents’ opinions and views. As much as the LNP can try and come up with smart responses to say back to them, this will only get fed back to the local residents, who have had enough of that, and they did really express that.

Otherwise, thank you so much for all of your advice. I’ll definitely take that on board. We hope to work together. Hopefully, we can talk about these matters again. I do appreciate that Councillor ADERMANN did note that we had quite a few things in common. I know there are some great projects you’re working on as well. I look forward to hopefully seeing you next week in Committee meeting, and talking about how we can continue to work on Ormskirk and Benhiam Street, and improving that. Thank you.

Chair: We’ll now put the motion to the vote.

As there was no further debate, the Chair submitted the motion to the Chamber and it was declared **lost** on the voices.

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

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 7 - The Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Jared CASSIDY, and Councillors Lucy COLLIER, Emily KIM, Charles STRUNK, Seal CHONG WAH, Trina MASSEY and Nicole JOHNSTON.

NOES: 16 - Councillors Greg ADERMANN, Adam ALLAN, Lisa ATWOOD, Fiona CUNNINGHAM, Tracy DAVIS, Alex GIVNEY, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Sarah HUTTON, Sandy LANDERS, Kim MARX, Ryan MURPHY, Danita PARRY, Steven TOOMEY, Andrew WINES and Penny WOLFF.

Chair: Further General Business?

Councillor CASSIDY: Yes, thanks, Chair. Thank you.

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair. I rise to speak about Share the Dignity’s Bloody Big Survey results. This is something that we talked about last Council session, particularly in the context of calling on this Council to support the work that Share the Dignity does in installing vending machines, sanitary product vending machines, in public spaces. I just wanted to share with the Chamber a snippet of those results that have now come in. Back in 2021, Share the Dignity started the Bloody Big Survey, which is the largest body of data anywhere in the world on menstruation—well, was until this year’s Bloody Big Survey.

Back then, there was 125,000 respondents, and that data was a game-changer, not only here in Australia but around the world. Now in the 2024 survey, we’ve seen 153,620 respondents, which is quite an incredible data set that not only Share the Dignity can use for advocacy but governments, like Brisbane City Council, can use to make practical social change in our communities. Some of the important points that Share the Dignity have highlighted include that 56% of respondents said they missed work due to their period—the economic cost of this is estimated to be at $9.6 billion annually—74% of respondents would have a higher opinion of their workplace if they provided period products, 21.75% of Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander people were unable to afford period products in the last 12 months, compared to 6.9% of non-Indigenous people.

The number of university and TAFE students who had to improvise on period products due to cost increased from 19% in 2021 to 25% in 2024, and 68% of residents missed sports due to their period, and for 76.5% of respondents, this was due to fear of leaking. This is an incredible data set. Share the Dignity is an incredible organisation that do amazing advocacy in our city here in Brisbane, and communities right around Brisbane, around Queensland, around Australia, and around the world. I’m very proud to know and work with Rochelle Courtenay, the founder and women’s equality advocate, and to have Share the Dignity based in my ward.

One of the things that the data underscores, of course, is the urgent need for continued action. Share the Dignity have said they’re going to continue to work with corporate organisations, schools, community centres, sporting organisations, and all levels of government to ensure we can continue the mission to end period poverty in Australia, and particularly through the installation of dignity vending machines in public spaces, and supporting those affected by period poverty. As we discussed last session, we have one of those in the Sandgate Aquatic Centre. Share the Dignity are very keen to see one of them in the Zillmere Library.

I note, during that debate, Councillor HOWARD said she was going to discuss this with Rochelle Courtenay at the Homeless Connect event, to see how Council could work with Share the Dignity to roll that out. I’ll be catching up with Rochelle shortly to see how those discussions are ongoing with Brisbane City Council, and to see how far along we are in making sure that we can get more of these vending machines and more action rolled out across Council venues and across Brisbane. But, again, just a massive congratulations and shout out to Share the Dignity and to Rochelle for the work that you continue to do in this very important space.

