#### " "

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

# The 4649 meeting of the Brisbane City Council,

# held at City Hall, Brisbane

# on Tuesday 25 May 2021

# at 2pm

**Prepared by:**

**Council and Committee Liaison Office**

**Governance, Council and Committee Services**

**City Administration and Governance**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

[TABLE OF CONTENTS i](#_Toc73341471)

[PRESENT: 1](#_Toc73341472)

[OPENING OF MEETING: 1](#_Toc73341473)

[APOLOGIES: 2](#_Toc73341474)

[MINUTES: 2](#_Toc73341475)

[PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: 2](#_Toc73341476)

[QUESTION TIME: 7](#_Toc73341477)

[CONSIDERATION OF COMMITTEE REPORTS: 21](#_Toc73341478)

[ESTABLISHMENT AND COORDINATION COMMITTEE 21](#_Toc73341479)

[A ANNUAL OPERATIONAL PLAN PROGRESS AND QUARTERLY FINANCIAL REPORT FOR THE PERIOD ENDED MARCH 2021 52](#_Toc73341480)

[B *ICT22 INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY POLICY* AND *ICT23 INFORMATION MANAGEMENT AND RECORDKEEPING POLICY* 53](#_Toc73341481)

[C TAILORED AMENDMENT TO *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014* – LONG TERM INFRASTRUCTURE PLANS 54](#_Toc73341482)

[D INTERIM AMENDMENT TO *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014* – LOCAL GOVERNMENT INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN AMENDMENT 1A 55](#_Toc73341483)

[E MAJOR AMENDMENT TO *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014* – EIGHT MILE PLAINS GATEWAY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 57](#_Toc73341484)

[F 2020-21 BUDGET – THIRD REVIEW 58](#_Toc73341485)

[CITY PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE 59](#_Toc73341486)

[A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – PROPTECH INITIATIVE 61](#_Toc73341487)

[B PETITION – REQUESTING COUNCIL INVESTIGATE THE REZONING OF 4 KENNETH STREET, LUTWYCHE, FROM THE LOW MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (2 OR 3 STOREY MIX ZONE PRECINCT) TO A HIGHER DENSITY RESIDENTIAL ZONE AND RELAX THE CURRENT HEIGHT RESTRICTIONS 63](#_Toc73341488)

[PUBLIC AND ACTIVE TRANSPORT COMMITTEE 65](#_Toc73341489)

[A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – GREEN BRIDGES CONSULTATION UPDATE 71](#_Toc73341490)

[B PETITION – REQUESTING COUNCIL REINSTATE THE DOCKSIDE FERRY TERMINAL AND, AS AN INTERIM MEASURE, ALLOW CITYCATS TO STOP AT THE HOLMAN STREET FERRY TERMINAL 73](#_Toc73341491)

[INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE 75](#_Toc73341492)

[A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – IPSWICH MOTORWAY UPGRADE WORKS INTEGRATION 75](#_Toc73341493)

[ENVIRONMENT, PARKS AND SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE 76](#_Toc73341494)

[A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – BRISBANE CITY COUNCIL’S GREEN HEART FAIRS 77](#_Toc73341495)

[B PARK NAMING – FORMAL NAMING OF THE PLAYGROUND IN SANDGATE FORESHORES PARK, SANDGATE, AT THE END OF FIFTH AVENUE, AS ‘PEEBO AND DAGWOOD PLACE’ 78](#_Toc73341496)

[C PETITION – REQUESTING THAT COUNCIL INSTALL A BASKETBALL HOOP AND CIRCLE IN BIAMI YUMBA PARK, FIG TREE POCKET 79](#_Toc73341497)

[CITY STANDARDS, COMMUNITY HEALTH AND SAFETY COMMITTEE 80](#_Toc73341498)

[A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – ILLAWONG WAY DRAINAGE PROJECT 84](#_Toc73341499)

[B PETITION – REQUESTING COUNCIL REMOVE THE CADAGHI TREE OUTSIDE 32 ROBERTSON STREET, SHERWOOD, AND REPLACE IT WITH A SUITABLE NATIVE TREE 85](#_Toc73341500)

[COMMUNITY, ARTS AND NIGHTTIME ECONOMY COMMITTEE 86](#_Toc73341501)

[A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – RESILIENT CLUBS SUPPORT PROGRAM 87](#_Toc73341502)

[FINANCE, ADMINISTRATION AND SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE 87](#_Toc73341503)

[A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – INFRASTRUCTURE FOR ECONOMIC STIMULUS 88](#_Toc73341504)

[B COMMITTEE REPORT – FINANCIAL REPORTS (RECEIVABLE, RATES, PAYABLE, PROVISIONS AND MALLS) FOR THE PERIOD ENDED MARCH 2021 90](#_Toc73341505)

[PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS: 90](#_Toc73341506)

[GENERAL BUSINESS: 91](#_Toc73341507)

[QUESTIONS OF WHICH DUE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN: 93](#_Toc73341508)

[ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS OF WHICH DUE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN: 95](#_Toc73341509)

## PRESENT:

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

The Chair of Council, Councillor Andrew WINES (Enoggera Ward) – LNP

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

## OPENING OF MEETING:

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

Chair: I declare the meeting open.

Are there any apologies?

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, Mr Chairman. I just want to put on the record today my concern about—

Chair: What’s the point of order?

Councillor JOHNSTON: I’m trying to put it on the record, Mr Chairman.

Chair: Right.

Councillor JOHNSTON: That is that the Council papers provided to us today, some of them are illegible. Others have been unable to be properly downloaded due to their size, and it is extremely concerning that the materials for today’s meeting are in the hundreds, if not thousands of pages, but they’ve not been able to be easily or properly downloaded. So, we’ve had repeated conversations with the CEO’s (Chief Executive Officer) office and IT (information technology) to try and resolve this, and it is extremely difficult to access today’s Council papers.

Chair: Okay, thank you, Councillor JOHNSTON. I’ll raise it with the CCLO (Council and Committee Liaison Office).

Are there any apologies?

Councillor LANDERS.

## APOLOGIES:

**723/2020-21**

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

Chair: Are there any further apologies?

Councillor CASSIDY.

**724/2020-21**

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

Chair: Councillors, the Minutes please.

## MINUTES:

**725/2020-21**

The Minutes of the 4648 meeting of Council held on 18 May 2021, copies of which had been forwarded to each Councillor, were presented, taken as read and confirmed on the motion of Councillor Sandy LANDERS, seconded by Councillor Sarah HUTTON.

Chair: Councillors, I draw to your attention the item on today’s Agenda, the public participation. We have two speakers today, or in reality three, but two different topics.

Can I please invite Ms Thelma Blucher to speak to us today about a dog off-leash area in James Warner Park at Kangaroo Point.

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

**Mrs Thelma Blucher – The dog off-leash area in James Warner Park, Kangaroo Point**

Chair: Welcome, Ms Blucher. You have five minutes. You’re welcome to stand or sit, whichever is your preference, and please, your time begins when you begin.

Ms Thelma Blucher: Okay, thank you.

Chair: Thank you.

Ms Thelma Blucher: Good afternoon, Mr Chair, LORD MAYOR and Councillors. My name is Thelma Blucher. I’m here about James Warner Park in The Gabba Ward and ask Council to review the decision that it is a suitable dog off-leash area. It is not. Do we want another of our beautiful parks bordering the Brisbane River fenced off to become a dog park? James Warner Park is located on the river, south of the Holman Street ferry terminal and directly opposite the Eagle Street restaurant precinct. James Warner Park is currently available to everyone, but Councillor SRI wishes to fence it off so only dog owners will use it.

Kangaroo Point is the most densely populated suburb in Brisbane, and a fenced dog park will reduce usable open greenspace to over 7,000 local residents. Councillor SRI is suggesting the dog park to be located at the northern end of James Warner Park. The proposed drawings prove it is, in fact, the whole of James Warner Park that will be fenced. Here’s what we’re worried about, congestion at the site, public nuisance, and no meaningful consultation and flawed opinion polling.

Firstly, congestion; the Kangaroo Point Bikeway borders the proposed dog park. This path currently caters for pedestrians, cyclists, e-scooters, parents pushing prams, with peak use in excess of 450 people per hour. Usage will increase with the advent of the Kangaroo Point Green Bridge. The streets around this park are narrow, congested, and usually there is no parking available. Access to the proposed park by maintenance crew and bin collection can only be achieved by crossing the busy pathway, an accident waiting to happen.

Public nuisance; to put it simply, it is just not the right location. Other dog parks around Brisbane are renowned for their unsightly appearance and close residents complain of the noise, dust and smell. Bear in mind, James Warner Park is only 15 metres from people’s homes.

The flawed polling; Councillor SRI conducted an online poll that gathered fewer than 250 votes in support of the dog park. We hastily organised a petition and gathered over 500 votes opposing the dog park. Councillor SRI’s poll appeared flawed. His office admitted votes were duplicated, manipulated and removed. iCloud email addresses were blocked from the voting process and the authentication process varied during the life of the poll, yet Councillor SRI chooses to ignore our numbers and has in fact told us he would not discuss this issue unless we had 2,000 signatures.

No meaningful consultation; Councillor SRI will tell you there has been community consultation. We will tell you that the first and only time affected residents met with Councillor SRI was on the day his poll closed, and that meeting happened to be arranged by us. Councillor SRI is required to determine the highest priority local project that is worthy of funding and satisfy himself of public support. How can his poll of less than 250 votes account for public support? Another dog park in this area will be the third in a two-kilometre radius. How many do we need?

Currently, dog owners have over 30 kilometres of pathway in which to walk and run their dogs. The dogs are not excluded from James Warner Park, but for some reason, Councillor SRI is intent on locking away a lovely riverside park for the exclusive use of a very small minority interest group who are already very well catered for. This decision should be made by the whole community at the next election. Never again will there be a picnic, never again will there be toddlers and children playing, never again will James Warner Park be an open park. A dog park at James Warner Park is a mistake. Council, please review the suitability of this park. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you. Please take your seat and I will call on Councillor DAVIS, I believe.

Councillor DAVIS, please respond.

**Response by Councillor Tracy Davis, A/Chair of the Environment, Parks and Sustainability Committee**

Councillor DAVIS: Well, thank you, Chair, and good afternoon, Ms Blucher, and thank you. My name is Tracy Davis. I’m the Acting Chair of the Environment, Parks and Sustainability Committee here in Council, and thank you for addressing us here today. Thank you also for the information that you and your neighbours have emailed, and I understand that you have received a response from the LORD MAYOR and Council’s CEO on the matter that you are talking to us about today.

I would note that in Councillor SRI’s communications with residents, that Councillor has said that Council agreed to install a dog off-leash area in James Warner Park, but can I assure you and your neighbours that the proposed project is one that has been entirely initiated by your local Councillor. In addition to projects funded by the LORD MAYOR in the annual budget, all local Councillors have a Suburban Enhancement Fund, where Councillors are allocated funding to determine the highest priority projects in their local community.

Whilst Councillor SRI has determined that this particular project is a high priority, I do hope that the Councillor has listened very carefully to the things that you have shared with us here in the Chamber today. I do understand also that Councillor SRI has recommitted himself to funding a dog park in this location, but if that does remain the case after today, I would strongly urge Councillor SRI to consider the neighbours of this park to determine the very best design and operation of the park, so that it is sensitive to the needs of those that are living close by and to your fellow residents.

I do understand that Councillor SRI is conducting further consultation on the design of the area, and once again, I hope that he undertakes a process that really is inclusive and is reflective of what the views of the local community are, and in a sensitive way. Councillors do have a number of responsibilities to their local residents, and it can be a difficult balance. I know that in my own ward, there have been proposals where residents have supported and not supported particular projects, but I do the very best I can, and people in this Chamber do the very best they can to try and find a balance that gives the best outcome for the local community, even if they do not agree with the local Councillor.

I do appreciate you coming into the Chamber and providing a very detailed account of why you have concerns about this particular project going ahead in your local area. I want to thank you for addressing Council, and I really do hope that your local Councillor has heard what you’ve had to say and continues to engage with the local community. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor DAVIS.

Ms Blucher, Mr Peers will see to you.

**Mr Daniel Allen and Mr Edward Ross – TradeMutt**

Chair: Councillors, I would also like to identify that two individuals will address us together. Mr Daniel Allen and Mr Edward Ross will address the Chamber on TradeMutt.

Welcome, Mr Allen and Mr Ross. Excuse me. You have five minutes, which begins when you begin. You’re welcome to stand or sit, and please proceed when you are ready.

Mr Daniel Allen: No dramas. Mr Chair, LORD MAYOR and Councillors, it brings both myself and Ed great excitement to be here today. As two former carpenters by trade with a combined 15 years’ experience on the tools, we consider ourselves to have played a small, but very important part in building this fantastic city. However, during that journey building houses around Brisbane, I lost one of my best mates to suicide, and it was during that time that Ed and I saw the need to provide a solution to the mental health crisis in this country at a social and a cultural level. So, we founded TradeMutt.

What is TradeMutt? It’s a social enterprise workwear company by tradies for tradies. We make funky, eye-catching workwear, designed to start conversations about mental health, and as we say, make an invisible issue impossible to ignore. When you wear a TradeMutt shirt, you take on a responsibility to act with empathy, show vulnerability, and always take a nonjudgmental approach to the conversation. This is a grassroots movement that is starting conversations and driving the social and cultural shift that we believe is required to reduce the rates of suicide in this country.

As a social enterprise, we obviously want to contribute to mental health organisations, but looking at the landscape, we don’t believe that there was anything out there that was really speaking to tradies, blue-collar and the working class. So, not that we didn’t have enough work on our hands already, we went and started our own charity called This is a Conversation Starter Foundation or TIACS, which is the acronym for what we wear across the back of our shirts.

We saw the issues being that we needed to remove the physical and financial barriers that exist that prevent anyone from accessing professional mental health support. The barriers that I’m referring to, making an appointment to GPs (general practitioner) takes time out of a workday, going and getting on a mental health plan has its own stigmas associated with it, making an appointment with a psychologist and going and attending that appointment during the working hours that tradies work between 6am and 6pm, it’s really not feasible.

The fact of the matter is that one hour with a private sector mental health support costs about the same as about six cartons of beer. What would you choose? We know that it’s an unhealthy coping mechanism. Jonathan, I know you liked that one. I don’t know what else you’re into, but it’s—look, you know, obviously we’re choosing a lot of unhealthy coping mechanisms, and we want to provide a solution, and not only that, we are providing the solution. In just under 11 months, our charity TIACS has provided 2,100 contact hours of professional mental health support for tradies, truckies, blue-collar workers, and support networks of those people who would have otherwise fallen through the cracks.

Now, pause for applause, I know. Now, the reality is that we’ve got traction, we’ve got wheels in motion. We consider ourselves to be providing a full, closed-circle approach to the mental health conversation. TradeMutt’s fun. It’s easy for people to get on board with. It’s very bright and it’s easy to start conversations, and on the back of that, we are providing a professional solution to actually provide the support that people need, if and when they need it. TradeMutt is a social enterprise. Our goal was to be the world’s best social enterprise known for end-to-end impact. We support SHE (Shaping Her Earth) Rescue in Cambodia. We support workRestart out at Borallon Prison out in Ipswich. We also employ 10 individuals with intellectual or physical disabilities who pick and pack our shirts.

Why are we here today? Because we think every single blue-collar worker for councils around Queensland, but obviously particularly Brisbane, should be wearing TradeMutt. I think Brisbane City Council would be setting an incredible example by bringing on TradeMutt at a procurement level, to be able to fit out every worker. Obviously, by having a really solid commercial partnership with Council, it would allow us to continue to do the work that we do, because, yes, I’m not going to beat around the bush, it’s hard and we are caning it at the moment.

The next thing that we need is support for our charity, TIACS. Now, we sell workwear to fund professional mental health support. We’re not—we haven’t really been asking for help, nor have we really had time to ask for help because we’ve got a full-time task on our hands, but we do have proof in the pudding that this works. We’ve got the runs on the board that this works, and how fantastic would it be for Brisbane to be at the centre of a national mental health solution that is actually working? I think that’s pretty bloody cool.

I think we can do it together, and we’d love to see more of these shirts getting around Brisbane. They’re already out here. I apologise that we haven’t been here to meet sooner, because look at this wonderful setup. We’re happy to be here. We thank you so much for your time. Is there anything that I haven’t asked for that I’ve missed?

Mr Edward Ross: That’s pretty much it, mate.

Mr Daniel Allen: Apologies, Jonno, for the joke.

Mr Edward Ross: Got to loosen it up a bit.

Mr Daniel Allen: So yes, we’re out there. We’re caning it. We’re putting our money where our mouth is, and yes, we’d like to see Brisbane get right behind this because we reckon that we can really shake it up out there.

Mr Edward Ross: Thank you.

Mr Daniel Allen: So thank you very much for your time.

Chair: Alright. No worries, thank you.

Can I call on Councillor MARX to respond, please?

**Response by Councillor Kim Marx, Chair of the City Standards, Community Health and Safety Committee**

Councillor MARX: Yes. Thank you, Mr Chair, for asking me to respond. I know it’s an absolutely serious subject, but there has been a bit of laughter around the room, which is kind of nice to put a bit of lightening on such a serious subject. So, good afternoon to you both, Mr Allen and Ross. As I mentioned before, thank you for taking time to address Council on the work of what you do, the TradeMutt and TIACS. It’s good to see you again. We met previously at the Acacia Ridge TAFE’s Women in Construction breakfast that was there, which is when I first saw you and noticed your shirts and everything like that. I have seen a few around, and I like particularly the bit that This is a Conversation Starter.

So, when I was told that you were addressing the Chamber about your organisation’s work in addressing rates of blue-collar suicide, I was enthusiastic about the chance to respond on behalf of the Team Schrinner Council. In my portfolio as Chair of City Standards, Community Health and Safety Committee, I have the most field officers, which in the field—which is the work that is most applicable to you. You may be interested to know that we have a range of strategies to support, promote and protect the mental health of our officers in Council.

We have an Employee Assistance Program, commonly known as EAP. It’s a confidential support service available 24 hours for all officers and their immediate family members, in addition to short-term solution-focused advice and support on things like stress, relationships, anxiety, depression, nutrition, legal and financial issues. They also act as a referee service to—a referral service to deal with longer‑term issues. They also provide officers and their immediate family members visitation to a professional counsellor at no cost.

There is a dedicated managerial hotline, as well, which supports our officers, and of course, in addition to the EAP, we have a range of courses to build the mental health capability of officers and leaders. These courses range from a couple of hours to a couple of days to fill in. So, you’ve got mental health first aid, mental health awareness, which is what you guys are talking about, wellness conversations for leaders, and managing stress and responding to challenging interactions. In the same way that your organisation recognises the different stresses placed on field and tools-based workers, Council also has a dedicated City Standards mindfulness team.

Look, I want to thank you particularly for coming in and speaking to us today. As I said, there’s a few of us here in the room who’ve had a very personal contact with regard to suicide. We’re aware of what an emotional subject it is, and nobody wants to see anybody—and particularly our workmates—go through that. It’s tough. Someone very close to me is going through that at the moment and she still struggles every day, so I understand where you’re coming from.

I want to continue to have a discussion with you both about how we can help you, whether that’s through putting up, sort of, notices about what you do and that—so it’s available to our workforce, of course. We also have, I’m not sure if you’re aware, the Council’s Corporate Community and Strategy Procurement Office. You may have been in touch with them. If not, I’m going to encourage you and give you the details to contact them. They are the ones that make the decisions about our corporate uniforms and that.

I have had a very brief conversation with the CEO and said, I’d like to see our guys wearing something a little bit more colourful, a bit different, and I think, you know, that would be fabulous. So, it’s definitely a conversation that we plan to have as a Council, and I know that you’ve met the LORD MAYOR and he obviously supports what you’re doing in your field, as well. Having one of the largest workforces in a council, we certainly like to be the leaders in whatever we do, so we’ll be here to help you as much as we can and I appreciate your time. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you for coming in, and Mr Peers will look after you.

Councillors, I draw to your attention Question Time.

## QUESTION TIME:

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

Councillor ADERMANN.

**Question 1**

Councillor ADERMANN: My question is to the Chair of Public and Active Transport Committee, Councillor MURPHY. There have been renewed calls for Council’s fifth green bridge to be placed east of the Story Bridge. Can you outline the history of this proposal and where the State Government stands on this issue?

Chair: Councillor MURPHY.