Chair: Further speakers?

 Councillor MARX.

Councillor MARX: Thank you, Chair. I just rise very briefly to speak about the local government conference that, as has been mentioned, Councillor HUANG and Councillor COLLIER and myself recently attended, at the beginning of the recess break. Generally, it’s held when we’re doing budget. But this time, for the first time in years, they actually delayed it somewhat, which meant none of us had to miss budget. We spent the first week of our recess down in Canberra, which was cold but, I might add, not quite as cold as Hobart when I went there for the rotary event that I had to go to. Anyway, back to Canberra.

Both Councillor HUANG and Councillor COLLIER have both very ably covered just about everything that was said and done at that convention conference, so I’m not going to repeat a lot of what they’ve already said. I’ll talk about a couple of other things, in particular, about the 74 exhibitors that were there at the show. There were a couple there that were interesting. One was the Young Mayors and YLab, which obviously was to do with all those young ones coming through into our space in the Local Government Area. Interestingly enough, I met a mayor and he was 26 years old, so I thought that was interesting. He was quite a cool guy to talk to.

They had information on different types of restrooms there. They also had obviously McArthur. Now, these guys are big sponsors of the convention, and they had the most popular booth, purely because they were giving away free coffee. They had long queues at all times. Mobile Muster was there as well, as they are every year. I have to say, I’m really, really disappointed. We did not pick up the Mobile Muster award this year, as we have done every year in the past—generally, because we are the biggest council, we always do the most recycling. However, Cairns pipped us at the post this year, so I suggest from that we need to lift our game and do something about that, because we cannot be beaten by Cairns Council.

There was a booth there on Airbnb, and I got some stuff from that for Councillor CUNNINGHAM, knowing the amount of work that she’s done in that space. They were very impressed with what Brisbane has so far produced in that. Of course, there was the ALGWA (Australian Local Government Women’s Association) booth, and the women there do a fabulous job in supporting everybody in the Local Government Area. I know Councillor COLLIER has mentioned already Councillor Scott. She just does an amazing job, a wonderful speaker. NBN was there, and it was lovely to catch up with Kylie. Those of you who know Kylie will know who she is and who I’m talking about. We had a bit of a chat.

There was also another booth there on Nearmaps, which of course we all use. There was another one there selling a new thing. We all know about Brisbane Monopoly. These are the guys who do that, and they actually do personalised Monopolies. You can do Longreach, or you could even do northside of Brisbane or southside of Brisbane or something like that. I got them to send through some quotes on what that might look like. Now, every year, there is a word of the year that comes out. This year, it’s actually two words that I’ve decided, and the words are cost-shifting. That was a big thing also at the conference as well, and that’s something actually the LORD MAYOR talked about just this afternoon.

Page 4 of the document folder, brochure thing that we got at the conference, Council’s disappointed with the Federal budget. I’m going to table that piece of paper that I’ve ripped out of that book because I think it’s actually really something important that everybody should read about. I just want to also mention a couple of slides that were mentioned by one of the speakers. It says, what does sound local government finance look like? Fiscal autonomy, Council should have independent access to a tax base commensurate with their service responsibilities. Fiscal equalisation, where Councils face tax base limits or costs beyond their control, they should be assisted to provide at least a basic level of service to their communities.

Subsidiarity—I’m not sure about that word—beyond facial—sorry. I’ll start again. Beyond fiscal equalisation—it’s a bit small—Commonwealth and State should only interfere with local resource allocation on matters of genuine national or state significance. I thought that was quite interesting. Another slide said, growth in own source revenue in local governments has flatlined compared to those other tiers of governments over the past five years. I think we all have to agree that’s exactly what’s happened in the last few years over Council.