Councillor MURPHY: What a fantastic question, Councillor ADERMANN. Through you, Chair, I’d be more than happy to lay out the facts on this issue and speak to the bizarre series of events that have taken place regarding Labor’s call for a green bridge between Bulimba and Teneriffe. Now, Mr Chair, I can speak to this because the State Government’s study on this potential green bridge finally, after five years, has been received by Council over the weekend. I’m sure Councillor COOK, who often watches on at home, will be pleased to learn what the Labor State Government knew five years ago.

Now, let’s start at the beginning, Chair. Back in 2015, TMR (Department of Transport and Main Roads) commenced an investigation into an active transport bridge between Bulimba and Teneriffe. TMR then provided Council with a draft report on the study with several conditions, because it was yet to be finalised. Then after this point, radio silence. I wrote to Minister Bailey in September last year, asking him to provide his Government’s report to Council’s Green Bridges team. For several years, this report has been sought by our offices, but the State Government has been holding onto the report very tightly indeed—

*Councillor interjecting*.

Councillor MURPHY: —but today, after five years, after numerous requests, after much political grandstanding from Councillor COOK, I can finally reveal what the report contains and what, indeed, the purported bridge between Bulimba and Teneriffe would look like, according to the State Government. If built, this bridge would certainly stand out on the Brisbane River. It would have a very significant clearance height. For reference, let’s look at other bridges across the Brisbane River. The Kurilpa Bridge is nine metres, the Captain Cook Bridge is 12.7 metres, and the Goodwill Bridge is 13.25 metres. Now, what do you think the bridge would clear the river at, according to the State Government? It would have a 30‑metre clearance height, 30 metres. Do you know the other bridge along the Brisbane River that has a 30-metre clearance height?

*Councillors interjecting*.

Councillor MURPHY: The Story Bridge. The Story Bridge. So, TMR’s modelling also indicates that the bridge climbs at an aggressive five per cent grade, which is not particularly friendly to pedestrians or cyclists. I’m sure we now will have a visual in our head of this bridge, Chair. Thirty-metre clearance, plus a five per cent grade means that you wouldn’t need a bike to get over this bridge, Chair. You would need a Sherpa. Just like the Gateway Bridge, this bridge would require regular pause points to allow users to recover from the punishing climb, and if residents of Bulimba or Teneriffe have a spare hour or two, I’m sure this bridge would make for a lovely walk over the Brisbane River. While they might not need oxygen for the climb, they might start hyperventilating when they find out the cost. Over $200 million in 2016 dollars, and that’s without considering property resumptions on either side.

TMR also writes it has significant ramping that will be very unattractive to users. So, the bridge would involve massive ramps on either side of the river, extending either down Oxford Street or parallel to Commercial Road, like the Riverside Expressway. The shadowing that this bridge would cause is another issue. Councillor COOK, like Monty Burns, should tell her residents to take one last look at the sun, because if this bridge were built in her ward, it would plunge riverside residents into darkness. Unsurprisingly, Chair, TMR did not endorse the report themselves and noted that it was only finally provided to Council for historical technical reference only.

Now, I’m sure Councillor COOK is pleased to know the outcome of her Labor Government’s own report. I know that just like us, Chair, she’s been waiting for a while. Councillor COOK, Di Farmer and Grace Grace have all been big advocates for investigating a green bridge east of the Story Bridge. They began calling on Council to do the feasibility report into a green bridge east of the Story Bridge, and while Council has been only able to access this final report for the last few days, I’m surprised that the trio haven’t read the contents of this report, considering it’s been sitting with the State and collecting dust for five years now.

There are so many questions that I have, Chair. Wouldn’t they have been able to access their own State Government report for several years? Have they not read or at least been told the outcomes of the final report? Have they not asked Minister Bailey? Does she expect us to believe that Cabinet Ministers like Di Farmer and Grace Grace don’t have access to their own Government’s report on the feasibility of this bridge? Now, Chair, putting this aside, it’s always been a perplexing request to me to demand that Council replicate work that’s already been done by the State Government.

Why would Council have started from scratch, expend public funds, resources, and take six months of planning to complete an investigation that the State Government have already done themselves? Chair, the answer is that Labor don’t care about governments. They only care about politics. Councillor COOK, Di Farmer and Grace Grace wanted to stir people into action, to get them excited about the prospects of a bridge that all along they knew, was not feasible. So, Chair, I can confirm today that we will not be progressing a green bridge east of the Story Bridge. It would require enormous resources, there would be excessive ramping, and the impact to the community on either side of the river would simply be too great.

Chair: Councillor MURPHY, your time has expired.

Are there any further questions?

Councillor CASSIDY.

**Question 2**

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair. My question is to the LORD MAYOR. LORD MAYOR, it’s come to our attention that four electric buses have made their way to Brisbane as part of the City Loop trial. Your LNP Administration claims to buy local, yet these four buses were made overseas. At a time when we need to be boosting our own economy and supporting local jobs, you send millions of dollars overseas to build electric buses instead of awarding the contract to local manufacturers. LORD MAYOR, why do you hate supporting local jobs and manufacturing?

Chair: The LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair. Well, one of the things that I’ve been very proud of as LORD MAYOR of this city is introducing our local buy procurement policy, which is all about targeting 80% of Council contracts to go with local business here in South East Queensland and we’ve had incredible success with that, the success that sees, for example, our double-decker CityCats being designed and manufactured here in Brisbane, in Murarrie, in fact, using local workers, using local experience and technical ability, and once again, we heard just last week, award-winning double-decker CityCats built by an award-winning company.

*Councillor interjecting*.

LORD MAYOR: Now, we heard this question from Councillor CASSIDY as though they had discovered something. That’s funny, because the contract actually came through Council.

*Councillor interjecting*.

LORD MAYOR: The contract came through Council ages ago—

*Councillor interjecting*.

LORD MAYOR: —and they’ve suddenly discovered something. This is, sadly, the lengths that the Labor Opposition will go through to manufacture a complete beat-up of a story, because what we’re seeing here is not us manufacturing anything that we will own. We are seeing four buses out of a 1,200-bus fleet as part of a trial, a trial. So, we haven’t made the decision to purchase any of these buses. What we’re doing is trialling the technology, and that was very clear right from the beginning.

So, the way that Councillor CASSIDY has concocted this fake news story is quite incredible. He’s implied that there was a local company standing ready to produce these buses for us. Well, in fact, when we went out to the open competitive tender, that same company that was mentioned in the media today did not bid. Why? Because they actually weren’t manufacturing any electric buses. They had the opportunity to put in a tender proposal, yet they didn’t because they weren’t building any electric buses.

So, we gave every opportunity for local companies to be part of this, but the reality is, in that tender process, no local companies were able to meet the specifications of the trial. I do stress again; this is a trial. This is something where we’re testing the technology before we make a decision to buy additional vehicles and buses, and so that is the right and responsible thing to do, but I would point out that, when Councillor CASSIDY was tweeting up a storm on his phone, that was probably manufactured in the same place as these buses, I wonder if it struck him the hypocrisy of what he was saying, because, you know, you would rightly say, well, of course mobile phones are not made in Australia.

There’s really only one place where they’re made, most of them. Yes, it’s interesting. If you actually have a look at the statistics, about 70% of mobile phones coming into this country last year came from the place that we’re mentioning here and 30% came from somewhere else. Do you know what percentage of electric buses in the world are manufactured in this place? It’s not 70%. It’s 99% of the world’s electric buses are manufactured in the place that Councillor CASSIDY is criticising. In fact, they’re on track to have millions of electric buses on the streets. There are already over half a million on the streets. This is tried and tested technology that we’re seeing from a market leader.

Now, we would like to see a situation where local companies gear up their capacity to manufacture these electric buses, but we’re not there yet. What we’ve seen is the local market has moved quickly, but it is still in its infancy when it comes to the ability to gear up to produce large numbers of electric buses. We’re seeing relatively small numbers in Australia, usually one-off or very small productions, but as I said, when we went out to tender in this competitive and open way, the local company that was referred to didn’t put in a tender because they didn’t actually build any electric buses at that time.

So, what we’re going to do is, within a very few short weeks, we will see the very first fully electric bus service being introduced in Brisbane, and it’s going to be fantastic. Why? Because this is about making sure we put to the test—

Chair: LORD MAYOR, your time has expired.

LORD MAYOR: —this technology that reduces emissions and will make a more sustainable Brisbane.

Chair: LORD MAYOR, your time has expired.

Any further questions?

Councillor HAMMOND.

**Question 3**

Councillor HAMMOND: Thank you, Mr Chair. My question is to the Chair of City Planning and Economic Development Committee, Councillor ADAMS. DEPUTY MAYOR, Brisbane has been part of an exciting announcement for some events, Dine BNE, Fridays in the City, and the Ashes held at The Gabba. Could you outline how these events are contributing to our local economy and how residents and visitors can get involved?

Chair: The DEPUTY MAYOR.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair, and thank you, Councillor HAMMOND, for the question because it is so exciting after coming off the back of the NRL (National Rugby League) Magic Round last weekend, which was just absolutely outstanding. Brisbane is buzzing and it just keeps getting better, 130,000 people at the Magic Round last weekend descended on Suncorp Stadium for three absolutely jam‑packed days full of football and celebrations. I’m glad to see the Leader of the Opposition also enjoyed his evening there on Friday night, as well, even though the Brisbane Broncos really didn’t hold their head up very proudly.

The Brisbane Truck Show welcomed over 30,000 visitors, Doomben 10,000 attracting 6,000 racegoers, and the AFL (Australian Football League) bringing in a full house at The Gabba, so proving once again that Brisbane is the actual home of major events and sporting events in Australia. It’s fantastic on the other hand to see also the hotels nearing capacity, our restaurants, pubs and clubs filled to the brim and our city streets bustling again. I spoke to a couple of people that were in the Queen Street Mall Saturday before last for the NRL Magic Round and it was absolutely jam-packed, and that’s what we want to see, foot traffic through the mall to make sure that we are getting our local businesses supported, averaging 30% above the average for this time of the year in Queen Street Mall. That is pre‑COVID-19, not just 2020.

So, our major events calendar this year is on track to deliver a $65 million economic boost to the city, and with more draw cards, sporting events just around the corner for the remainder of 2021. It’s looking very, very rosy. Of course, as Councillor HAMMOND mentioned, Cricket Australia’s announcement that the first test match of the Ashes series will be played in Brisbane again, yay, as it always should be, a huge milestone in our international sporting calendar.

The more major events we can attract to Brisbane, the more our local businesses will benefit and the better we’ll be for the economic recovery of the city. We have also been trying to entice our local residents and workers to come back into the city and support our businesses within the city heart. We’ve been gathering some serious momentum and it hopefully will not be slowing down anytime soon. Last week, I had the pleasure of joining Property Council to announce the latest campaign of Fridays in the City.

We know since the pandemic that Fridays just haven’t been quite the same, with a large portion of workers still on the split schedule between the home and the city office. So, Property Council’s office occupancy data tell us that people tend to opt to work from home on Mondays and Fridays, leaving our CBD noticeably quieter and occupancy rates stagnating at around 60%. What is unclear, is how long is this going to last for, and why they’re there working from home and the arguments that will continue around that, as well, but we’re certain that the home office won’t be as fun as working in the city on Fridays anymore, with tons of freebies and food discounts on offer.

You don’t need to convince me that Friday’s the best day of the working week. Sometimes in this place, though, we do feel that Friday’s not the end of our working week, for some of us, but there’s definitely a lot of Friday energy. We need to bring that back into the city and city workers come back to rediscover what’s great about catching up with your workmates after work on a Friday afternoon. In response, we saw city restauranteurs and retailers being overwhelmingly positive. Forty-two properties jumped onboard to participate in the campaign that goes through from last Friday to 25 June, late night shopping, bar hopping, fine dining, restaurants, bar eats, things that entertain you during the day, and right through into the night.

Post Office Square has got free yoga, pilates and boxing classes. Charter Hall has got ping-pong tables in their foyers. BSQ (Brisbane Square) has got free coffee on arrival in the building foyer, so you might all want to book in your meetings with the Council officers on a Friday morning. There is live music in the mall. There is discounted parking. We know public transport usage is one of the issues, and we’re encouraging the State Government to get onboard and work with us and with the Property Council to consider free trips to further incentivise city workers to make the change and choose Fridays.

Over the next month, I encourage you all to spread the word and ask your residents to grab their workmates and make the most of everything on offer. On top of that, if your residents get in quick, they might be able to double up on the Dine BNE City program, which has seen two weeks of incredible dining deals in the heart of the city, more than 80 meal deals available, 50 participating restaurants and bars, and plenty to choose from, some fantastic offers from our very, very best restaurants.

It’s all about the opportunity for people to come and experience our world-class restaurants right here in our backyard. First of its kind anywhere in Australia, it’s rounding out an action-packed month in May, but will continue on through the year, and it’s all about making the Brisbane of tomorrow, even better than the Brisbane of today.

Chair: Councillor ADAMS, your time has expired.

Further questions?

Councillor JOHNSTON.

**Question 4**

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes. My question is to the DEPUTY MAYOR. Why did you refuse to allow a briefing by Council’s planning officers for all councils on significant changes to the City Plan infrastructure plans prior to consideration at today’s meeting?

Chair: Councillor ADAMS.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair, and I do not uphold the premise of the question. I did not refuse any briefings with Councillors with Council officers. Councillor JOHNSTON sent a letter of request for a briefing. She got the reply yesterday afternoon, which said you are more than welcome to have a briefing, many changes in the LGIP (Local Government Infrastructure Plan). My officers were waiting for an email this morning from Councillor JOHNSTON that never came for her briefing on the LGIP.

Chair: Further questions?

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order, Mr Chairman.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: The letter that Councillor ADAMS sent me yesterday said there is no briefing for Councillors on the LGIP.

Chair: Thank you. This is not an opportunity for debate.

Further questions?

Councillor MACKAY.

*Councillor interjecting*.

**Question 5**

Councillor MACKAY: Thanks, Chair. My question is to the Acting Chair of the Environment, Parks and Sustainability Committee, Councillor DAVIS. Councillor DAVIS, Brisbane’s favourite sustainable living festival, Green Heart Fair, is back for another year. Can you outline how residents can get involved in this year’s exciting line-up?

Councillor McLACHLAN: Point of order, Mr Chair.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor McLACHLAN.

Councillor McLACHLAN: Mr Chair, could you ask Councillor JOHNSTON to turn off her torch? It’s very distracting to everybody else in the Chamber.

*Councillor interjecting*.

Chair: Yes, please. Please don’t shine lights on other Councillors if you’re using torches. Thank you. Councillor—

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order, Mr Chairman.

Chair: No, no. If this is going to be an argument about something silly, I’m not interested. What’s your point of order?

Councillor OWEN: Point of order, Mr Chair. That light is actually shining straight in my eyes. I find it very difficult to concentrate.

Chair: Okay, could—please could we just—this is not really what this is about.

Can we please just turn the torch off and move on?

Councillor DAVIS.

Councillor DAVIS: Well, thank you very much, Mr Chair, and thank you—through you, I’d like to thank Councillor MACKAY for the question, and I very much look forward to seeing Councillor MACKAY on the northside of Brisbane on Sunday. Mr Chair, the Schrinner Council is not only building a better Brisbane, but also a greener Brisbane, and we are so excited that this Sunday, our hugely popular Green Heart Fair is back, Under LORD MAYOR Adrian SCHRINNER’s leadership, Brisbane remains Australia’s largest carbon neutral government, and we are investing in projects to reduce our carbon footprint.

Whether it’s by increasing our solar power generation by over 10 times in 2016, by retrofitting our streetlights with energy efficient lamps, or by continuing to grow our green cover and natural habitat across the suburbs, we are seen as a leading government, when it comes to taking practical action to create more sustainable community. We are also passionate about giving residents and community groups the tools they need to make an impact at home. Our much‑loved Green Heart Fairs are a big part of that. Mr Chair, the Schrinner Council is bringing them back in 2021 after a hiatus last year.

In many ways, the Green Heart Fair is more important than ever. With more people spending more time at home, we want to arm residents with the information and inspiration that they need to make more sustainable choices in their everyday life. Together, we can make a big difference. So, Mr Chair, I warmly invite residents to come along to this year’s Green Heart Fair in Chermside, in 7th Brigade Park. At the fair, you will learn about innovative products and services, listen to presentations on green living, gardening and recycling, and get practical tips in hands-on workshops.

The fair is split into several themed zones, each offering different information to help you live more sustainably. The Waste Zone showcases rubbish trucks, recycling education stalls, and workshops on composting, worm farms and creating an edible garden. The Green Home Zone will feature stalls on sustainable living and expert talks on creating a habitat garden, bees, chickens, and kombucha and sourdough workshops. We’ll also have presentations from the inspiring Yas Grigaliunas from *World’s Biggest Garage Sale* about buying second-hand.

Our Grow Zone is for the green thumbs and wannabe green thumbs of Brisbane, with experts on hand to answer your questions about gardening, as well as tips on plant choice and choosing the right type of mulch. The move for less outdoor transport area is all about taking transport to the next level, showcasing low-cost and sustainable transport options, including electric and hybrid vehicles, and information on Council’s public and active transport initiatives. The Kids’ Eco Zone has a range of fun activities for our future environmental champions, including stalls from Australia Zoo, our Council libraries, putt putt and games, arts and crafts, and make your own macramé plant holders and garden plant labels.

Our Council marquee provides residents with information about Brisbane’s urban forest, waterways and invasive species, plus environmentally and kid-friendly nature play activities. The Council marquee is also where you’ll find our popular free native plant giveaway. We expect to hand out around 3,000 pots to be planted in backyards across Brisbane. On the Main Stage, there’ll be live music to enjoy and performances for the kids, including dirtgirlworld and the Waste Warriors.

There are also food trucks to suit all types of foodies. It’s important for the Green Heart Fair to walk the talk, and you will see sustainability embedded in just about everything you see at the fair. Our food vendors source their products locally where possible, and all serveware is recyclable or compostable. We know some stall foods are recycling their cooking oil and composting all food waste. Some of our stalls will run off solar power and all generators onsite use biodiesel.

Mr Chair, it’s great that events like Green Heart Fair are back and in action on the ground. Last year, we had to switch to a virtual fair. This included sustainable school holiday activities, eco-friendly gift ideas, sustainable living tips from local experts, and exclusive discounts and giveaways on popular sustainable products. Around 14,000 people attended the virtual fair, with our sustainability messages reaching over 210,000 people on social media. Whilst this was a wonderful engagement, I can’t wait to be back at 7th Brigade Park, where based on previous years, we’re expecting around 20,000 visitors to join us.

Mr Chair, there is something for everyone at the Green Heart Fair. Kick-off is at nine o’clock, so come along and enjoy Brisbane’s favourite sustainable living festival, just another way that the Schrinner Council is building a better, greener Brisbane.

Chair: Councillor DAVIS, your time has expired.

Further questions?

Councillor CASSIDY.

**Question 6**

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair. My question is to the LORD MAYOR. LORD MAYOR, you’ve just claimed that there were no Australian electric buses that could operate and service Council’s requirements. That is just not true. Volgren, who manufactures buses right here in Brisbane does make electric buses, and they have been making buses for this Council and Eagle Farm since 2008. BusTech on the Gold Coast also makes electric buses, yet you and your LNP Administration snub these local manufacturers in order for electric buses from overseas for the City Loop trial. LORD MAYOR, why do you avoid buying local at a time when Brisbane’s economy needs the support the most?

Chair: The LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair. Look, I’ve already answered this question, but I’m happy to give some further insight. First of all, I pointed out that when we went out to tender, which did already come through this Council for approval, which Labor Councillors saw—I don’t know if they were asleep or maybe reading a novel—

*Councillors interjecting*.

LORD MAYOR: —or some kind of political intrigue book. Look, I don’t know, but it came through this Council, and then suddenly all of this time later, they’ve had a lightbulb come on and they’re outraged that when we went out to tender, no Australian company could actually provide the buses that we needed.

*Councillor interjecting*.

LORD MAYOR: That’s not wrong. That is the facts, and in fact, if Councillor CASSIDY paid attention in Council, Mr Chair, rather than reading a novel each week, he might actually have noticed when this came through. Now, we know that Councillor CASSIDY seems to have—

*Councillors interjecting*.

Chair: Councillors, please allow the answer to be heard in silence.

LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: —a propensity to miss certain facts, but this is the fact. We went out for an open competitive tender. That tender was advertised to the entire bus manufacturing industry in Australia, and guess what we received? We didn’t receive a tender from an Australian company that could provide the buses that we needed. Now, what we’re doing here, as I pointed out before, is not gearing up a manufacturing facility for a large number of buses. What we have done is we have leased four buses as part of a pilot. That’s four buses out of 1,200.

If you believe what Councillor CASSIDY is trying to peddle, suddenly we’re acquiring an entire fleet of vehicles from overseas. That is not what’s happened. We’re simply having a small pilot project as proof of concept before we make a decision on future bus manufacturing. Now, we had a long-term arrangement with Volgren that came to its natural end. That arrangement at the Eagle Farm facility came to its natural end, and we have advised the market that we’re very interested going forward in local manufacturers that can provide a range of options to us for buses, including alternative powertrains, such as electric buses and hydrogen buses potentially, to supplement the existing fleet.

So, we’ve made that clear, but what we’re going to do first, what we want to do first before making that longer-term production decision, is to trial the latest technology here in Brisbane, in our local conditions, and what better way to do that than right here on the CBD Loop, which will be the first fully electric bus route in Brisbane, which is an exciting way to test this technology that is now world leading. Now, as I said before, we know that the local manufacturers and industry are gearing up to meet this challenge, but we know that there’s only a very small number of buses available, and those that were available at the time of our tender—

*Councillor interjecting*.

LORD MAYOR: —which was two years ago, as Councillor MURPHY pointed out, were not able to meet our requirements. It’s as simple as that. So, I suspect that, as we go forward and we make a longer-term decision, that there will be local Australian manufacturing ability and assembly ability to provide this, and so it is a good thing that we have made this decision after putting the product to a test, which is exactly the responsible and right thing to do. Look, I really don’t know, I really don’t know what Councillor CASSIDY would expect us to do. If we run a tender and there’s some vehicles that comply and there’s some vehicles that don’t comply, or there’s some companies that don’t even make such vehicles, what are we to do?

*Councillor interjecting*.

LORD MAYOR: What are we to do? If the local company could not actually manufacturer a vehicle at the time we went out to tender, what are we to do? I’ll tell you what we’ll continue to do. We’ll continue to provide procurement opportunities for local business. Now, we know—and I mentioned the double-decker CityCats before. That is just one story of hundreds of good news stories right across the city, where we’re working with local business to support local jobs. So, whether it’s the CityCats or whether it’s the construction of major projects or whether it’s local upgrades—

Chair: LORD MAYOR, your time has expired.

LORD MAYOR: —we will continue to support local business wherever possible.

Chair: Further questions?

Councillor LANDERS.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor JOHNSTON.

**MOTION FOR SUSPENSION OF STANDING RULES:**

**726/2020-21**

At that juncture, Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON moved, seconded by Councillor Jonathan SRI, that the Standing Rules be suspended to allow the moving of the following motion⎯

*That this Council condemns Cr Adam’s failure to hold a briefing for all Councillors on changes to the City Plan 2014 infrastructure plans prior to today’s Council meeting.*

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, three minutes to urgency, please. Please, you have three minutes. Please limit your comments to urgency.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Thank you. This is an urgent matter before us today, because later in today’s Council meeting, we will be debating fairly significant changes to City Plan 2014, they affect the Local Government Infrastructure Plan and the Local Government long-term plan, so the LGIP and the LTIP (Long Term Infrastructure Plan). Upon becoming aware of this matter coming to Council, I immediately wrote to the CEO and the LORD MAYOR last week, requesting a briefing for all Councillors. It’s not just myself that is interested in this matter, but I presume all Councillors are, in how changes to City Plan impact on their wards.

Late yesterday afternoon, the DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor ADAMS, responded, and she said the following. ‘The LORD MAYOR has asked that I respond on this occasion. The amendments to the LGIP are minor in nature compared to the overall document, and a full Council briefing was determined not to be required’. She goes on to state that ‘there are some changes to Tennyson Ward’, which in fact only say new things, doesn’t say what’s actually been cut, so she has provided misleading information in the letter, as well.

Chair: No, now Councillor JOHNSON, I appreciate much of what you said has been on the topic of urgency, but you are straying into the substance, and also there will be an opportunity later in the meeting to debate these points. So, can I just ask you to come back to urgency, please?

Councillor JOHNSTON: It is incredibly important that all Councillors are fully briefed on the matters before us today. Councillor ADAMS decided she did not want to provide a briefing for Council officers. The CEO confirmed that in an email, that there’ll be no briefing by Council officers, and today we are asked to consider thousands of changes to City Plan 2014 without a briefing. Now, these are citywide changes that impact on every ward. So, the big issue here is why Councillor ADAMS personally determined that a full Council briefing was not required, not required, and advised me—that’s in her own words—in the—

DEPUTY MAYOR: Point of order, Mr—

Chair: Yes, point of order to you, Councillor ADAMS.

DEPUTY MAYOR: I know I haven’t spoken on this, but the misrepresentation and falsehoods are continuing.

Chair: Thank you. No, no, I’ll accept a misrepresentation.

Councillor JOHNSON, you’ve got 35 seconds left. Please focus on urgency.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, thank you, and it’s urgent because—and I quote, again, even though, as she says, she hasn’t spoken, so there can’t be misrepresentation—Councillor ADAMS wrote back to me late last night and said, in her own writing, in her own words, a full Council briefing was determined not to be required. Now, there are hundreds and hundreds of pages of documentation. There are thousands of project changes, many affecting my ward, but affecting everyone else’s ward, and Councillor ADAMS—

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, your time has expired.

Councillor JOHNSTON: —has refused to brief people prior to the meeting.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, your time has expired.

Thank you.

Councillor ADAMS, please say your piece very quickly.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Yes, thank you, Mr Chair. The part that she left out is that a full briefing was offered to her, which she could have had this morning.

Chair: Okay, thank you.

Right, that’s—we’re moving on. We’re having a vote.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order, Mr Chairman.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Mr Chairman, that was not a point of misrepresentation under the rules, but a personal attack on me—

Chair: No, okay, thank you.

Councillor JOHNSTON: —and I would ask that you require Councillor ADAMS to withdraw those comments.

Chair: No, we’re moving on. We’re having a vote.

All right, on the matter of urgency.

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 Charles STRUNK immediately rose and called for a division, which resulted in the motion being declared **lost.**

The voting was as follows:

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

NOES: 17 - The Right Honourable, the LORD MAYOR, Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER, DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Krista ADAMS, and Councillors Greg ADERMANN, Adam ALLAN, Tracy DAVIS, Fiona HAMMOND, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Sarah HUTTON, Sandy LANDERS, James MACKAY, Kim MARX, David McLACHLAN, Ryan MURPHY, Angela OWEN, Steven TOOMEY and Andrew WINES.

Chair: Councillors, we will now return to Question Time.

Councillor LANDERS.

**Question 7**

Councillor LANDERS: My question is to the Chair of the Community, Arts and Nighttime Economy Committee, Councillor HOWARD. Councillor HOWARD, last week marked Library and Information Week. Can you outline how our city celebrated and how libraries contribute positively to our communities?

Chair: Councillor HOWARD.

Councillor HOWARD: Thank you, Chair, and through you, thank you, Councillor LANDERS, for the question, and I know that you’re a great supporter of libraries. Library and Information Week celebrates the wonderful work of librarians right across Australia, and the important role libraries play in the community. Chair, only the Schrinner Council can be trusted to protect and deliver the library services our communities need. For 17 years, the Schrinner Council Administration has invested millions of dollars into maintaining and upgrading libraries every single year since we’ve been in government.

The Schrinner Council has delivered 16 balanced budgets and through our strong economic management, we’ve delivered 23 new and upgraded libraries over the past 17 years. More importantly, Chair, we are doing this in an environmentally friendly way by delivering cleaner and greener libraries. Through you, Chair, I know Councillor LANDERS’ local community has greatly benefitted from the new Bracken Ridge Library delivered last term, one of our greenest libraries to date with more than 200 solar panels, reducing carbon emissions by over 100 tonnes each year.

Bracken Ridge Library is just one of the many libraries the Schrinner Council has invested in renewable energy as part of the largest carbon neutral government in Australia, an achievement delivered by the Schrinner Council. Over the past 17 years, we’ve installed hundreds of solar panels at facilities right across Brisbane. In fact, Chair, in the last 12 months, we’ve installed over 200 new solar panels across Ashgrove, Holland Park, and Mitchelton Libraries, but we’re not about to stop work there. The Schrinner Council is continuing our investment and more to be delivered over this term.

The Schrinner Council is investing $10 million to deliver a brand-new library for Everton Park, as well as a new upgrade for Zillmere Library. So, Chair, there really is no better friend of libraries than the Schrinner Council, a stark contrast to Labor who left behind a legacy of closing down libraries, even going so far as to take a wrecking ball to the Acacia Ridge Library, something which I know Councillor OWEN fought hard to put a stop to, but unfortunately, Labor did not heed Councillor OWEN or the residents’ calls to protect the library. The contrast could not be clearer, Chair.

*Councillors interjecting*.

Chair: All right, Councillors, Councillors, please allow the answer to be heard in silence.

Councillor HOWARD.

Councillor HOWARD: Labor’s policy is to demolish libraries.

*Councillors interjecting*.

Councillor HOWARD: Our policy is to build and protect libraries. For 17 years, the Schrinner Council Administration has protected and managed Australia’s largest library service. The Schrinner Council has never closed a library and we will continue to deliver more library upgrades and new lifestyle and leisure opportunities for the residents of Brisbane. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the more than 300 hardworking library staff. They pour their heart and soul into their work, something which has never been made clearer than in the past year as they have gone above and beyond to keep our city moving forward.

So, it was great to join residents from right across Brisbane last week in celebrating the importance of our libraries and the wonderful work of our librarians. Each year, we celebrate Library and Information Week with a special theme, and this year’s theme was Adventure. Last week, residents from all over Brisbane came together to celebrate our libraries as places of adventure, whether it’s searching for specific information, coming together to learn something new, or browsing Australia’s largest library collection at one of Brisbane City Council’s 33 libraries. One of the key events of Library and Information Week every year is the National Simultaneous Storytime.

Each year, a picture book by an Australian author and illustrator is selected for libraries, bookshops, schools and kindergartens across Australia to read simultaneously. This year’s National Simultaneous Storybook was Philip Bunting’s *Give Me Some Space!*, and for an extra special experience, the Mount Coot-tha Library hosted their book reading in the Sir Thomas Brisbane Planetarium, where projected images of the universe in the Cosmic Skydome followed the events of the story throughout the reading. At Brisbane Square Library, Australian Children’s Laureate Ursula Dubosarsky read *Give Me Some Space!*, as well as her own new picture book, *The March of the Ants*.

Another fantastic program run by our libraries, Mr Chair, is the children’s literacy sessions. These include the First 5 Forever children’s storytime, First 5 Forever babies’ books and rhymes, First 5 Forever toddler time, and First 5 Forever stories and signs.

*Councillor interjecting*.

Councillor HOWARD: Eight hundred and thirty-two in-library events have been held so far this year with these sessions hosting more than 5,140 participants. Mr Chair, launching on 1 May was of course the ever-popular 2021 Gold Star and Little Stars Reading—

Chair: Councillor HOWARD, your time has expired.

Councillor HOWARD: Thank you.

Chair: Further questions?

Councillor CASSIDY.

**Question 8**

Councillor CASSIDY: Oh, thanks very much, Chair. My question is to the LORD MAYOR. LORD MAYOR, Brisbane is in the midst of an economic recovery right now. Every level of government should be focused on supporting local jobs, but you and your LNP Administration are all talk when it comes to buying local. Council needed four electric buses for the City Loop trial. Volgren already makes buses for this Council right here in Brisbane and has the capacity to manufacture electric buses. They just delivered four electric buses in Victoria. BusTech on the Gold Coast can also manufacture electric buses.

Both of these local manufacturers support hundreds of local jobs directly and indirectly, but this LNP Administration decided to award the $3 million contract to an overseas company instead. LORD MAYOR, when will you apologise to Brisbane workers for snubbing them?

Chair: The LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair. I will never apologise for supporting Brisbane workers and Brisbane business, because we have a record that is unparalleled when it comes to any Council Administration in the history of this city, in the history of this city. We are proud of our support for local business and local workers, and what we see on the other side of the Chamber is Councillors that just pay lip service to it, but have never done a single thing to actually support local business, or local workers, for that matter. They simply play politics with important issues like this. We introduced the local preference policy. We introduced the target of having 80% of our contracts awarded to local business.

We are proud of the progress that we’ve made in increasing the number of contracts towards that target. There have been hundreds of millions of dollars’ worth of contracts that have been awarded to local businesses, hundreds of millions of dollars of local contracts. So, what Councillor CASSIDY is doing here is misleading and deceptive, and it’s purely political. We can all see through it. He has asked the same question in three different ways and I have answered it each time, but he doesn’t listen to the answer because he doesn’t want to understand. He just wants to keep making a political point.

I think it’s particularly disappointing, but we will continue to do what we can to support local business, and we will continue to do what we can to be at the cutting edge, as well, when it comes to providing new technology that’s sustainable technology. We are very proud of the fully electric Brisbane Metro project that is gearing up, and we know that that’s a project that has been only criticised by Labor, only criticised. Apparently, Labor is all for electric buses and electric vehicles, except when it comes to anything that’s done by the LNP, and then they find reasons to oppose it. They opposed the fully electric Brisbane Metro. They opposed the free City Loop, which will be fully electric in just a few weeks’ time.

It is a shame that they’ve taken this opposition for opposition’s sake approach, Mr Chair, because it is not good for the people of Brisbane that they behave this way and that they respond this way, because what we’re doing is we’re moving forward to the future of transport in our city. We’re moving forward to an electric fleet. We’re moving forward, whether it’s Brisbane Metro and the fully electric fleet there, or working out how we can best electrify or bring in alternative powertrains to our existing fleet of 1,200 buses. I can report, for example, that so far this year, we have invested $648 million into contracts with local Brisbane business, 648 million.

What we have here is Councillor CASSIDY taking a very small contract in the scheme of things, a trial of four buses, which no local manufacturers could provide when we went out to tender, and he is trying to mislead the people of Brisbane. The people at Brisbane aren’t dummies, Councillor CASSIDY, they can see through this political approach, but what they do see is these $648 million of investment that we’re making in local business with local contracts. That makes a real difference. That supports workers, that supports jobs, and that supports a brighter future for our city. That’s about building a better Brisbane, yet we have Labor playing silly political games with important issues and it’s a shame, Mr Chair.

Chair: Further questions?

Councillor HUTTON.

Councillor CASSIDY: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor CASSIDY.

**MOTION FOR SUSPENSION OF STANDING RULES:**

**727/2020-21**

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

*The Lord Mayor apologise to local bus manufacturers and their workforce for snubbing them in favour of overseas manufacturers for contracts to supply goods and services.*

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY, we’ll reset your clock. You have three minutes to urgency, please.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair. This is urgent because we have today witnessed this LNP Administration snubbing local manufacturers for the production of electric buses for this City Loop trial. This is urgent, Chair, because we’re in the middle of an economic recovery, when supporting local jobs in the local economy is paramount, and this LORD MAYOR is doing the exact opposite. He is sending bus contracts off to a company founded by the Chinese Communist Party. It’s urgent, Chair, because we know that there were clearly options to buy local here in Brisbane and in South East Queensland. This electric bus contract could and should have been awarded to a local company, and this is, Chair, a slap in the face of Brisbane workers.

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY, just back to—okay, everybody calm down.

Councillor CASSIDY, just on urgency, please.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thank you, Chair. This is urgent because this LNP Council Administration is ruining Council’s reputation here in Brisbane. Brisbane residents and workers are seeing this LNP Administration for who they truly are, selfish and unsupportive of local industry. It’s urgent, Chair, because this decision has essentially now shut down bus building at Eagle Farm, where buses have been built for this Council by local workers since 2008, and before that, they were built at Toowong, thanks to Jim Soorley, Maureen Hayes, and Labor.

It’s urgent, Chair, because this month is the final month that a Brisbane-made bus is rolling off that production line into Brisbane’s bus fleet. It’ll be the end of a buy local era for manufacturing here in Brisbane, all on this LORD MAYOR’s watch, Chair. It’s urgent because a Local Government should be doing everything, everything in its power to support local jobs, and buying buses from China, importing buses from overseas, is not doing that, Chair.

It’s urgent, Chair, that this LORD MAYOR apologise because we need to restore Council’s reputation with and relationship with local manufacturers and workers, and if not, they may not bid for future Council contracts when they know they are not going to be supported by this LORD MAYOR and LNP.

Chair: We will now put the resolution on the matter of urgency.

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

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

The voting was as follows:

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

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

Chair: Councillor HUTTON. Your question please.

Councillor HUTTON: Thank you, Chair.

Chair: Your question, please.

**Question 9**

Councillor HUTTON: My question is to the Chair of the Infrastructure Committee, Councillor McLACHLAN. Councillor McLACHLAN, Council has recently reached a number of milestones with infrastructure projects, including the completion of lights at Montague Road and Victoria Street, West End. Can you outline how the Schrinner Council is tackling congestion, getting residents home quicker and safer, improving safety for pedestrians, and building and improving infrastructure across our city?

Chair: Councillor McLACHLAN.

Councillor McLACHLAN: Thank you, Mr Chair, and through you, thanks to Councillor HUTTON for the question. Mr Chair, the ordinary business as usual for the Schrinner Council Administration is to plan for and deliver infrastructure upgrades for our residents day in, day out. The Schrinner Administration has a proven track record in building a better Brisbane, and I’m delighted that our team is delivering upgrades throughout the city and getting results to help Brisbane’s residents get home both quicker and safer, be they in cars, on buses, commuting by bike or walking.

Mr Chair, we all see congestion busting projects and safety enhancement projects being delivered all around our city every day. Two in particular are good examples of projects nearing completion over the next couple of weeks, which will be of benefit to all our residents, but there are many other projects, as well. In West End, as mentioned in the question, the Montague Road/Victoria Street intersection upgrade is an important infrastructure improvement for the residents of West End and those traveling to and from work in the precinct. It is crucial that Council continues to deliver important projects that start with looking at how the road network is working.

This was an intersection built on a rise in the road, creating blind spots that were dangerous for pedestrians attempting to cross the increasingly busy road. In addition to this intersection upgrade, the speed limit was reduced to 50 kilometres an hour, as endorsed by the Speed Management Committee comprising the Council, the police, and Transport and Main Roads. Steps have been taken to prioritise accessibility for pedestrians and active transport users by making the footpaths wider and safer to tie in with the new road levels. The hump has been taken out. Verge space has been allocated for new tree plantings and integrating these with the new signalised pedestrian crossing, which will be turned on very soon.

Councillor SRI, to your question last week about trees in West End, I understand that there’ll be six trees planted at this intersection. So, space has been allocated as part of this project for the planting of several trees, six in total. Tulipwoods, Bennett’s Ashes, in particular, so you’ll be seeing new trees being planted there, to your question from last week. Other, more significant aspects of this intersection upgrade have been the inclusion of an indented bus stop and a designated right-turn lane from Montague Road into Victoria Street.

So, Mr Chair, this was more than just installing traffic lights at an intersection, while upgraded to a wider intersection with the addition of traffic lights and the new left-turn lane, the project has been undertaken without the need for property resumption, which is sometimes necessary when making network improvements, but fortunately not needed here in this project.

Mr Chair, infrastructure upgrades are not just restricted to roads. Just across the river from City Hall, we’re completing works on the Cultural Centre Riverwalk between the Kurilpa and Victoria Bridges. The Riverwalk was built in 1994 and caters for over 30,000 users each week, and was in need of significant rehabilitation to guarantee the safety of the structure underneath the boardwalk, as well as dealing with warping timber on the surface. These wooden panels have been progressively replaced with fibre-reinforced plastic, which is recycled plastic. I’m pleased to see that being used, which will provide long-term benefits for the Riverwalk and stand the test of time.

The Riverwalk will be reopened to the public in time for the Brisbane Marathon, which will be held here next weekend. Its completion will be a welcome milestone for locals in South Brisbane, as well as those who regularly make use of South Bank’s facilities, and that’s just about everybody in the city. The Riverwalk upgrade is a perfect example of how the Schrinner Administration is getting on with delivering the basics for our city, by investing in safety and undertaking improvements in our active transport networks.