Generally at these conferences, a lot of talk is about bats. We didn’t hear anything much about bats this time—and I mean the flying kind. But there was definitely lots and lots of conversations about cost-shifting. In fact, Alison Smith wrote a fairly lengthy article about this very issue recently. The other speaker that I found very interesting was Samuel Johnson. I don’t know if you all know him. He is an actor and his sister passed away recently of cancer. He talked about the fundraising, and how he’d take it on as his life to raise awareness of cancer on her behalf. It was very emotional, and he’s actually suffered some other issues himself. He was a very, very good speaker.

In actual fact, I reached out to Alison Smith after the conference, and said I was particularly impressed with all of the speakers they had, and all of that. They were very, very good. On a final note, we all did attend the ALGA dinner, gala dinner that night. As was mentioned, the Prime Minister was there. I want to thank Councillor COLLIER for accompanying me up there to have my photo with the Prime Minister. I wasn’t sure I could go up there on my own, but she came up with me, so that was okay. It was bipartisan. The Prime Minister obviously knew Councillor COLLIER, so obviously he must have thought whoever was with her might be a decent person, and was happy to have a photo with me. Appreciate that. We also did save money. We all caught it a taxi from Cairns back to the airport, all three of us sharing in that, so there was only one cab voucher. Thank you very much.

Chair: Further speakers?

 Councillor CHONG WAH.

Councillor CHONG WAH: Thank you.

Chair: Oh, sorry, Councillor. Sorry. Yes, Councillor STRUNK, I was going to call you. He did have his hand up earlier. It’s very hard when you’re on the screen.

 I apologise, Councillor CHONG WAH.

 Councillor STRUNK.

Councillor STRUNK: Thank you. Can you hear me, Chair?

Chair: Yes, loud and clear.

Councillor STRUNK: Okay. Oops. Now I’ve just—hang on a tick. I’ve just done something.

Chair: You’re good. We can hear you, and we can see you.

Councillor STRUNK: There we go. Sorry. My screen dropped down. It was my fault, not yours. Last Saturday was a very important day. I have just one bit of General Business tonight. Last Saturday was a very important day for eight very special young recipients of the Lions Children of Courage. My Lions Club of Forest Lake initiated this program after seeing what Western Australia was doing, to recognise a very special group of young Australians with special needs, and their families who are supporting them. If I can try to paint a picture, the special needs vary quite considerably, as all Councillors can probably imagine.

It was really good that my Lions Club has done this for almost 20 years now, because we have some really special kids out there in our special schools that really do it tough. With their family supports, of course, they get their education, and they move on with their lives. This is just a special recognition by the community, not just Lions, by the community as well, because we have businesses involved as well. Of course, the Speaker of the House, Milton Dick was there, who’s always a bit of a drawcard, of course, for the kids. Our newest MP (Member of Parliament), Margie Nightingale was also there at the ceremony.

You can tell that she’s a former nurse and teacher because of how she handles the kids, how she interacted with the kids. She’s just a fantastic MP. She’s really, really hit the ground running, and is doing a terrific job. Anyways, Milton, of course, as I say, the drawcard. Of course, I come the second, well, the third in line basically, because those two were really out there, and the kids really wanted to talk to them. It was just really great to see the reaction, of course, on their parent’s and sibling’s face when they came up and received their awards. They were so proud of them, and they were so happy that they had been identified as an award recipient in this particular year.

I just want to thank the Forest Lake Lions Club for continuing on with this program for the last almost 20 years now. I recommend any of the Councillors who have Lions Clubs in their areas, in their wards, that they undertake this award ceremony as well, in recognition. Our District Governor, Richard, was there as well. He supports it greatly as well. I just want to finish my comments there. Thank you, Chair.

Chair: Thank you Councillor STRUNK.

 Councillor CHONG WAH, thank you.