As I said earlier, Mr Chair, right across Brisbane suburbs, residents will see examples of the Schrinner Administration’s commitment to building a better Brisbane. In our north, we have significant projects that are underway with the Hoyland Street and Norris Road upgrades in Bracken Ridge. Council is progressing well with significant works taking place at the Gresham Street Bridge upgrade in Ashgrove. I’m also glad to see that in Brisbane’s west, the significant maintenance work for Walter Taylor Bridge is now complete, which will help to extend the bridge’s lifespan and ensure ongoing safety is guaranteed for users.

Mr Chair, the Schrinner Administration’s investment in infrastructure across our city is a good example of our ongoing commitment to deliver the basics for Brisbane’s residents and to get people home quicker and safer. Whether it’s intersection upgrades, like in highly populated areas like West End or the Riverwalk, which complements our city’s natural landmarks, like the Brisbane River, we are aware that of the ongoing demands of a growing population and we know ongoing infrastructure upgrades are required to keep up with the demand. These are typical, Mr Chair, of the projects the Schrinner Administration is getting on with delivering.

Chair: Councillor McLACHLAN, your time has expired and that concludes Question Time.

Councillors. We will proceed to the consideration of Committee reports.

The Establishment and Coordination Committee, please.

Chair: The LORD MAYOR.

## CONSIDERATION OF COMMITTEE REPORTS:

### ESTABLISHMENT AND COORDINATION COMMITTEE

The Right Honourable, the LORD MAYOR (Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER), Chair of the Establishment and Coordination Committee, moved, seconded by the DEPUTY MAYOR (Councillor Krista ADAMS), that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 17 May 2021, be adopted.

Chair: Is there any debate?

The LORD MAYOR.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor JOHNSTON.

**Seriatim *en bloc* for debate and voting - Clauses B and C**

|  |
| --- |
| At that time, Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON rose and requested that Clause C, TAILORED AMENDMENT TO *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014* – LONG TERM INFRASTRUCTURE PLANS, and Clause D, INTERIM AMENDMENT TO *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014* – LOCAL GOVERNMENT INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN AMENDMENT 1A, be taken seriatim *en bloc* for debating and voting purposes. |

Councillor JOHNSTON: I have a second point of order.

Chair: Yes.

Councillor JOHNSTON: I seek the following further information to enable me to make a decision on the matters before us today. Mr Chairman, I seek information about the total number of projects that are being cut from the LGIP. I seek further information about the total number of projects that have been cut from the LTIP. I seek further information about the number of projects that have been moved between the LGIP and the LTIP. I seek the following information. The LTIP does not provide a timeframe between 2026 and a future date for the Long Term Infrastructure Plan. What is the timeframe for delivery of projects that are now listed on the LTIP?

I seek information about the following projects. There are no dollar figures attached to the information in the amendment to the LTIP, and I’m referring to Part 10, Other plans, Proposed infrastructure amendment 1a, Long Term Infrastructure Plans. There are no dollar figures attached to any of the projects listed in the LTIP. I seek dollar figures for all of the projects listed in the LTIP, together with, as I’ve requested, the years that they will be delivered, between when and when would be helpful. I seek the following further information about the LTIP. Specifically, there are three pipe projects listed on page 18, which are Chelmer pipe, pipe, pipe. I seek information about where that is located in Chelmer. There is a very significant reason for that.

I seek the following further information about the pipe projects listed for Fairfield on page 21. It says, Fairfield pipe, Fairfield Yeronga pipe, Fairfield Yeronga pipe. I’m seeking information about where those projects are located. There is a further project located at Graceville, Chelmer on page 22. I’m seeking information about where that project is located. I’m seeking the further following information about the LTIP. Specifically on page 31, there are a dozen to 15 projects listed for Oxley. They say pipe projects. I’m seeking advice on where they are located. So that would be a street reference if that, uh, if that makes it a little bit clearer for the DEPUTY MAYOR.

I’m seeking the further following information, which is the total value of the projects that have been put into the LTIP relating to the 22 Yeronga stormwater projects on pages 44 and 45. I’m seeking the further following information about the project listed on page 47. It says Bridge Street, Chelmer. What is that project? What is actually listed under the LTIP? I’m seeking the further following information regarding Englefield Road, Oxley, it’s listed on page 49 of the LTIP. What is the nature of the project or the scope of the project that is listed for Englefield Road, Oxley?

I’m seeking further information also on page 49, relating to Fairfield Road. It’s listed as Fairfield Road, Dutton Park, Rocklea, Yeerongpilly, Yeronga, Fairfield. It’s also listed as Fairfield Road, McDowall, but I think that’s a mistake. What is the nature of the project that is listed for Fairfield Road in those multiple suburbs? I’m seeking further information about the project that is listed for Honour Avenue in Sherwood, Chelmer, Graceville on the bottom of page 50 and the top of page 51. What is the nature of that project that is listed on the LTIP?

I’m seeking information about the listing for Ipswich Road through Moorooka, Woolloongabba and Annerley on page 51. What is the nature of that project? I’m seeking information on the proposed Long Street East, Sherwood, Graceville project on page 52 of the LTIP. What is the nature of the project that is proposed? I’m seeking the further following information on page 54 of the LTIP relating to Oxley Road, Chelmer, Oxley, Corinda, Graceville, Sherwood. What is the nature of the project, the scope of the project that is proposed under the LTIP for that listing?

My last question is, or my last information that I’m seeking is, both in the LGIP and the LTIP, how many outstanding backflow valve projects are listed for delivery in the LGIP and the LTIP, and can the DEPUTY MAYOR please provide a list of those locations so they can be identified in the LGIP and the LTIP, as they are not identified as such in the papers before us today?

Chair: LORD MAYOR, can I call upon you to present your report, and can I also ask that when you speak to your report, please keep in mind that items C and D have been taken seriatim for both debate and voting? So, can you please leave comments regarding those to a debate that will occur later in the day?

The LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair. I just wanted to start off by referring to the developing situation at the moment with the fire at a power station in South East Queensland and the impact on approximately 400,000 homes and businesses across the city. It has been reported that the Callide Power Station has experienced a fire and that a number of their turbines are out, and that has led to flow-on impacts right across the South East Queensland power network.

Those impacts include impacts on public infrastructure, such as intersections, where the lights are out or flashing, and that is approximately 360 intersections across Brisbane that are impacted by the power outage. So, these are signalised intersections where the signals aren’t functioning. At least seven of our libraries have been impacted. There were some temporary impacts on the Contact Centre, which is now back up and running again, but I simply wanted to point this situation out to residents and encourage them to stay safe.

At this point in time, if it is at all possible to avoid travel on that road network, that would be a good thing. It is chaos out there with the number of intersections that are down at the moment, and—so avoiding any unnecessary travel is a good thing to do. I know that most travel is not unnecessary, so please stay safe on the roads and we’ll certainly do our best to keep residents updated through the Brisbane Metropolitan Traffic Management Centre and also through our call centre on the latest information as it comes into our possession on this matter. Obviously, we don’t control the power network, but we are very interested in seeing this situation resolved for public safety reasons.

While I’m talking power, I do want to refer to the lighting up of Council assets as I do each week, and today we’re lighting up Council assets for the Red Shield Appeal, which was launched recently at the Brisbane Convention and Exhibition Centre. The Salvation Army, as we know, provides incredible and practical support to meet the social, emotional and material needs of people who are marginalised in society through poverty, health issues and/or unemployment. The Red Shield Appeal is their key annual fundraising event. It’s launched each year in the major capital cities in Australia, and they have ambitious targets in terms of fundraising.

As most charities have found, they are finding it difficult to fundraise compared to normal years due to the COVID-19 situation and the, I guess, reduced ability to hold large functions. So, we saw the breakfast function the other day with less than half of what they would normally be able to fit into a room as a result of COVID‑19 restrictions, but I can say that Council, as well as other levels of government, will continue supporting the Red Shield Appeal, and we as an organisation are proud to be able to donate $10,000 to the Red Shield Appeal each year on behalf of all of us. We’ll be lighting up the Story Bridge, Victoria Bridge, Tropical Dome, and Reddacliff Place sculptures in red to show our support.

Tomorrow marks National Sorry Day. This is a day that is commemorated on 26 May each year to acknowledge, remember and recognise members of the Stolen Generations and the mistreatment of our country’s Indigenous population through the forced removal of children from their families. This is something that I know has touched us all, and something that we all support the recognition and acknowledgement of.

Tomorrow, there’ll be events held, not only here but also around Brisbane, to acknowledge the impact that these policies had on the Stolen Generation. That is something that we do each year as a Council in a bipartisan way to support and acknowledge. In recognition of National Sorry Day, the Tropical Dome at Mount Coot-tha, Story Bridge and Victoria Bridge and the Reddacliff Place sculptures will be lit in black, yellow and red tomorrow night.

Thursday’s the start of Australia’s Biggest Morning Tea, which is the annual community fundraiser organised by the Queensland Cancer Council, a fantastic organisation that raises vital funds for those impacted by cancer. The Reddacliff Place sculptures and Victoria Bridge will be lit in yellow on Thursday night in support of Australia’s Biggest Morning Tea.

Thursday also marks LGBTI (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex) Domestic Violence Awareness Day. DVConnect and the Queensland Council for LGBTI Health are hosting an inaugural day of remembrance for LGBTI victims and survivors. The Story Bridge and Tropical Dome will be lit in rainbow colours on Thursday night in support of this important awareness campaign.

I did want to reflect on the issue that was raised by Councillor CASSIDY in Question Time, and Councillor CASSIDY asked me to apologise. He does this from time to time. Apparently, I’m supposed to apologise for things that apparently I have done, but I really do think when you look at the facts here, it is Councillor CASSIDY that should be apologising. When will Councillor CASSIDY apologise for trying to mislead the people of Brisbane on the nature of this bus trial?

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: When will Councillor CASSIDY admit that he was asleep at the wheel when this contract came through Council in October last year? He suddenly sort of wakes up today and puts forward an urgency motion, yet this contract came through and was reported to this Council in October last year, and in fact, the buses are in Brisbane. They’ve arrived. They’re here. They’re going to hit the streets shortly, and suddenly Councillor CASSIDY thinks this is an urgent issue.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: I think that Councillor CASSIDY needs to apologise to the local bus companies for misrepresenting their role in the tender process, because he mentioned two companies, specifically, both of whom did not submit a proposal in our tender process. Why? Because they couldn’t meet the requirements. That was their choice. It wasn’t our decision to exclude them. They did not put in a proposal.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: So Councillor CASSIDY needs to apologise for completely misrepresenting the situation and apologising for not supporting more sustainable transport in our city, through either this electric bus trial or through the Brisbane Metro which he continues to oppose. It is very disappointing, Mr Chair, the approach that is taken by this Opposition Leader.

Item A is the Annual Operational Planning Quarterly Report for March 2021, and it reflects once again the strong and responsible management of the city’s finances and the strong delivery of projects and improvements right across Brisbane, across the suburbs of Brisbane, creating a better Brisbane and better suburbs. It also highlights some important points here, which is the support, the type of support that Council has been able to provide during the difficult period of COVID-19.

Now there are very much positive signs now showing in the economy, both across Australia and locally here in Brisbane and South East Queensland. Now we’re not entirely out of the woods, but the bounce back in Australia and in particular in Brisbane—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —has been virtually unparalleled anywhere in the world. We had at certain times diabolical predictions of unemployment rates of up to 15%. Yet now we’ve got a prediction that unemployment will be less than five per cent in the near future. That is a positive thing and it’s positive to see strong economic growth locally and across the economy.

Last year was obviously a challenging year and going across to the current financial year and there were impacts on Council’s revenues and we’ve pointed that out many times before. We also stepped up and for example providing the special COVID-19 rebate and also the KSD (Kingsford Smith Drive) rebate, special rebate. A combined total of some $31 million of relief for the ratepayers of Brisbane.

A relief package which saw, for the very first time in the city’s history, rates actually going down in a financial year. The average residential rate bill this financial year went down.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Compared to the year before. That’s because of the $31 million of investment that we made in providing those rebates. That’s because we did the responsible thing in running a responsible budget.

Chair: LORD MAYOR your time has expired.

**728/2020-21**

At that point, the LORD MAYOR was granted an extension of time on the motion of the DEPUTY MAYOR (Councillor Krista ADAMS), seconded by Councillor Ryan MURPHY.

Chair: LORD MAYOR, a further 10 minutes.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you to the Chamber. That’s also because, Mr Chair, that we had to make some challenging decisions. Like the pause in kerbside collection.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Something which Labor talks about repeatedly but one thing they forget is where that money was reinvested.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Where did it go Councillor MACKAY?

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Did it go into someone’s back pocket?

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Well yes, it did. It went into the back pocket of clubs and community groups and sporting organisations.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: It went to help them reduce their bills. There was more than $3 million in grants paid to community groups during COVID-19 to help them with their bills.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Then there was an incredible level of support, something like $18 million that went into supporting local business in a time of need. That included things like waving all business permit fees and licence fees and rents right across the city for business. Footpath dining charges wiped, food business licences wiped.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Advertising fees wiped, application fees wiped. All of that money that was saved through kerbside collection went straight back to the community. Straight back to the community.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: So what we see here is the helpful Labor Opposition encouraging people to get into illegal dumping. Because that’s effectively—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —what they are doing.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: If you have a look—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: No, no.

LORD MAYOR: —if you have a look—

Chair: Councillors.

LORD—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: —no.

LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: If you have a look—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —at the areas where the illegal dumping is the highest—

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —it’s in those Labor wards—

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —where their Councillors have been saying, you know what?

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Someone else’s fault.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Someone else’s fault—

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —you can do what you want, yes. It’s that terrible LORD MAYOR you know, just put your stuff out—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —on the kerb. I think it’s disgraceful—

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —and reprehensible that they would take this approach in a time of crisis. In a time when we have paused kerbside collection—

Councillor GRIFFITHS: Point of order.

LORD MAYOR: —to help the—

Chair: Point of order—

LORD MAYOR: —people of Brisbane.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor GRIFFITHS.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor GRIFFITHS: I actually find the LORD MAYOR’s comments really distasteful and untrue—

Chair: Okay.

Councillor GRIFFITHS: I don’t believe he can back it up—

Chair: But that’s not a point of order.

Councillor GRIFFITHS: I request he withdraw them.

Chair: No, no.

LORD MAYOR, please continue.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: You’ve got—

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Mr Chair, I’ve been asked for proof.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: I’m more than happy to because we are aware, Mr Chair, of multiple occasions where Labor Councillors, including the so-called Leader of the Opposition, have gone to do a media stunt at a site of illegally dumped material. So the cameras turn up, Councillor CASSIDY gets all angry and says—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —it’s the LNP’s fault that people illegally dump, but then what does he do? Does he report it to Council to get it cleaned up?

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: No.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: No, he doesn’t.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: He doesn’t. He walks away, he turns his back because, apparently, it’s someone else’s fault.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: If you have a look at some specific examples.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Councillor CASSIDY’s kerbside stunt on the 8 April in Rowell Street, Zillmere, he found the items—he stood there, used it as a prop and then walked away, never reporting the illegal dumping—

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —so that it could be cleaned up. Guess who reported it? Us, we did. We did the right thing. But you know what? Councillor CASSIDY, once the cameras are off, doesn’t care. Doesn’t care—

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Doesn’t do his job. Thereby facilitating people that are doing the wrong thing and facilitating these issues—

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —not being cleaned up. We also saw on 11 February where he pulled another illegal dumping media stunt at Zillmere, but did not report the material that had been dumped. You know who reported it?

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Councillor MARX.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Councillor MARX, the Chair of City Standards, because she cares about city standards.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: She cares. She’s the one that is out there taking the lead from the front, in the field.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: I am proud of our Councillors, like Councillor MARX, that do the right thing.

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Councillor CASSIDY and his team should be ashamed of themselves for the way that they’ve approached this issue. Absolutely ashamed of themselves. Because yes, there were some challenging decisions to be made like pausing kerbside collection, but all of that money went straight back into the community. Went straight back into—

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —the community groups, the sporting groups, supporting local business.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: That has been a really good thing and something that we should all be proud of rather than playing petty political games with.

Now another thing that I would point out in relation to these two financial documents that are here in front of us, both the quarterly report and the Third Budget Review (3BR), is that we made a deliberate decision to run a surplus budget and a surplus budget with a relatively small surplus. But one that would give us a buffer zone in case the situation deteriorated further.

I did want to point out again that that is exactly what happened. Because from the time when the budget was released in June last year, the income coming into this Council has deteriorated further than what we anticipated. So we saw an initial surplus of 195 million predicted. But we’re seeing in the budget review and the quarterly financial review, a further confirmation that that is now down to less than 100 million.

So there’s been a further deterioration in the income coming into Council. So we made the right decision to have that small surplus, that buffer zone. We knew that things would evolve quickly, we knew that the situation would evolve quickly. So that buffer zone has enabled us to get through a very difficult year and to provide the support to the community and local business that we’ve been able to do.

It was the right thing to do and I remember distinctly, what did Councillor CASSIDY say about the surplus? He said it was bizarre, it was bizarre that any government would try and get a surplus or a balanced budget.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: I think that says everything you need to know about the Labor team—

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: It is bizarre. They think it’s bizarre that you would run a balanced budget—

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: I wonder how Councillor CASSIDY runs his household budget?

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Does he go for a surplus or a deficit?

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Does the credit card get bigger and bigger each year?

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Is that what happens? I wonder.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: All right, all right, we’ve all had some fun.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: We’ve all had fun, back on topic please.

LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: But look we’re talking about—

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —we’re talking about public funds here and we strive always to run a balanced budget.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: Not with a massive surplus—

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: This is not about storing up any kind of massive surplus. This is about making sure—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —that our income and our expenditure match. That’s the right way to run a budget. We will continue to do that and to have that buffer zone has been important this year because it’s allowed us to provide support for our community during times of need. So, Mr Chair, I commend these financial reports to the Chamber. They are evidence of how we’ve been investing in the community, building infrastructure, supporting local jobs and supporting community groups and small business as well.

Item B is the Information and Communications Technology Policy, ICT23, and the Information Management and Record Keeping Policy. These items related to updates for Council’s ICT22 and ICT23 policies. The purpose of the ICT22 policy is to establish Council’s strategic direction and framework for the coordination and management and use of ICT products and services. It has been updated significantly with continued focus on a centre-led approach to ICT spending and decision making.

ICT23 is a policy that has been renamed from Information Management and Record Keeping Policy to Information Asset and Record Keeping Policy, to reflect the amendments made in the review. The policy reflects Council’s focus on managing information as an asset through the lifestyle management—lifecycle management, sorry—and updates are in line with legislation and in accordance with Council’s information and security classification process.

Through to item E, which is the major amendment to the City Plan Eight Mile Plains neighbourhood plan. Obviously, this planning work commenced as part of our gearing up for the Brisbane Metro project.

*Councillors interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: A very exciting project which will help transform our city’s public transport system with the turn-up-and-go, fully electric service which we’re very proud of and which is really gearing up. The plan area is well located, close to public transport, including the proposed Brisbane Metro station and also between major motorways as well. There’s a significant employment cluster established in the Brisbane Technology Park, the Garden City Office Park and the Freeway Office Park. The remainder of the plan area is predominantly low rise housing—

*Councillor interjecting.*

LORD MAYOR: —along that precinct. The draft plan aims to support the ongoing development of advanced technology and manufacturing businesses in Brisbane, particularly in the technology park precinct, and also facilitate residential growth close to well‑located public transport facilities such as Brisbane Metro station. So the draft neighbourhood plan is being presented for endorsement to proceed to the first State interest review, prior to proceeding to consultation later this year. I think that’s it, Mr Chair, thank you.

Chair: Further speakers?

Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair, I rise to speak on these items—A, B, E and F before us today.

**Seriatim - Clause E**

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

Chair: Please proceed.

Councillor CASSIDY: Clause A, the Annual Operation Plan Progress and Quarterly Financial Report for the period ending March 2021. The purpose of this report of course is to update us all and the public on the progress that has been made so far in the Council budget. It’s bad news for ratepayers, Chair. At three quarters of the way through this budget—through this financial year, nearly every project or program is lagging behind.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: The word rephased—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: —appears 141 times.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: The term, timing of delivery, is mentioned 31 times. The phrases that are missing, Chair are, due to this incompetent LNP Administration and it’s clear the LNP can’t be trusted with residents’ money. Nearly every program is underspent on capital and expenses, and the Clean, Green, Sustainable Brisbane, 39% of the capital budget has been spent at 75% of the way through the budget. Infrastructure for Brisbane, only 50% of the capital has been spent. Only 30% of the Future Brisbane budget has been expended.

Parks maintenance has been cut by $6.4 million, community facilities planning has been cut by $2.1 million this year. $27 million has been cut from resurfacing and bridge and culvert works in our outer suburbs. $8 million in local traffic improvements cut from the 2020-21 financial year, Chair.

This is a litany of bad financial management and poor project planning by this LORD MAYOR and the LNP. The only thing that has increased is the money that Council has received from developers. So, while rates continue to go up and services continue to go down, Chair, the LNP LORD MAYOR continues to prioritise developers over residents.

Clause B, Chair, which is the ICT—Information and Communications Technology Policy. This plus the Information Management and Record Keeping Policy, two policies. The ICT policy was first introduced in 2009 and was reviewed in 2015 with no changes. It was due for another review in 2018, but we’re only seeing a proposed amendment document before us today, three years too late.

The review for the Information Management and Record Keeping Policy was also due for review three years ago. So I think the LORD MAYOR needs to check his watch, Chair. He also needs a history lesson because what this report lacks in detail is that Council’s approach to ICT spending and decision making very rarely delivers the best value investments. We all know what happened when Council awarded that IT contract to TechnologyOne for its cloud platform, a $60 million blowout, that’s almost 10 years’ worth of kerbside collections, Chair. How about the outsourcing of ICT to HCL which cost 55 people in Council their jobs?

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: It led to wage theft, discrimination and exploitation of IT contract staff on this Administration’s watch.

These are the opposite of best value investments, as mentioned in this report, Chair. They weren’t good deals for ratepayers and they weren’t good deals for workers. We won’t be opposing these policies today, Chair. We certainly don’t support modern day slavery and huge cost blowouts on this LNP Administration’s watch.

Clause E which is the major amendment to the City Plan for the Eight Mile Plains Gateway neighbourhood plan. Council previously resolved to include the Eight Mile Plains Gateway neighbourhood plan on 26 March 2019. The draft that we have before us today is going to the State Government, the Minister for State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning for the State interest review and then out for community consultation.

We support the item going to the State interest check and community consultation and reserve our opinion of the plan pending that feedback and how that feedback is incorporated into the final plan. We do, however, hold grave concerns for community consultation. Given the LNP’s track record, Chair. I certainly hope that the residents in the Eight Mile Plains Gateway neighbourhood plan area are listened to and their views are taken seriously.

We certainly hope they’re not berated, ignored and patronised by this LNP Administration like so many other residents have been for trying to speak out. Whether that’s at New Farm, Spring Hill or the Enoggera Creek area, Chair.

Clause F is the Third Budget Review, the final item in this lot here. Again we see basic work in the suburbs has been delayed or cut, even though some of this work has been receiving funding from other levels of government. So another budget review, Chair and another piece of neglect from this LNP LORD MAYOR for our suburbs.

You know why, Chair? Because suburban upgrades don’t stroke this LORD MAYOR’s ego. They don’t get him on TV, they don’t get his face on—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: —glossy brochures. If it’s not newsworthy, Chair, this LNP LORD MAYOR doesn’t want to know about it. Almost $3.5 million for active transport infrastructure has been pushed back a year.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: $920,000 in bikeway works funded by a State Government grant to help Council boost the local economy has been pushed out to next financial year. $11 million in capital has been cut from the accessible bus stop program and spending on active school travel and safer paths for seniors has been cut. Over $3 million in intersection upgrades in the suburbs like Nundah and West End are delayed. Millions of dollars allocated for roadworks under the Better Roads for Brisbane scheme at Bracken Ridge, Ransome, Mount Gravatt East and Rochedale have been delayed. Over $1 million in road resurfacing works have been pushed back too, Chair.

Even spending, you know it’s a litany of underspending in the suburbs, Chair. But even spending on inner city projects like the green bridges. Which were allegedly being fast-tracked, have been held up and $7 million in funding now has been pushed back to next year. Nearly $2 million for new CityCats has been delayed, Chair. Even projects that this LNP LORD MAYOR hangs his hat on are being delayed.

At a time when we need to support local jobs and local industry and boost Brisbane’s economy, we see more delays and more cuts on LORD MAYOR Adrian SCHRINNER’s watch. This review really showcases the LNP’s inconsistency, Chair, when it comes to Brisbane. Let’s take a look at the Brisbane Metro project. Federal Government was supposed to hand over $80 million for this project his financial year, but that’s been put off again to next financial year. Perhaps they took a closer look at the project, Chair, and released how poorly planned it has been from the start and now thinking twice about their support.

The allocation for the Brisbane Metro operational readiness has also been pushed back by a year. Not a good sign for that project which has already been plagued by delays and hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars’ worth of cost blowouts. This review is riddled with examples of poor management and planning by the LNP, Chair. The much toted spending on koala research has been cut.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: $2.5 million on rehabilitation of parkland and sports and recreation land has been put off to next year. Works on Nudgee Recreation Reserve and Wally Tate Park are delayed to next year, as well as maintenance in suburban parks. The Bushland Acquisition program has had a boost in revenue, Chair, but a reduction in capital spending.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: Surprise, surprise.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: Drainage construction works—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: —have been delayed. Almost $1 million in the Village Precinct Projects has been pushed out to next year. Spending on business and local economy support and the Economic Recovery Taskforce has been cut. But the big ticket item is a $133 million expenditure for an unexpected purchase of the Sherwood bus depot. Buying back that bus depot that we used to own, after selling it for just $21 million and renting it out for more than a decade, Chair.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: There is something that hasn’t been cut though, Chair. There is an item that hasn’t been cut, it’s obscene, but it is not entirely surprising. It’s this LNP LORD MAYOR’s advertising budget. We see every single dollar allocated to his self‑promotion and advertising spend, spent on time, every time, Chair. I’m sure Brisbane residents would love to see a cut to the $5.2 million being spent on the *Living in Brisbane* newsletters with the LORD MAYOR’s face all over them.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor CASSIDY: What we’re not seeing as well, Chair, is a cut to this LNP LORD MAYOR’s $100,000 unaudited, unaccountable allowance, but we do see cuts to kerbside collection, Chair, and Brisbane residents are angry.

Chair: Further speakers?

Councillor HUANG.

Councillor HUANG: Oh, thank you, Mr Chair. I rise to speak on item E of the E&C report on the Eight Mile Plains neighbourhood plan. Mr Chair, I would like to start by congratulating and commending the work of Schrinner Council in delivering on the Eight Mile Plains neighbourhood plan.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor HUANG: This is a blueprint that achieves good balance that guarantees the future growth of the area while keeping the enviable lifestyle that local residents will continue to enjoy. Eight Mile Plains is part of Brisbane’s new global precinct. It is strategically located at the junction between Southeast Freeway, Gateway Motorway and Logan Road. Despite all the stories about where the name Eight Mile Plains coming from, Eight Mile Plains is 20 minutes to the city, 25 minutes to the airport and 45 minutes to the Gold Coast.

The Metro depot and the terminus station are both within this neighbourhood plan. This significant, in fact probably the biggest, investment in Brisbane’s public transport history not only going to create jobs and business opportunities, but will change people’s travel behaviour forever.

Eight Mile Plains is also the home to Brisbane’s Technology Park, RACQ (Royal Automobile Club of Queensland) and a number of office parks. It is an important employment hub for Brisbane, and an economic powerhouse for Brisbane’s future. Eight Mile Plains is also a place with a significant multicultural religious precinct. Whether it’s the Korean Church, Chinese Taoist Temple, Bosnian Mosque or Sikh Temple, Eight Mile Plains showcases how attractive and inclusive Brisbane is.

This neighbourhood plan reinforces the unique characteristics of Eight Mile Plains and the strength of transport convenience, employment potential, vibrant multiculturalism and a blissful environment. But I must admit there is still complaint from the residents about this neighbourhood plan. The enterprising residents of Eight Mile Plains they come and complain to me about not being included in this neighbourhood plan.

So, Mr Chair, I would like to once again congratulate the Schrinner Council Administration in delivering on this neighbourhood plan. That is future proofing our local suburbs and has a wider economic impact to our city. I commend the report to the Chamber.

Chair: Further speakers? Further speakers?

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Oh yes, thank you. I rise to speak on items A, B and F. I just want to start with item B, the Information and Communications Technology Policy. I noted in his speech, the LORD MAYOR described this as setting the strategic direction for Council. If that is the purpose of the policy before us today, then it has absolutely failed in its intention. I just want to run through a few of the issues. Some of which I’ve raised in this Chamber many times previously.

But I want to start with the fact that Councillors who log jobs for their residents to have them fixed, repaired and so on, compromises about 25% of all jobs that are registered with Council for carrying out. We still do not have technology that connects us into Council.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: There is a person who sits in a call centre—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: —and that person retypes the information that we log electronically into our Council provided computer systems. Our Council provided computer systems in the ward offices do not integrate with Council software. So as a result, we have people performing a manual task and it is leading to significant ongoing problems. Now I’ve raised that many times in this Chamber.

You would think with the billions of dollars that Council spends on software acquisition, that 25% of all of its customer service obligations, perhaps, should make an effort to make sure that the IT systems that Council has supports their effective integration into Council core business. That has not happened. I’m still waiting. Two, the computers, Thursday and Friday last week, our computers didn’t work.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: This is a regular occurrence in the ward office. Thursday they were down for half a day. Friday they were down for hours because the Council papers were so large they could not be downloaded. This required multiple callouts to IT, multiple visits by IT and hours and hours of time that my staff and I do not have trying to rectify inadequate computer support for our ward offices.

Finally, the best one and remember, this is the LORD MAYOR saying he wants to be really strategic about the direction of IT services. I just want to refer to Council’s rollout of the new phone system.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: So last week we were advised that Council was installing a new phone system in the ward office. We were told there would be one incoming line. If it was not answered within 20 seconds it would automatically divert to voicemail. No one else in the office could pick up a call from any other phone. Now our offices—and I’m sure we all do things slightly differently—but effectively our offices have multiple phone lines at the moment. Staff can pick them up at any phone, depending on what they are doing.

I’m sure, like most other offices, we have a huge amount of foot traffic, we have emails, we have phone calls. We’re not just sitting there waiting like some receptionist to answer the phone. The fact that Council thought it was okay for the phones to ring for 20 seconds and then divert to voicemail shows how hopeless this scoping of the project has been. The delivery of the project and the installation of the project.

It was immediately apparent to me in the briefing note that this system was not fit for purpose. It’s not been explained to me why it’s being done. I believe it may be because Cisco Systems we currently use are slightly more expensive than the Microsoft Teams solution that Council is going to put in, but no one conducted, to my knowledge, any trials in any ward offices. No one.

So it’s okay for the 7,000 or 8,000 Council officers who have a dedicated phone number attached to them. Who don’t perform a call centre type function in their offices. What I don’t understand—and perhaps Councillor Adam ALLAN will stand up and tell us if he is responsible for this—is what ward office trials were done to ensure that this system was appropriate for the ward office environment?

Remember 25% of all Council’s customer service obligations come through ward offices. Now, apparently, I wasn’t Robinson Crusoe in raising this. So good on whoever it was that also spoke up because this has been botched, absolutely botched. This is what happens when Council refuses to work collaboratively with Councillors and ward offices to deliver on proper IT support for our ward offices.

Finally on the Third Budget Review. Like Councillor CASSIDY, it is quite shocking to read through the Third Budget Review this time round. Often, they’re bad, often there’s just cuts rollovers, delays, but this is across the board. Across the board. So we just have to remember that this Administration has a huge majority. They’ve got multiple Chairpeople, they’ve got 8,000, 9,000 Council officers at their disposal. They’ve got a budget of $3 billion and they can’t even resurface streets.

They’ve been unable to deliver on their stormwater budget. They’ve been unable to deliver on parks projects. They’ve been unable to deliver on Village Precinct Projects. They’ve been unable to deliver on—look, every single area. Drainage is a massive one, there’s a huge problem with drainage. There are both carryovers and cuts to drainage projects. It’s being rolled over simply because they cannot get the work done. This is your job, through you, Mr Chairman. It is the job of the Chairs to make sure that the budget is carried out within their departments.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: What is going so wrong? These things aren’t even rolling over from this year to next year. Some of them are actually rolling over two years in advance. Now we don’t even know if they’ll appear in the budget next year. But there are a whole host of issues in here that are just a reflection of the grossly inadequate financial management of this LNP Administration.

They’ve even failed to deliver on their long-term transport planning project. So there’s been cuts there, $3.2 million cut. It’s just a phenomenal amount of money. That’s on long-term planning for our city. So they can’t even—whatever’s going on, okay maybe you can’t get enough people to put bitumen on the road. But are there really not enough engineers and town planners out there to help us with our long-term planning? I really don’t think that’s the case.

There is millions of dollars being cut right across the board. There are blowouts, massive blowouts and I’m just looking at the CityCat and ferry operating subsidies. We know that’s because the CityCats don’t work properly. So, they’re too noisy and there’s problems. So there’s that. There’s all the other ferries that are on hold somewhere in dry dock. Who knows if they’re being fixed or if they’re ever going to come back into service.

So we just don’t know what this Administration is doing. There’s less people on our buses very clearly, millions of dollars in decreases in revenue there. We’re seeing a $2.5 million cut in the Bridges and Culvert program. It looks like it’s a huge cut to the congestion busting projects. Oh yes, Ipswich Road and Cracknell Road, that was a good one. You offer a few constructive solutions on how you can improve a project for pedestrians as well as cars, and this Administration cuts it. Councillor McLACHLAN with no authority to do so, stands up in this Chamber and stomps his feet and goes no, we’re not doing it and he cancelled it.

So it’s listed, interestingly enough in the LGIP to be done in a future year but the funding is being cut in the budget. So how do you put a project which is supposed to be delivered in your LGIP but you don’t actually reallocate your funding over to a future year? That’s a cut. It’s not rolling over from one year to the next, it’s just been cut.

But as Councillor CASSIDY noted and I just have to say there’s quite a lot of other stuff. But I do just have to finish on the Sherwood bus depot. $133 million down the toilet because of the poor financial management of this Council Administration. They are playing loose and fast with ratepayers’ funds. There is no way, no way we should be spending $133 million buying back an asset that we’ve already purchased previously that we’ve paid commercial rent for.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor JOHNSTON: Then we’re now going to sell it again to the CBIC (City of Brisbane Investment Corporation) and pay probably even more commercial rent for. This is a shell game with ratepayers’ money and it is an inappropriate use of Council funds. It is a waste of money and $133 million could fix almost every single project in Tennyson Ward and probably Councillor GRIFFITHS’ ward and probably Councillor STRUNK’s ward and probably Councillor CUMMING’s ward. Councillor SRI’s got more problems, he might not—might not be enough for him.

But that’s a huge amount of money and this Administration is wasting it on a financial transaction that is unnecessary and is simply a matter of transferring an asset to the CBIC where we’re going to pay even more money. More money. We’ll probably get locked into a 20-year or a 30-year lease with the CBIC at the top commercial market rate. I’ll be fascinated to see that lease when it comes through. Just to see what it is because that’s more money—

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, Councillor JOHNSTON your time has expired.

Further speakers?

Councillor LANDERS.

Councillor LANDERS: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Point of order to you.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

|  |
| --- |
| **729/2020-21**  At that time, 4.08pm, it was resolved on the motion of Councillor Sandy LANDERS, seconded by Councillor Sarah HUTTON, that the meeting adjourn for a period of 15 minutes, to commence only when all Councillors had vacated the Chamber and the doors had been locked.  Council stood adjourned at 4.11pm. |

**UPON RESUMPTION:**

Chair: Welcome back, everybody.

Further speakers on the E&C report?

Councillor ADAMS.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair. I rise to speak on item E, which is the Eight Mile Plains Gateway neighbourhood plan. This is a plan that has been a little long while in the making, because we did have a bit of a blip here last year. But thank you, Councillor HUANG, for your comments and I think what you said was exactly right. This is about making sure we continue to support the operations of the business opportunities and the employment that we have in the Eight Mile Plains Gateway, considering we are so close to the new Metro station. We also have the Brisbane Technology Park, which is such a very important part of this area to make sure we have industrial line, industrial and technology into the future.

It runs along the crossover between the Gateway and the Pacific Motorway, again very highly centred for a transport node as well. Of course, there are other large important spaces on this map, like the continue to establish places of worship on Logan, Millers and Underwood Road as well. So what we see is development of small-scale retail within the technology park to improve the amenity. We retain the existing low density residential housing in most of the plan area, but make sure we also give housing choice in locations near schools, services, employment and public transport infrastructure.

The idea is that we can attract and retain advanced technology and manufacturing industry at key locations to support employment growth within the study area as well. So the community planning team meetings, information kiosk, newsletters, eBird, interactive mapping and online surveys, all were released for community consultation from 18 November to 16 December and there were 65 comments in response, with a range of matters. Once adopted, the plan will be part of City Plan and used to guide the assessment in this very important area in Brisbane.

Chair: Further speakers?

Councillor ALLAN.

Councillor ALLAN: Thank you, Mr Chair. I rise to speak on items A, F and if I get to it, item B. Now quickly, item A is the Annual Operational Plan and Quarterly Financial Report for March 2021, or to March 2021. The Council’s Annual Operating Progress Plan and Quarterly Report reflects our financial and operational results for the period ended 26 March 2021 and is a point in time report, as we often say in this Chamber, in relation to Council’s budget. It also records variances in the delivery of the 2021 Annual Plan. In this report, it provides an overview of the commercial operations and financial wellbeing of Council’s business activities.

In terms of Council’s performance against key financial ratios and targets for the period ended March 2021, all results are within the targets. Not only does this demonstrate effective management of financial risks, it also goes to the heart of this Administration’s strong commitment to sound financial controls. To echo the words of the LORD MAYOR, while we are certainly seeing some broad-based positive economic signs in terms of employment and economic recovery, there continues to be a few lingering impacts from COVID-19 reflected in this report.

I’d have to say, based on Councillor CASSIDY’s comments, that he seems to be living in a parallel universe where COVID-19 didn’t exist and all our projects would run smoothly and be delivered on time, when clearly COVID-19 had a major impact on the first half of this financial year and the projects that were commenced during that period. It’s obviously tipped over into this particular part of the financial year. So we’ve seen a situation where the first six months of the financial year were quite heavily impacted by COVID-19.

Our ability to deliver key projects was impacted and while, to some extent, that’s obviously been alleviated as we’ve moved into the first quarter of this calendar year, the recovery has only commenced in recent months. So we still have a bit of an overlay where projects are catching up, but we would expect them to catch up over coming months. So this report depicts a number of items of note and particularly an increase in discounts and rebates, mainly due to the special COVID-19 rebate and the Kingsford Smith Drive rebate, which as the LORD MAYOR indicated went straight back into the pockets of the residents of Brisbane.

There was a decrease in developer contributions due to the lower level of developer activities in the current period. An increase in depreciation and amortisation costs, mainly due to higher depreciation for infrastructure assets of $62.5 million, as a result of infrastructure asset revaluations undertaken in the prior year. We’ve also seen an increase in cash and cash equivalents, due to net cash generated from operations of $492.5 million, net proceeds from working capital facilities of $189.5 million, receipt of capital contributions, donations, grants and subsidies to the tune of $89.5 million and proceeds from disposal of capital assets of $30.8 million.

This is partly offset by payments for capital expenditure of $553 million, principal lease payments of $63.1 million and principal payments of borrowings of $55.9 million. There has been an increase in property, plant and equipment, mainly due to capital expenditure of $553.2 million. Non-developer donated assets of $63.8 million, developer contributed assets of $41.9 million, asset upgrades for service concession assets of $11.3 million and these are partly offset by deprecation of $329.7 million. The transfer of the Sherwood bus depot to assets classified as held for sale of $133 million. Disposals of $55.6 million and a revaluation decrement of land of $18.7 million. So, key projects attributable to these listed are on page 4 of the report.

Now moving to Program 8 in City Governance, the quarterly reports show movements in the budget as a result of increased revenues, rephasing, deferrals of some projects due to COVID-19 and also the nature of receipts and expenditures of State and Federal stimulus funding. On the whole, we’ve seen an increase in actual revenues of circa $40 million when compared to the year to date actuals of the 2020-21 budget. This is significantly comprised of the early termination of the Sherwood bus depot lease and revenues associated with new accounting standards for service concessions to the tune of approximately $28.4 million.