Councillor CHONG WAH: Thank you, Chair. Through the Chair, I rise to speak on the one item that is the rehabilitation of Mt Coot-tha Quarry, and the Schrinner Council’s plan for its privatisation. I’ve already spoken in these changes during budget discussions about the lack of Council action and transparency on closing the Mt Coot-tha Quarry and today I’ve asked a question to the LORD MAYOR. The Mt Coot-tha Reserve is arguably the most important natural area of Brisbane. This iconic sanctuary of eucalypt forest, rainforest gullies, creek lines and koalas should be given the highest level of protection by this Council.

This Council Administration, however, does not believe Mt Coot-tha deserves the highest protections. This is demonstrated by the fact that the Schrinner Council is still carving out a 26-hectare crater in Mt Coot-tha, with no end in sight, an open pit quarry less than five kilometres from the centre of Brisbane. This huge quarry is still blasting, spraying noise and dust onto households, and onto the iconic forest. The LORD MAYOR last June announced a half-a-million-dollar commitment to consult residents on the future of Mt Coot-tha and Pine Mountain Quarries. So far, all we’ve seen is Have Your Say website.

We know that all that $500,000 wasn’t spent on one website, sorry, webpage consultation. The local—plan requires the quarry to be closed by 2025, but that is highly unlikely to happen when there is no budget and no timeline from Council. In this Council’s latest budget, even the very phrasing—planning for quarry transition—has disappeared. While this Council Administration have said that they will close this huge block of inner-Brisbane land, like many other election promises, they won’t actually commit to a date or timeline. You would think that after 20 years of being in power that this LNP Administration would have learnt how to balance their budget, to be able to actually follow through on their election promise commitments.

In October 2019, Michael Berkman, State MP for Maiwar, hosted a Future of Mt Coot-tha Quarry Forum with the Mt Coot-tha Protection Alliance, with more than 100 local residents attending. From this forum and subsequent feedback to elected representatives on the westside, residents have told us very clearly they wanted a rehabilitated quarry to be kept for public open access space and greenspace. Residents want this Brisbane asset to be kept as public greenspace that enhances the Mt Coot-tha natural landscape and complements the Botanic Gardens. Just last week, we are now seeing proposals promoting hotels and zip lines in a rehabilitated quarry, designed by Prax, a local Brisbane company, and has all received heavy promotion in the news media.

Placing a hotel in Mt Coot-tha completely ignores the overwhelming community desire for the quarry to be converted into public space with no commercialisation. The LORD MAYOR’s response to this proposal for a hotel and zip line in Mt Coot-tha was to clearly signal that Schrinner Council wants to prioritise and commercialise Mt Coot-tha to maximise tourism. We heard the LORD MAYOR in Chambers today that we need an income source. We need private investment. That means a new large area of Mt Coot-tha will become privatised. I will say it again. It is vital that the revitalised quarry is kept as public greenspace, and it concerns me deeply that this Schrinner Council is showing support for a major privatisation and commercialisation of Mt Coot-tha, including hotels and zip lines.

PRAX’s inclusion of a zip line also flies in the face of the community’s opposition to a zip line. In 2019, the LORD MAYOR, who had only held his position for four days, agreed with the residents of Brisbane that Mt Coot-tha was not the right place for a zip line. I quote the LORD MAYOR from an article with ABC Radio Brisbane on 11 April 2019. “The majority think Mt Coot-tha is not the right spot for it.” The LORD MAYOR went on to say, “I believe the community believes there are other locations where something like a zip line can occur. When we voted on this project in Council back in December 2017 there had been very little community feedback. You have to listen to people, and then you have to make clear, strong decisions, and that’s what we’ve done here.” Following on from all extremely generous developer infrastructure discounts this Schrinner Council are giving to their developer mates, this Administration now see an opportunity to hand over some highly sought after public land to private developers as well. I will finish here with a warning to this Council that commercialisation of a rehabilitated quarry at Mt Coot-tha will be strongly resisted by the community, and this resistance will be actively supported by the growing number of elected Greens representatives in west Brisbane.

Chair: Any further speakers?

 If there are no further speakers, I declare the meeting closed.
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