Turning to the annual plan implementation variances, you’ll note that a small number of items that are impacted by timing of their delivery—and I’ll quickly go through a couple of them here. Firstly, Our Agreement, formerly known as the EBA (Enterprise Bargaining Agreement), this has been delayed due to unresolved claims by two unions. I would note that the agreement was supported in principle by all unions and certainly in recent times it’s been supported by nine unions. We did have in principle support in October 2020, however, at the 11th hour the RTBU (Rail, Tram and Bus Union) and Professionals Australia stated they had some differences and, unfortunately, we haven’t been able to move forward with the implementation of the EBA.

It will now be settled through normal industrial processes which will involve the QIRC (Queensland Industrial Relations Commission). We’ve also had a bit of a delay in getting some of our fleet onshore and this is basically a function of global supply chain challenges, as a result of COVID-19. We’ve had a number of other projects that have been impacted by delays associated with COVID-19 and the acquisition of key pieces of equipment. I won’t go into the full details of that, but needless to say it just does reflect a little bit of an overhang of COVID-19 that we’re still working through. As I indicated, hopefully that will be resolved over coming months.

Now, moving to item F, the Third Budget Review, each year when the annual plan and budget is set down in this Chamber, project delivery is phased based on the best possible information available at the time. It is further refined during the budget review process to reflect changes and that’s what we’re doing today. As mentioned in my commentary on the Quarterly Financial and Annual Progress Report, COVID-19 remains as an influencing factor, though obviously that is diminishing and that’s great to see. We certainly are seeing an environment where the economy and employment and a number of other indicators are starting to trend in a very positive fashion.

In terms of the key changes that are going to occur as a result of this 3BR, the anticipated accumulated surplus for 30 June 2021 as approved by Council was $13.247 billion. As a result of the Third Budget Review, the anticipated accumulated surplus will increase some $234 million to $13.481 billion. This increase is a result of the implementation of the new accounting standards, specifically Service Concession Arrangements Grantors. In this budget review we have demonstrated savings to the tune of $81.6 million. These savings are a combination of approximately $17.6 million in CapEx and $64 million in OpEx.

Savings achieved in CapEx include an emerging projects land acquisition saving of $2.3 million and Transport for Brisbane tools of trade of $2 million. There is a range of complementary OpEx savings as well. Once again, I won’t go into those, they’re all in the report. We have seen some accounting adjustments with respect to transfers of CapEx to OpEx in the vicinity of $32 million and these have occurred through projects like accessible bus stops, where there was a transfer of $8.4 million and delivering iconic parks for Brisbane, where there was a transfer of $1.4 million. Equally, there have been changes from OpEx to CapEx of approximately $12.3 million.

I will quickly touch upon some of the items in Program 8, which have obviously had some impact as well. So notable changes in Program 8 include a transfer of $247,500 from the ERT (Economic Recovery Taskforce) budget to business and local economy support, to fund a sponsorship program for local events. There was a carryover of $200,000 to 2021-22 for the Asia Pacific Cities Summit. We’ve also had a number of concessions that have resulted in transfers between accounts. We also have a new project of $62,000 loaded against it for employee emergency broadcast solution and this is a solution that will allow Council employees to communicate during emergency events.

Just quickly, I did want to touch upon the item B, which related to the ICT. Councillor JOHNSTON made a point of indicating that ward enquiries represented 25% of Call Centre activity, that is untrue, the number is one per cent.

Chair: Councillor ALLAN, your time has expired.

Any further speakers?

There being none, we’ll now proceed to—

Councillor SRI.

Councillor SRI: Thanks, Chair. Just really briefly on the budget review, I just wanted to highlight and I think others have drawn attention to the loss of revenue from developer infrastructure charges. I remember distinctly back in 2016, when I first got into Council, I pointed out that we were in a bit of a boom time in terms of new construction and development approval (DA). That there was a real opportunity here and a window to capture a little bit more of that revenue by increasing infrastructure charges.

Of course, the Council Administration kind of had a bob each way saying that’s a State Government issue, it’s the State Government that’s placed a cap on infrastructure charges, while simultaneously doing nothing at all to advocate for removing that cap. In fact, the LNP’s position at the State level is to support retaining that cap on infrastructure charges. But as a result, we’ve had several years of rapid construction and growth and very little money from the development industry has actually flowed into Council revenues.

Now we’re at a point where even that’s dried up and we’re staring down the barrel of a situation where we don’t have as much certainty about the income from developers going forward. It really feels like we’ve missed a great opportunity over the past few years, where developers have made hundreds of millions of dollars out of developing our city, billions in fact when you add it all up. Only a very small proportion of that revenue has been captured to go towards public services and public infrastructure and facilities. So looking at this budget review, I just do think it’s a bit of a shame that the Council Administration didn’t do a better job of capturing some of that revenue when the opportunity was there.

Now that that’s drying up, I guess there’s going to be more pressure on Council to either raise rates or cut services. I just think it’s a little bit disappointing that this Administration was so resistant to that idea and didn’t do anything at all to advocate for a more flexible and, I guess, what you might almost call a means tested approach to infrastructure charges, where you look at the land values of the areas where the developments are occurring and say, well look, this is an area where land is really expensive, so we’re going to charge higher infrastructure charges and this is an area where land’s a bit cheaper so the infrastructure charges will be a little bit lower.

Instead we have a one size fits all infrastructure charges system that means no matter how much the land costs or how expensive it actually is to build, wherever you’re building in the city your infrastructure charges are the same. It’s actually a very top-down, bureaucratic and one size fits all mechanism that I would have thought the libertarians in the LNP would have been opposed to. You’d have thought that they’d prefer a model where the charges that are levied on a developer actually reflect the costs of the services and the infrastructure we’re supposed to be delivering.

But instead, rich or poor, major project or minor project, all developers are paying those infrastructure charges at the same rate. As a result, we just don’t have enough money coming in. I think that really is a key factor as to why we’re now in this situation, where all the development has happened and we now need to deliver all this infrastructure, but we no longer have any plan to pay for it. Because the only plan that the Council had made, was to cross its fingers and hope that the construction boom would continue indefinitely, even though we know it’s a boom‑bust cycle and that sometimes there’ll be money coming in from new development projects and sometimes you won’t be.

But you can’t rely on tomorrow’s developments to pay for the infrastructure we need to accommodate yesterday’s developments. We should be making yesterday’s developments pay for the infrastructure that is needed to support those communities and those new residents. I think that’s just a real shame that we haven’t gotten that balance right.

Chair: Further speakers?

There being none, the LORD MAYOR?

I’ll now put items A, B and F.

**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 Establishment and Coordination Committee was declared **carried** on the voices.

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

The voting was as follows:

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

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

Chair: On item E.

**Clause E put**

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

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

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 22 - The Right Honourable, the LORD MAYOR, Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER, DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Krista ADAMS, and Councillors Greg ADERMANN, Adam ALLAN, Tracy DAVIS, Fiona HAMMOND, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Sarah HUTTON, Sandy LANDERS, James MACKAY, Kim MARX, Peter MATIC, David McLACHLAN, Ryan MURPHY, Angela OWEN, Steven TOOMEY and Andrew WINES, and the Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Jared CASSIDY, and Councillors Peter CUMMING, Steve GRIFFITHS and Charles STRUNK.

NOES: 2 - Councillors Jonathan SRI and Nicole JOHNSTON.

Chair: Councillors, we will now proceed to debate on items C and D.

The LORD MAYOR, would you please move those items.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair. So, C and D come together as a package and have been obviously taken seriatim for that reason, they are related. Item C is the Long Term Infrastructure Plan and item D is the Local Government Infrastructure Plan. Item D, the Local Government Infrastructure Plan is something that’s required of all councils under State legislation, that covers a certain timeframe. Item C, the Long Term Infrastructure Plan, includes infrastructure that we’ve identified, not within the LGIP or the Local Government Infrastructure Plan timeframe, but in the longer term. So this is the format that we’ve had this plan in previously and so it should be familiar to all Councillors.

First of all, to the LGIP. This LGIP that’s coming forward has been reviewed based on the different patterns of growth in the City of Brisbane. Now, an LGIP by its nature, having a five-year projection of infrastructure that’s required, is something that does need to be updated from time to time and is very much driven by patterns of growth in the city. Now, the Council officers have to do a projection on what they expect the growth will be, but the growth does not necessarily turn out to be the same as what was anticipated. So a number of the changes here relate to different patterns of growth across the city, some areas progressing faster than was anticipated and some areas not progressing so quickly as was expected in the previous plan.

Council introduces an LGIP, not only as a State requirement but also to allow us to continue levying infrastructure charges for approved new developments, as well as continuing conditioning trunk infrastructure on certain development approvals. Now, as Councillors would be aware, people putting in applications to build new developments in Brisbane have some options either to pay infrastructure charges to Council, or in fact to build certain trunk infrastructure themselves. So they have the choice on whether they’ll do it, or they’ll pay Council and we’ll do that infrastructure. So this plan facilitates both of those outcomes.

The amendment that’s proposed today brings 115 new projects into the LGIP, totalling an investment of $374 million. There is an increase in our parks projects, ferry terminal network, pathways, bikeways and stormwater network, as well as more land required for community facilities. Signature projects also being brought into the LGIP include the Victoria Park project, Kangaroo Point and Breakfast Creek Green Bridges and the Howard Smith Wharves ferry terminal.

In addition to these projects of citywide benefit, there’s also $25 million worth of transport infrastructure in the suburb of Rochedale, which is growing rapidly and $20 million worth of stormwater in Pallara, which is being brought forward. There are also four brand new parks being brought forward and $46 million in upgrades and embellishments to existing parks in this plan. Now this plan that we’re voting on today is not the final product; it is a plan that will go out to public consultation, which will begin on 31 May and last for 20 business days.

Related to the infrastructure plan is the long-term plan, that I mentioned before. The Long Term Infrastructure Plan will see 52 projects being transferred from the LGIP, which are making their way into the LTIP. So they’re being transferred from the LGIP into the LTIP. This is being done for a whole range of reasons, including a change in delivery timeframes, or the expected development in an area not coming to fruition in the way that was anticipated. After five years of monitoring growth in Brisbane, it’s the right time to review the projects that were included all those years ago in the original LGIP.

It should be made clear that moving projects to the LTIP does not mean that they won’t happen; it simply changes the delivery timeframe based on the expected development of the city and the suburbs. It also determines when projects are required in terms of the growth of the community and one of the key outcomes of having an LTIP is that when a development approval is granted in and around that project site, we can condition the land to be preserved for our long-term interests.

So the LGIP relates specifically to the collection of infrastructure charges or the building of infrastructure, trunk infrastructure, by people carrying out developments. The LTIP allows us to condition the preservation of land. The LTIP does not allow us to collect charges, that only happens as part of the LGIP. So basically in the short term, in the five-year period, we see collection of infrastructure charges for those projects, in the longer term, so plus-five years, it’s about the preservation of land that will be required for infrastructure down the track. So that’s some of the critical differences here between these two plans.

Fifty-two projects are being moved into the LTIP. There are 115 projects that are coming to be brought forward from the LTIP into the LGIP, so there’s an overall increase in projects in the short term. By making these changes, we’re ensuring that our delivery program is targeted and makes the most impact to meet the needs of our growing city.

Chair: Further speakers?

Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair. I rise to speak on both of these items together, Clauses C and D. They both deal with the planning of the future infrastructure needs of Brisbane arising from future development. Many of the changes in these items propose moving some matters and we’ve heard about those some matters, from the Long Term Infrastructure Plan to the Local Government Infrastructure Plan and vice versa. These forward infrastructure plans should be considering the future needs as Brisbane grows. They include community facilities, transport and roads, water and sewage infrastructure requirements and developer schedule of works and costings to reflect that.

Now while some of these works have been brought forward, as we heard a couple of examples there, the vast majority are being pushed out into the distant future, Chair. Promised parks and community facilities in Mitchelton, Rochedale, Windsor, Wilston, Bulimba, South Brisbane and West End haven’t been delivered. Sports and recreation precincts in Fitzgibbon, Calamvale, Algester, Bridgeman Downs, Upper Kedron, Rochedale, West End and Wakerley haven’t been delivered. We see $11 million projected for the upgrade of the Norman Park ferry terminal, the same one that the LNP shut down and is now refusing to upgrade, blaming residents for it being discontinued.

So we wonder what is going on there, Chair. Is it part of this LNP Administration’s secret plans to privatise river-based public transport? Perhaps upgrading it for water taxis only, Chair, or maybe just never at all. Open level crossing works at Coorparoo and Coopers Plains have been pushed back. Nudgee Road intersections have been delayed and it’s concerning that stormwater improvement works in suburbs like Albion, Pallara and Yeronga have also been postponed again. The list of cancelled and delayed suburban works runs very long under this LNP Administration, Chair.

The entire budget is being chewed up by the LORD MAYOR’s vanity projects and basic community upgrades are losing out. The LNP’s priorities are themselves, Chair and not Brisbane residents. They quite simply, looking at these changes to the LGIP, don’t care about the suburbs. Clause D is probably the most concerning and includes the most concerning figure of all. That $2.1 billion infrastructure deficit projected for the Brisbane City Council by 2026. That is a $2.1 billion infrastructure deficit projected for this Council by 2026. In the cash flow modelling for these infrastructure plans it shows that Council’s deficit blows out from around $250 million to $2.1 billion in just five years.

A $2.1 billion black hole in funding for critical infrastructure for a growing city, that’s a fairly dire projection, Chair. It’s eyewatering but makes sense, in a way, considering the sheer amount of rates that this LORD MAYOR throws away in cost blowouts and discounts given to developers. Perhaps if the LNP planned projects a bit better, this projected deficit wouldn’t be so horrific. Every time this LNP LORD MAYOR announces a project, Chair, residents are starting to cringe. They know it means either a deal with developers or massive cost blowouts and proof of that is on that final page of the cost model, that $2.1 billion shortfall.

The bigger the deficit, Chair, the higher the LNP will have to hike Brisbane rates and the more they will cut community services. Now people are happy to pay their rates when they know that that is going to providing their communities and their suburbs with the services and infrastructure that they need and they deserve. But we’re seeing less and less of that return for rates paid in our suburbs. The LORD MAYOR clearly just has one plan, Chair, he’s in it for himself and not the people of Brisbane.

If only we had a LORD MAYOR that did their homework before announcing a project, or shared the priorities of residents not developers, then we would have a clear plan for infrastructure in Brisbane, with less cost blowouts, a more liveable city, better cash flow projections, lower rates and more services for our suburbs. But unfortunately that hypothetical situation will stay hypothetical as long as this LORD MAYOR and LNP Administration are in charge. They continue to choose the shortest possible period for planning the future infrastructure needs of our city.

When this initially came to Council and the requirements for the LGIP were brought in, Councillors were given an option to develop plans for up to 15 years ahead. A 15-year plan would have given this city a very clear plan to address the needs of a growing Brisbane well into the future, but we know that this LORD MAYOR and LNP Administration opted for the shortest possible timeframe for an infrastructure plan, which was 10 years. The plan runs from 2016 to 2026, but of course didn’t come into effect until 2018, making this just an eight-year plan.

So this Administration took two years to get the plan drawn up and has now, to date, pushed out an enormous amount of projects into potential future plans, or potentially never delivered at all. That’s extremely disappointing for the residents and ratepayers of Brisbane, but it’s not entirely surprising when you look at the track record of this LNP Administration. It is more proof that the LNP don’t have a plan for Brisbane and can’t get out of their own way to make one for Brisbane, Chair. They don’t care about our city or its people, the only thing they care about is their political careers and that’s writ large here tonight.

Chair: Further speakers?

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, thank you, I rise to speak on the two items on the agenda before us today. Firstly, I just want to start by saying there is a long history to this Administration failing to deliver on the infrastructure needs for our city. It dates back to the LGIP when it was created and the PIP (Priority Infrastructure Plan) was killed off. The PIP was a reasonably useful document in that it had a lot of stuff in it, but it gave people a really good idea about what would be delivered over a long period of time. Now, when the LGIP was introduced back when city plan was developed, the LORD MAYOR dudded Tennyson Ward at that stage and I’m reading from the LGIP.

There were over 1,000 projects valued at approximately $2 billion across the city. The LORD MAYOR at that point had allocated $8 million in Tennyson Ward. There are 22 drainage projects for Yeronga and that was pretty much about it, there really wasn’t a lot going in. The stormwater projects, Ipswich Road, Cracknell Road, Villa Street road project, which has been cancelled by this Administration. Coonan Street, Wharf Street intersection upgrade, that’s still on the list. Long Street East at Graceville, that is still on the list and I don’t think the Oxley Creek Common at Rocklea is even making the list anymore.

So now we move to the current documents before us today, the LGIP. There are approximately just over 1,000 projects that I can see on the LGIP at about $2.4 billion. Within Tennyson Ward, there are just 13 projects and that includes individual pipes, so what is really one project might actually be four because it’s pipes across a certain area. The total cost of these projects for Tennyson Ward is $12 million, that’s out of a budget of $2.4 billion for the city. It works out, I think, approximately, if it was done fairly, $90 million per ward and about 40‑plus projects per ward.

So whichever way you look at it, Tennyson Ward is being dudded and if you believe the DEPUTY MAYOR or the LORD MAYOR, it’s because there’s no development happening in Tennyson Ward. Well, I don’t think they exist on Planet Earth with us. We’ve had massive upgrades to Sherwood and Corinda, with five and six storey buildings. We’ve had massive upgrades through Yeronga, with industrial land converted to major units, including multiple six storey buildings in Cansdale Street, multiple five storey buildings on Venner Road. We’ve seen just last week this Administration allow a commercial childcare development on a heritage listed sport and recreation site.

We’ve had a massive new suburb built in Yeerongpilly. We’ve seen four storey buildings built along Fairfield Road in Yeronga. We’ve seen hundreds of townhouses where there were houses through Yeronga and we’ve seen major public housing developments. Yeronga has experienced some of the strongest growth in the city and not a cent has been invested. It’s worse than that, so back in 2000 in Yeronga, Council did a stormwater drainage project and at that time found that the stormwater drainage in Yeronga West was inadequate. The report states that there should be no further infill development in Yeronga West until stormwater is upgraded.

Fair enough, 2000, that’s that. Then Council put it on the PIP, great. They put it on the LGIP, but even then they cut some of the Yeronga projects from the PIP to the LGIP. But they listed it and it was supposed to be done between 2016 and 2021. It’s today March 2021. Now, as most people in this Chamber know, every year I stand up and I advocate in the budget for the stormwater projects in Yeronga to be delivered. They have been listed on the LGIP and the PIP for the best part of two decades and today Councillor Krista ADAMS, the LORD MAYOR and the Liberal National Party are cancelling those projects, they are cancelled.

There are 22 individual pipe projects in the stormwater drainage projects that are being cut, at about $4 million. Now this is critical infrastructure for Yeronga residents. Yeronga is a suburb that experiences flooding now, localised flooding, flooding in homes, flooding in streets, flooding in parks. It happens in heavy rain, it happens when the river floods and the fact that Krista, Councillor ADAMS, is publicly stating there is not enough development happening in Yeronga, will be a slap in the face to these residents, who know that giant six storey buildings are being built in the suburb.

The actions of the LNP here today are appalling. Councillor ADAMS proudly boasts that she’s putting it onto the LTIP. Well guess what, there’s no funding allocated to it, there’s no timeframe allocated to it, it’s a never-never list. Has she answered any of the questions that I put forward today about what are these projects, when they’ll be funded, what their scope is? She’s done none of those things, nor has the LORD MAYOR.

So let me be clear, this Administration is robbing Yeronga residents, who have advocated strongly for improved stormwater drainage projects. That they have fought for years to have these stormwater upgraded throughout Yeronga and the failure of this Administration to deliver these projects over the last five years, they’re not even rolling them over to the next five years; they’re actually cancelling them. Cancelling them out of the LGIP, putting them on the never‑never list with no funding attached to them and no timeframe commitment to do it.

I want to make a few other very brief remarks. I’m looking at the stormwater project, there’s a couple of other small pipe projects going on there in Oxley, which are about $1.5 million, that’s it. Now I live in a southside ward that floods badly and that’s the only stormwater project going. For the pathways project, there’s one bikeway project in Oxley, that’s lovely. There are 90 projects and $300 million allocated to bikeways, there are three projects in Oxley totalling $3 million. It’s a statistical anomaly of 0.00001 per cent of the budget. The stormwater projects, there are 400 stormwater projects on the list. There are five in Tennyson Ward, totalling $1.5 million out of a budget of $141 million.

When it comes to parks and community facilities, there’s nothing, $40 million allocated citywide and not a sausage for Tennyson Ward. When it comes to public parks and community facilities, there are 170 projects valued at $576 million. There is one in Tennyson Ward, 170 projects citywide, there is one listed in Tennyson Ward. Just the one and that’s a project that Council’s already doing, that it’s popped on the list so there’s probably one park project there in the Sherwood Arboretum.

Here we are with the road network schedule, there are four projects out of 360 citywide, 360 citywide and there are four in Tennyson Ward. Their value totally at $1 billion across the city, $5.8 million in Tennyson Ward. For anybody listening at home, there’s only 26 wards and I’m sure you can do the math on that. It’s statistically an anomaly to see how much funding Tennyson Ward is getting. Here we are with ferry terminal upgrades, zero to Tennyson Ward, $126 million, 10 projects.

Then when you look at the LTIP, so that’s appalling in my view. As I said, there are over 1,000 projects and $2.4 billion citywide, just 13 projects are in Tennyson Ward, valued at around $12 million. That is an outrage. Residents in Tennyson Ward suburbs, Chelmer, Graceville, Sherwood, Corinda, Oxley, Tennyson, Yeerongpilly, Yeronga, Fairfield and Annerley, pay huge volumes of rates. They pay huge money into this city and to watch the LNP Administration not only take away projects that have been promised for many, many years and that are desperately needed, but to fail to allocate to these suburbs that are experiencing high levels of growth, any kind of new projects, is shameful.

Do you know is getting it? The Gap Ward. I had a good read of what’s going on with the stormwater and whilst they’re taking projects off Yeronga because there’s not enough growth, apparently that great bastion of high rise growth and development, The Gap, is getting stormwater projects.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, your time has expired.

Are there any further speakers?

Councillor OWEN.

Councillor OWEN: Thank you, I rise to speak in support of the LGIP amendments as they are before us in this Chamber today. What is very important is that we do go back to what the LGIP is all about. It is for acknowledging those areas of the city that are experiencing rapid growth and addressing projects to support that growth, so that the infrastructure is in place to match the population growth. So I would like to speak tonight about some of the projects that are coming through the LGIP to support the rapid growth that we have had in the suburb of Pallara. So for those people who are not aware of the volume of growth, there has been nearly 4,000 individual housing lots that have come online in the past couple of years.

Now, unfortunately the Electoral Commission of Queensland took Pallara out of my ward between 2016 and 2020 and that caused a little bit of a disruption in my advocacy for this suburb. But certainly since it has come back into my ward in April 2020, we have seen some improvements that have already come through. In fact, the Pallara State School has bus services that go into the main suburb of Pallara. It will be getting an extension of the 803 bus service into Heathwood Avenues, Heathwood Rise, Chain of Ponds and Sanctuary Pocket Estates, from 12 July.

But most importantly, through this LGIP program, I want to say to all of the parents with children at Pallara State School there is $3,997,760 that is there to address the intersection of Wadeville Street and Ritchie Road, and then following on down to 139 Ritchie Road, to enhance the safety and the road infrastructure immediately outside Pallara State School. There is $931,116 to go into bikeways that lead from Vied Road through to Sweets Road and then from Sweets Road through to Kraft Road. There is $4,110,847 for local access and recreational corridor parks.

This is needed because these new residents that are coming into this area need to have areas for their children to play, for them to access the school safely and also to ensure that that school precinct is catered for as far as major road infrastructure improvements. Now, as the LORD MAYOR mentioned, there is approximately $20 million that is going towards natural channels, culverts and pipes and wetlands for stormwater management throughout that precinct. There are a lot of young families moving into the suburb of Pallara.

This is an important area and being formerly a rural area, that was decided upon to become part of the growth of the Oxley Wedge, by a former Labor premier, it is important that we as the Schrinner Council Administration deal with this growth that is happening now and that has come to the forefront over the past couple of years. We are dealing with it, we recognise the population growth, the Council officers are working with us to ensure that the infrastructure that is needed is going to be there to support the young families that are choosing to make Pallara their home.

So I say to all of the officers who have been working behind the scenes since I’ve gone back to advocate for this suburb since April 2020, thank you for your support of these young families, because this infrastructure is going to help this suburb to grow as the population increases over times to come. Thank you.

Chair: Further speakers?

Councillor STRUNK.

Councillor STRUNK: Yes, thank you, Chair. I just rise to speak on Clause D and Attachment C. I just want to start off my comments to say I totally agree with Councillor JOHNSTON in regards to that briefing, that would have been very helpful to answer a lot of the questions that we’re dealing with right now, I suppose. Will we get any answers? I doubt it because there probably won’t be enough time. But anyway, my team and myself sat down and had a look extensively through Clause D, because it’s probably in the E&C report today. We came out, we spent quite a number of hours actually doing this as well and it was very informing.

First, let me just highlight one issue which I just thought was really, really curious and strange. That was that from page 25 through to 40, there were a number of projects, mostly road projects actually. Also, quite substantial amounts of money, many, many millions of dollars in these projects. What we found actually when we compared the previous LGIP to the current one and the proposed one here, that is that there were actually six projects here I’ve got on the list that were actually reduced in value or in dollar terms by exactly $1,000.

Now, isn’t that interesting, when you can have one project that’s worth say $3.2 million, another one $1.6 million, but interestingly enough all the ones that were reduced in my ward were reduced by an exact amount of money of $1,000, with the exception of one that was $2,000. You wonder if there is a harvesting algorithm that was set loose with all these projects, right across Brisbane, not necessarily in my ward I would hope, to try to reduce the amount of money that was going to be needed for these projects in the future. I don’t know if that had any implication on that $2.1 billion that the leader of the Opposition was talking about, but possibly so.

Now, let’s move on and another interesting item out of the LGIP for this particular Clause was some projects that were actually removed from the LGIP. There are two large ones here that I thought were significant enough to raise here tonight. The first one was the Johnson Road, just from Woogaroo Street down to Stradbroke Street, down Johnson Road. Now, I know that Councillor OWEN knows this road quite well, as anyone who lives in and around the area that we live and there was supposed to be an upgrade to this corridor of $16.733 million and now that has been dropped.

Now, this road is a connector road right through to Browns Plains for many of my residents in the Forest Lake area and of course, in Ellen Grove as well. These people rely upon that road and it has been deteriorating over a number of years, since I’ve lived and worked in the area. But to see that just be knocked out, $16.73 million, that’s one that I would have loved to ask at a briefing to see why that happens. Don’t we need it anymore? I don’t think so. Of course, Woogaroo and Johnson Road, that intersection as well, is designated to be upgraded into a regulated intersection at some stage in the future. So I don’t know why the upgrade of the road itself was gotten rid of.

Now, we had a briefing at the Infrastructure last week in regards to the Ipswich Motorway project and the completion of that from Rocklea to Oxley. Part of that upgrade was an exit that came around behind Harvey Norman and through an industrial area down onto Boundary Road, which didn’t exist before that was built. It was very much needed and it’s a beautiful road now, by the way. But it feeds out onto Boundary Road then, which goes through to the industrial streets in Richlands. So you can imagine there’s going to be a lot of happy drivers, a lot of happy truck drivers that are going to use that road, because it’s a beautiful road now and it takes you straight into the industrial estate.

I said to the person that was presenting on the day, what about the golf club? What’s happened with the golfers that are in Boundary Road? The clubhouse is on one side of Boundary and the majority of the golf courses on the other side. There are a lot of golfers and they have a membership there of many, many hundreds of golfers. I said what’s happening with the safety of the golfers? Because I do remember that there was, in the original design of what was actually delivered, supposed to be some consideration given to the golf club as to how the golfers get across the road when it becomes much, much busier.

I was told—everyone looked at me blank and said we don’t know about that. I said well, I’ve worked in the State office, I actually saw it on the plans and all of a sudden, it’s not happening. I thought okay, I’ll accept what they say, until I looked here and there it was, $9.9 million for that corridor project upgrade from where they left off down to Kimberley Street. That was supposed to be spent on looking after the safety of some of those golfers and also to improve the road itself, because it was really almost an old rural road.

Still is pretty much all the way through to Archerfield Road, it’s still a pretty rural road, the shoulders are shocking. One of the developers actually that just built a facility just before Kimberley Street, had to modify their design for their project because to make this they had to actually design their project to fit in with the upgrade that isn’t going to happen. So they’ve wasted all that money for no good, because it’s not going to happen anymore.

Projects added to the LGIP, well there’s an interesting one here as well, at Ellen Grove. There are four properties, parts of the properties that have had some development happening. They were set aside for some recreational infrastructure, parks and recreational, I suppose you’d call it. It was in the original PIP, by the way, some years before I was Councillor. Then it was set aside and then when the LGIP took over in about 2018, it disappeared. We weren’t getting any park space or park and recreational space in that area anymore.

This is an acreage area that’s actually had a lot of development happening, so we really do need a lot of parkland to support those new builds that are actually happening. What’s happened? It’s back in again. So I’m calling it the yoyo project, because it’s in, it’s out, it’s in, I just can’t track that one.

One of the goods news we got about 18 months ago was the upgrade of the Thrush Street Park at Inala for about $1 million. Well it was about $1.1 million but it now says it’s $1.5 million. They actually haven’t started the project, but I believe they will be starting it before the end of this calendar year and it’s going to be very appreciated for those people that live in and around the area. It’s a lovely park, it deserves an upgrade, embellishment and the PCYC (Police Citizens Youth Club) is right next door and they’re really looking forward to that as well.

Projects that were not delivered between those years of 2012 and 2022, or 2021 I should say, there were a couple of those as well. One of them was Richlands, was the bikeway from Natalie Street to Eugenia Street, which is going through, which actually skirts through an area that’s under development as well. Why we haven’t actually delivered that, it was only $687,000, it should have happened along with the development but it did not. Also, the final one here at Ellen Grove, Waterford Road, we can’t work this one out, actually what it is, because there’s a particular piece of land which is on the corner of Waterford Road and Woogaroo Street­—

Chair: Councillor STRUNK, your time has expired.

Councillor STRUNK: Thank you, Chair.

Chair: Further speakers?

Any further speakers at all?

Councillor SRI.

Councillor SRI: Thanks, Chair. I rise to speak on the LGIP and the LTIP. I’m tempted to go on a long list of what I think should and shouldn’t have been included in the documents, I might try and keep that to a shorter list. But the first and I guess most important point I wanted to make is really a point that’s not addressed to the Councillors in this Chamber, but that’s addressed to the public servants and to the residents of this city. That point is quite simply that these documents that we’re voting on here today are political documents.

They are political documents in the sense that they are not necessarily informed by best practice, evidence-based planning principles or sustainable planning principles. The decisions about what projects and items have been included or excluded are not based on the highest and most important needs for our city, or the highest priorities for our city. They are based on political calculations about what might win votes, or what might deliver on certain LNP election promises.

I think it’s important to state that clearly for the record, because I worry that a year or two from now, I’ll be in a conversation with some Council officer and I’ll be saying look, we really need this project, it’s a really high priority for the city. They’ll say but it’s not in the LGIP and it’s not in the Long Term Infrastructure Plan, I guess if it’s not in those plans it mustn’t be very important. But the point is that these plans do not actually show and articulate what are the most important projects for our city, or what are the projects that we most urgently need to cater for growth and new development.

In some cases that’s what they do, but many of the projects in there are projects that are not necessarily the highest priority, but have been included simply because it was politically valuable for the LNP to do so, or because they had some agreement with a particular developer or stakeholder. I think as one really obvious example for me, that the Howard Smith Wharves ferry terminal stands out. Now, I’m not opposed to a terminal being constructed there and I think there are a lot of residents who see the value of a ferry terminal being constructed there.

But I strongly reject the suggestion that that is the highest priority use in terms of funding for new ferry infrastructure for our city. There’s no general river transport plan or strategy that says we really need a new terminal at Howard Smith Wharves. There’s no long-term transport strategy that identified that as important or says this is a gap in our transport network, or this is a place where we really need to provide more access to river-based transport. In fact, it’s literally only a few hundred metres walk along the river to the Eagle Street existing terminal. So the reason that Howard Smith Wharves ferry terminal is being built is essentially because Council did a deal with that particular developer.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Point of order, Mr Chair.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor ADAMS.

DEPUTY MAYOR: I’ve been listening now for two minutes and the imputing motive is outstanding and I ask him to withdraw that comment.

Chair: Councillor SRI, will you withdraw that comment?

Councillor SRI: No, I don’t understand what I’ve said. It’s a matter of public record that Council made a deal with the developer.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor SRI, can I just ask you, it’s a direction that reflects on all Councillors, please don’t impute motive.

Councillor SRI.

Councillor SRI: Can you please define what impute motive means, Chair?

Chair: Yes, but it will take up your time, so why don’t you just use your time for you?

Councillor SRI: No, that’s fine.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor SRI: Look, I stand by my comments. I think Council did a deal with the developer and that deal led to that terminal being prioritised ahead of other higher priority infrastructure for our city. Let’s not beat around the bush about this, that’s what happened. Council looked at how it could spend money and what its priorities were and said look, that’s where we’re going to prioritise funding, is for construction of a new terminal at Howard Smith Wharves. Even though I haven’t heard a single transport planner in Council or the State Government or any independent experts say we really need a terminal there at Howard Smith Wharves as a high priority.

The only people I saw arguing for that as a high priority really were the developers and other stakeholders attached to the developers. I think that’s just one small example, but there are many projects in the LGIP and the LTIP that have been included not because they are the highest priorities for our city, but because it suited a particular stakeholder, or it was politically valuable for a certain Councillor as part of an election campaign. I don’t think that’s a controversial or inaccurate—I see a few Councillors rolling their eyes as though I’ve said something shocking. That’s pretty clear and it’s equally clear when you look at what’s not been included in these documents.

I’m going to just read a short excerpt from the South Brisbane riverside neighbourhood plan, which is a document that was introduced around a decade ago now and led to the up-zoning of large chunks of West End. This is 3.7 Riverside South Precinct, it’s not too long a section. It says this precinct will provide a transition between the tenanted housing of Greater West End and Highgate Hill and new development in the South Brisbane riverside area. The precinct will accommodate predominantly medium to high density residential development, replacing obsolete industrial and warehouse uses.

Small scale retail and commercial uses integrated within new residential developments, servicing the local community are permitted. One new supermarket with a gross floor area of up to 1,500 square metres is supported. A new ferry terminal will be located at Victoria Street. Associated land uses will be supported to activate the terminal. Now that’s in there, in Council’s own neighbourhood plan. That’s not some vague, strategic, extrinsic material. That’s in the statutory document, that’s in the neighbourhood plan and the City Plan from a decade ago, saying we’re going to deliver a new CityCat terminal here at West End.

It’s there in black and white, or actually I think the font is a sort of purple when I look at it in the original document. It’s very clear that Council has said in its neighbourhood plan we’re going to deliver a ferry terminal. Yet now, a decade later, that new ferry terminal for the western side of West End still isn’t in the LGIP or the LTIP. The only responses I’ve heard from Council are we’re still conducting—we’re undertaking a further river transport study to decide what we need. Don’t worry, we gave you a bus along Montague Road. That’s apparently the satisfactory substitute.

Even though we’ve had higher density development and a greater scale of development than that neighbourhood plan contemplated. We’ve had even more density development than that neighbourhood plan anticipated and yet the Council hasn’t delivered the ferry terminal infrastructure that it said it would. I think that is yet another example of the fact that even though we’ve got our own Council planners, our own transport planners have said look, we’re going to need a ferry terminal down there on the western side of West End because we’re cramming another 10,000 people into the west of Montague Road, literally 10,000 people within that one small area.

Now Council planners have said we’re going to need a CityCat terminal to carry those people in and out of that neighbourhood. They’ve identified that, it’s been there in their own strategy and yet it hasn’t made it into the LGIP or the LTIP. I could go on with more examples, Kangaroo Point Riverwalk, the eastern side of the Kangaroo Point Peninsula. There’s been a clear articulation of the need to complete that riverwalk, it’s there in the cycling overlay, it’s there in the transport strategy and corridor studies. There’s a clearly identified need and a recognition that that project is a priority.

It’s even in the Kangaroo Point urban renewal strategy from 2018 that was the precursor to the neighbourhood plan, where in that strategy Council said it would deliver that completed section of riverwalk in a five to 10-year timeframe. It’s there in Council’s own planning documents, yet the completion of that Kangaroo Point Riverwalk hasn’t made it into the Local Government Infrastructure Plan, or even the Long Term Infrastructure Plan. So I want to be very clear to the people of Brisbane and to particularly the public servants who will end up looking back at these documents over time, that the decision to include or exclude certain projects from the Local Government Infrastructure Plan was a political decision.

It was not based on best practice, sustainable transport or sustainable urban planning principles. It was not based on a rigorous assessment of what the most important needs for our community were. It was simply based on what the LNP thought was most politically viable to include and exclude at the time. I can even look at some of the projects there for West End, I’m genuinely surprised to see the costings there. There’s identification of the need to buy a couple of hectares of parkland in West End and South Brisbane. But the money allocated there is far less than the actual cost of buying that land will be.

We’re talking about the land areas and the sites identified are probably worth tens of millions of dollars, perhaps even close to $100 million. The Council’s allocated around $10 million to buy it all back, so where’s the other $90 million going to come from? The other Councillors have identified that there’s already a shortfall in terms of the money available, money that’s proposed to be spent under this LGIP, but even the money that’s proposed to be spent doesn’t cover the true cost of delivering this infrastructure.

So I’m very disappointed at the poor planning that’s informed this process. I don’t think it is genuine planning; I think it’s a political exercise. I’m very disappointed to see that there’s no new intersections and safety upgrades along Montague Road, which is a serious -

Chair: Councillor SRI, your time has expired.

Are there any further speakers?

Councillor ADAMS.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair and I stand to speak on items C and D before us today. First of all, before I go into the items, I just would like to make apologies to the Council officers who have spent months working on this LGIP and this LTIP, through the methodology that is clearly outlined to us by the State Government, that we must under legislation follow. What we just heard there from Councillor SRI today was the height of hypocrisy, considering we heard earlier today about his concepts of consultation when it comes to projects in his ward. The Council officers follow the methodology and work hard on this and to say otherwise is insulting, so I apologise to you on behalf of the Chamber.

With regards to item D and item C, as it relates, first of all, to the LTIP, as the LORD MAYOR mentioned earlier, we’ve been working away on these amendments and as I just said, the Council officers have for quite a few months. Both of these documents need to be looked at together and revised, as the direction of Brisbane constantly changes. So we get questions from those on the other side saying tell us what changes and show us how it’s different and how much has moved. All you need to do is pick up the LTIP from the last time and put it beside the LTIP of this time and you can see those changes.

But let me make it very clear, Mr Chair, which is where we hear sometimes from the other side, the LORD MAYOR did answer the questions that came on notice around the general changes within the LTIP. There are no—projects in LTIP are scheduled for delivery from the year 2026. There is no indicative budget assigned for their delivery, because of course by 2026, budget and costs will change. Seventeen road projects moving into the LTIP, two park projects, 32 stormwater projects and one bikeway project. In the case of the stormwater network, there is a case of specific areas in Brisbane not reaching the density targets that were expected.

As I said, there is a very clear growth model that is used by the officers when they prepare an LGIP and then what goes into the Long Term Infrastructure Plan. That growth modelling is all based around expectations of what we’ve seen in the last few years and what we are expecting to come. But guess what, things happen, things like floods in 2011, or COVID-19 pandemics in 2020 and these growth modellings change. So you would think that the Councillor for Tennyson Ward had seen Metropolitan New York develop in Yeronga over the last three years from what we heard here this afternoon, which is utterly ridiculous.

I’m sure there has been growth in Yeronga, I’m sure there has been change in Yeronga. But on comparison across the city, not like some other suburbs. When it comes to the growth modelling, let’s make it clear, Mr Chair, 72 is the number where Yeronga comes in in the 190 suburbs in this city, 72nd place for development. So to say that we should prioritise Yeronga for stormwater drainage over 71 other suburbs that have grown more than Yeronga is outrageous, but what we usually hear.

Coorparoo, 522 DAs. Camp Hill, 483. Even at fifth, West End only had—only but it still had 374, Councillor SRI. Yes, there’s definitely growth in that area.

*Councillor interjecting.*

DEPUTY MAYOR: Guess what? Ten years ago and in Yeronga—-

*Councillor interjecting.*

DEPUTY MAYOR: One-hundred and twenty-seven, because the complaints I heard were about Yeronga, and Yeronga was 127.

*Councillor interjecting.*

DEPUTY MAYOR: One-third of those that saw the highest growth and when it comes to not delivering a ferry terminal that was put in the neighbourhood plan 10 years ago, well 10 years ago, that neighbourhood plan, we then had a flood. We had a massive flood and that massive flood changed a lot of the hydrology works that we know now in Brisbane and a lot more work needed to be done on that ferry terminal and is still being done.

But guess what? Instead of the ferry terminal, at this point of time, he’s getting two green bridges. Hands up if you’re on the river and would like two green bridges? But some people are never happy.

As it relates to road projects, the majority are moving into LTIP due to the delivery not being scheduled between 2020—before 2026 and most of these are 52 projects that are being moved into the LTIP. One hundred and fifteen are being brought forward into the LGIP.

So, some of them that were on the Long Term Infrastructure Plan are coming back into the Local Government Infrastructure Plan. This will all be—the LTIP will be out to consultation from 31 May to 27 June. Let’s talk about the LGIP and the big mean Schrinner Council that stopped the PIP. Let’s get it clear again.

It is State legislation. We have to do an LGIP, we are no longer allowed to do a PIP. A Priority Infrastructure Plan, for those who haven’t been in Council for quite as long a time and it came in, in 2018, not 2014. So, again, the Councillor for Tennyson is definitely not on the same planet as us but we’re on Earth and that explains it.

*Councillor interjecting.*

DEPUTY MAYOR: These changes are making it clear and transparent to the community about what we’re prioritising in the delivery of our important trunk infrastructure to support existing and future residents of Brisbane. It is a requirement, as I said under State Government legislation, as is the methodology set by State Government legislation, that our Council officers follow to a T.

We receive infrastructure charges from new developments and the LGIP allows us to use the infrastructure charges on the things that are in the LGIP. Otherwise, we couldn’t build them with infrastructure charges and the definition of trunk infrastructure, again, is set out by the Queensland Government and we have incorporated these obviously into our planning policy as well.

There is one particular item I do want to address proactively and that is that there’s been a lot of projects that have had their value increase by $1 and Councillor STRUNK said he sat down carefully and went through this line by line but obviously not with the leader of the Opposition if—to go by his speech.

If you had a look at it, there would have been a lot of them that had changed by a very small percentage in dollars but this was around calculations to zero decimal places, so there’s a significant number of the changes we see in the LGIP that are purely due to rounding changes. Again, as I said, State methodology that require us to update it that way as well.

I think what everybody needs to understand, whether they feel their area is growing fast or growing slow, this is a whole of Brisbane infrastructure plan. A whole of infrastructure plan for Brisbane to reflect the changing nature of our city.

Councillor SRI: Point of order, Chair.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Where there are high growth suburbs—-

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor SRI?

Councillor SRI: Will the DEPUTY MAYOR take a question?

Chair: DEPUTY MAYOR, will you take a question?

DEPUTY MAYOR: No.

Chair: Carry on.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Where there are high growth suburbs and major infrastructure projects designed to keep our city moving. If they’re not in the LGIP, we can’t use infrastructure charges to build them. So there is definitely the vision for the city here from the Schrinner Council but the work by the Council officers to make sure that those priorities—make sure that they’re in there so that they can be delivered for the future.

This document is like everything that we do in the Schrinner Council and it’s about making the Brisbane of tomorrow even better than the Brisbane of today.

Chair: Further speakers? Further speakers?

There being none, the LORD MAYOR?

I will now put items—-

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order, Councillor JOHNSTON?

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, I asked a whole range of questions about projects in the LTIP, including a lot of road projects asking—-

Chair: Yes, yes.

Councillor JOHNSTON: —-what the scope of those projects were and that’s not been addressed by either the LORD MAYOR or the DEPUTY MAYOR.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Sorry, I did forget to mention that in my speech if you allow?

Chair: No.

DEPUTY MAYOR: No?

Chair: Your speech is concluded.

Councillor JOHNSTON, the rules allow for questions to be asked and for answers to be provided, however, it doesn’t—that the answers be provided is not compulsory within the rules.

I will now proceed to items C and D.

**Clauses C and D put**

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

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

The voting was as follows:

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

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

The report read as follows⎯

#### A ANNUAL OPERATIONAL PLAN PROGRESS AND QUARTERLY FINANCIAL REPORT FOR THE PERIOD ENDED MARCH 2021

**134/695/317/1130**

**730/2020-21**

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

2. Sections 196(2) and (3) of the *City of Brisbane Regulation 2012* state that the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) must present financial reports to Council at least quarterly. The reports are to state the progress that has been made in relation to Council’s budget.

3. The Annual Operational Plan Progress and Quarterly Financial Report March 2021 (refer Attachment B, submitted on file) separately identifies and reports the financial results of Council’s Program Services (i.e. Council excluding Business Activities) and Business Activities. The written commentaries provide explanation of the figures.

4. Section 166(3) of the *City of Brisbane Regulation 2012* states that the CEO must present a written assessment of Council’s progress towards implementing the Annual Operational Plan to Council at regular intervals of not more than three months.

5. The previous financial report for the period ended 25 December 2020 was presented to Council on 23 February 2021. The current report relates to the period ended 26 March 2021.

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

7. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A  
Draft Resolution**

**DRAFT RESOLUTION TO ADOPT THE ANNUAL OPERATIONAL PLAN PROGRESS AND QUARTERLY FINANCIAL REPORT FOR THE PERIOD ENDED MARCH 2021**

As:

(i) sections 196(2) and (3) of the *City of Brisbane Regulation 2012* require that the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) present financial reports to Council at least quarterly

(ii) section 166(3) of the *City of Brisbane Regulation 2012* states that the CEO must present a written assessment of Council’s progress towards implementing the Annual Operational Plan to Council at regular intervals of not more than three months,

then:

(i) Council directs that the Annual Operational Plan Progress and Quarterly Financial Report for the period ended March 2021, as set out in Attachment B (submitted on file), be noted.

**ADOPTED**

#### B *ICT22 INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY POLICY* AND *ICT23 INFORMATION MANAGEMENT AND RECORDKEEPING POLICY*

**146/268/189/8**

**731/2020-21**

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

9. The *ICT22 Information and Communications Technology Policy* and *ICT23 Information Management and Recordkeeping Policy* describe Council’s strategic position, with regard to management of Council’s information communications and technology assets.

10. *ICT22 Information and Communications Technology Policy* supports Council’s continued focus on a centre-led approach to information and communication technology (ICT) spending and decision-making, which helps ensure efficiencies will be realised now, and in the future, as well as deliver best value ICT investments, that benefit Council and the community. The proposed amendments to *ICT22 Information and Communications Technology Policy* include a refresh of the ICT Principles, which govern how Council prioritises, designs and delivers ICT products and services, and provides alignment between business and technology.

11. *ICT23 Information Management and Recordkeeping Policy* addresses management of Council’s information assets and supports the *Public Records Act 2002* (Qld), policy, standards and guidelines issued by the Queensland State Archivist in relation to the making, keeping, preserving, managing and disposing of public records. This policy reflects the importance of good information management and recordkeeping practices, which support the efficient and effective operation of Council.

12. The proposed amendments to *ICT23 Information Management and Recordkeeping Policy* include an emphasis on open access to Council data and information with restrictions, where appropriate, in accordance with Council’s information security classification framework. Information security classification provides guidance when creating, handling, storing, using and disposing of information to help manage the risk of unauthorised access or disclosure. A stronger focus on the concept of ‘information assets’ has also been included, given Council’s and Information Services’ attention on Enterprise Information Management governance. It is proposed that the policy be renamed ICT23 Information Asset and Recordkeeping Policy, to reflect the amendments.

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

14. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A  
Draft Resolution**

**DRAFT RESOLUTION TO ADOPT AMENDMENTS TO *ICT22 INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY POLICY* AND *ICT23 INFORMATION MANAGEMENT AND RECORDKEEPING POLICY***

As Council:

(i) considers it appropriate to amend *ICT22 Information and Communications Technology Policy* and *ICT23 Information Management and Recordkeeping Policy* to align to current practices,

then Council:

(i) approves the amendments to *ICT22 Information and Communications Technology Policy* and *ICT23 Information Management and Recordkeeping Policy* as set out in Attachments B and D (submitted on file).

**ADOPTED**

#### C TAILORED AMENDMENT TO *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014* – LONG TERM INFRASTRUCTURE PLANS

**152/160/1218/488**

**732/2020-21**

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

16. *Brisbane City Plan 2014* (the planning scheme) contains Council’s Long term infrastructure plans (the LTIP), which was adopted by Council on 5 June 2018. The LTIP ensures that longer term infrastructure planning information and requirements (beyond the 2026 planning horizon of Council’s *Local Government Infrastructure Plan 2016-2026* [the LGIP]), are identified in the planning scheme.

17. A review of both the LGIP and LTIP has been undertaken to ensure that both planning instruments are current, transparent and reflect Council’s infrastructure priorities and commitments. This ensures that Council’s infrastructure conditioning powers are maintained to facilitate developer-delivered infrastructure. As a consequence of this review, amendments are proposed to the LTIP (the proposed amendment) and are summarised as follows.

- Deletion of items identified in the Community purpose network overlay and Table 10.3.1A for the parks network and the Other plans maps and Table 10.3.2 for the stormwater network, as they are being brought forward to the LGIP.

- Deletion of items identified in the Community purpose network overlay and Table 10.3.1A for the parks network and the Other plans maps and Table 10.3.2 for the stormwater network, as they are no longer required.

- Inclusion of new items in the Community purpose network overlay and Table 10.3.1A for the parks network and the Other plans maps and Table 10.3.2 for the stormwater network which are currently identified in the LGIP and are not anticipated to be required or delivered within the LGIP planning horizon.

- Consequential changes to Schedule 2 of the planning scheme.

18. Section 18 of the *Planning Act 2016* (the Act) allows Council to request a tailored process to amend a planning scheme. On 8 January 2020, Council wrote to the then Queensland Government’s Department of State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning (DSDMIP), requesting consideration of the proposed amendment. Council intends to progress the proposed amendment with the proposed Interim amendment to *Brisbane City Plan 2014* – Local government infrastructure plan amendment 1a.

19. By letter dated 5 March 2020 (refer Attachment B, submitted on file), DSDMIP provided Council with a Chief Executive Notice, which was prepared under section 18(3) of the Act. The process for amending the planning scheme set out in Part C of the Chief Executive Notice applies instead of the process set out in the *Minister’s Guidelines and Rules*.

20. The schedule of proposed amendments is set out in Attachment C (submitted on file) and the proposed amendment to be adopted into the planning scheme is set out in Attachment D (submitted on file).

21. Council has consulted with the relevant distributor-retailer (Urban Utilities) and Queensland Government agencies (DSDMIP and the Department of Transport and Main Roads) while preparing the proposed amendment. There were no material concerns raised by Urban Utilities or the Queensland Government agencies and therefore no changes were required to the proposed amendment and no further information was requested.

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

23. **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 PROGRESS A TAILORED AMENDMENT TO *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014* – LONG TERM INFRASTRUCTURE PLANS**

As Council:

(i) sought, pursuant to section 18(2) of the *Planning Act 2016*, approval from the Chief Executive, Department of State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning (DSDILGP) (formerly the Department of State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning), to make a tailored amendment (the proposed amendment) to *Brisbane City Plan 2014* (the planning scheme)

(ii) pursuant to Step 1 of Part C of the notice given by the Chief Executive (the Chief Executive Notice) (refer Attachment B, submitted on file) under section 18(3) of the *Planning Act 2016* and dated 5 March 2020, has prepared the proposed amendment to the planning scheme in the manner stated in section 1 of Attachment C (submitted on file) and as identified in the schedules in Attachment C (submitted on file)

(iii) pursuant to Step 2 of Part C of the Chief Executive Notice, has consulted with the relevant Queensland Government agencies when preparing the proposed amendment

(iv) pursuant to Step 3 of Part C of the Chief Executive Notice, has consulted with DSDILGP when preparing the proposed amendment,

then Council:

(i) decides, pursuant to Step 4 of Part C of the Chief Executive Notice, to prepare the proposed amendment

(ii) directs that the proposed amendment be given in accordance with Step 4 of Part C of the Chief Executive Notice

(iii) directs, pursuant to Step 5, Step 6 and Step 7 of Part C of the Chief Executive Notice, that public consultation of the proposed amendment be carried out.

**ADOPTED**

#### D INTERIM AMENDMENT TO *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014* – LOCAL GOVERNMENT INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN AMENDMENT 1A

**152/160/414/806-001, 152/160/414/806-002 and 152/160/414/806-003**

**733/2020-21**

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

25. Part 4 of *Brisbane City Plan 2014* (the planning scheme) contains Council’s *Local Government Infrastructure Plan 2016-2026* (LGIP). The LGIP was adopted by Council at its meeting on 5 June 2018. The LGIP has a planning horizon from 1 July 2016 to 30 June 2026.

26. It is proposed to make and progress an interim LGIP amendment to ensure that the LGIP remains current for conditioning trunk infrastructure as part of the development assessment process and is reflective of Council’s trunk capital works delivery program. The *Minister’s Guidelines and Rules* (the Guideline) sets out the process for making an interim LGIP amendment and requires Council to decide to make an interim LGIP amendment.

27. The amendments proposed to the LGIP (Interim LGIP amendment 1a) are summarised as follows.

- The stormwater, parks, land for community facilities and transport plans for trunk infrastructure and schedule of works (SOW) have been updated to account for new network planning and trunk infrastructure priorities as outlined in Council’s *Annual Plan and Budget 2020-21*.

- A new LGIP SOW model has been produced to provide a better user experience, improve transparency and clarity and to more closely align with the SOW model template.

- The extrinsic material has been updated to reflect the changes made as part of the proposed amendment to the SOW, costings and SOW model.

- The LGIP review checklist (refer Attachment B, submitted on file) has been completed to reflect the changes made to the infrastructure schedules and costings as part of Interim LGIP amendment 1a.

28. Interim LGIP amendment 1a has been prepared in accordance with the Guideline and is set out in Attachment D (submitted on file). A schedule of proposed amendments is set out in Attachment C (submitted on file).

29. The amendment to other parts of the planning scheme to capture changes to the long-term trunk infrastructure items (beyond the LGIP timeframe) will be progressed through an amendment to the Long term infrastructure plans (LTIP) provisions of the planning scheme. That amendment package will follow the process approved by the Chief Executive, Department of State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning (DSDILGP), under section 18(3) of the *Planning Act 2016*.

30. Council has consulted with the relevant distributor-retailer (Urban Utilities) and Queensland Government agencies (DSDILGP and Department of Transport and Main Roads) while preparing Interim LGIP amendment 1a. Following consultation, there were no material concerns raised by Urban Utilities or Queensland Government agencies, and therefore no changes were required to Interim LGIP amendment 1a.

31. Public consultation will be carried out for the LGIP and LTIP concurrently to demonstrate current, comprehensive and responsive planning.

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

33. **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 PROGRESS AN INTERIM AMENDMENT TO *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014* – LOCAL GOVERNMENT INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN AMENDMENT 1A**

As Council:

(i) pursuant to Chapter 5, Part 2, Section 4.2 of the *Minister’s Guidelines and Rules* (the Guideline) has prepared a proposed amendment to the *Brisbane City Plan 2014* (the planning scheme), to amend the planning scheme in the manner stated in section 1 of Attachment C (submitted on file) and as identified in the Schedules in Attachment C (submitted on file) (the proposed amendment)

(ii) pursuant to Chapter 5, Part 2, Section 4.3 of the Guideline has consulted with the relevant Queensland Government agencies and distributor-retailer when preparing the proposed amendment

(iii) pursuant to Chapter 5, Part 2, Section 4.4 of the Guideline has completed the relevant sections of the Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP) review checklist,

then Council:

(i) pursuant to Chapter 5, Part 2, Section 4.1 of the Guideline decides to make an interim LGIP amendment (Interim LGIP amendment 1a)

(ii) pursuant to Chapter 5, Part 2, Section 5.1 of the Guideline decides that public consultation of Interim LGIP amendment 1a (refer Attachment D, submitted on file) be carried out.

**ADOPTED**

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

**152/160/516/495**

**734/2020-21**

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

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

36. The proposed amendment will guide future development in parts of the Eight Mile Plains draft neighbourhood plan area and will advance the following objectives.

- Transform the Eight Mile Plains gateway area to a global precinct, particularly for advanced manufacturing, specialised medical research and technology-based employment.

- Enhance the lifestyle of residents, workers and visitors by encouraging improved landscaping and building design and providing a range of housing choices near employment and services.

- Capitalise on the significant infrastructure investment, particularly for public transport and the road network.

- Protect and enhance environmental and biodiversity values in the Bulimba Creek catchment.

- Enhance the streetscape, wayfinding and walkability between major employment hubs, residential areas and public transport infrastructure.

- Provide services and facilities to meet the needs of the local community.

- Provide an opportunity for the local community to have a say and help guide the future of the Eight Mile Plains draft neighbourhood plan area.

37. The Eight Mile Plains gateway draft neighbourhood plan planning scheme amendment package (the amendment package) (refer Attachment B, submitted on file) has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the *Minister’s Guidelines and Rules* (the Guideline) made under section 17 of the *Planning Act 2016*. When developing the amendment package, consideration was given to community feedback received during community engagement events and in response to the Eight Mile Plains gateway neighbourhood plan draft strategy.

38. Due to boundary changes resulting from the proposed amendment, the amendment package includes amendments to the Kuraby and Rochedale urban community neighbourhood plans and associated amendments to planning scheme policies.

39. Should Council decide to proceed with the proposed amendment, the Minister for State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning (the Minister) will be requested to complete a State interest review of the proposed amendment and agreement will be sought to publicly consult on the proposed amendment. Upon receipt of the Minister’s response and approval, public consultation on the proposed amendment will be undertaken in accordance with the Guideline.

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

41. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A  
Draft Resolution**

**DRAFT RESOLUTION TO DECIDE TO PROGRESS A MAJOR AMENDMENT TO *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014* TO INCLUDE THE EIGHT MILE PLAINS GATEWAY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN AND AMEND ASSOCIATED PLANNING SCHEME POLICIES**

As Council:

1. at the meeting of 26 March 2019 decided, pursuant to section 16.1 of Part 4 of Chapter 2 of the Minister’s Guidelines and Rules (the Guideline) made under the Planning Act 2016, to amend Brisbane City Plan 2014 (the planning scheme) to make a major amendment to include the Eight Mile Plains gateway neighbourhood plan and to make associated amendments as required (the proposed major amendment)

(ii) has prepared, pursuant to section 16.4 of Part 4 of Chapter 2 and section 2.2 of Part 1 of Chapter 3 of the Guideline, the proposed major amendment and associated amendments to planning scheme policies as set out in Attachment B (submitted on file) (the proposed amendment package),

then Council:

(i) resolves, pursuant to section 2.1 of Part 1 of Chapter 3 of the Guideline, to make amendments to the planning scheme policies associated with the proposed major amendment

(ii) directs, pursuant to section 16.5 of Part 4 of Chapter 2 of the Guideline, that a notice be given to the Minister which includes a copy of the Council decision to amend the planning scheme to include the proposed major amendment (refer part of Attachment B, submitted on file) and the required material for the proposed major amendment as prescribed in Schedule 3 of the Guideline requesting:

(a) a State interest review of the proposed major amendment

(b) the Minister’s agreement to publicly consult on the proposed major amendment.

**ADOPTED**

#### F 2020-21 BUDGET – THIRD REVIEW

**134/135/86/368**

**735/2020-21**

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

43. Section 162(2) of the *City of Brisbane Regulation 2012* provides that Council’s budget for a financial year may be amended at any time before the end of the financial year.

44. The Third Budget Review has been prepared and considers:

(a) emerging issues requiring funding and changes to revenue and expenditure for 2020‑21 through to 2023-24

(b) requests to carryover and bring forward project funding to 2020-21 and other forward years.

45. Attachment B (submitted on file) outlines the recommended amendments to the approved budget for 2020‑21 through to 2023-24.

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

47. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A  
Draft Resolution**

**DRAFT RESOLUTION TO APPROVE BUDGET AMENDMENTS – THIRD REVIEW**

As:

(i) Council proposes to amend the budget to address emerging issues and changes to revenue and expenditure for 2020-21 through to 2023-24; and requests to carryover and bring forward project funding to 2020-21 and other forward years

(ii) section 162(2) of the *City of Brisbane Regulation 2012* provides that Council may, by resolution, amend the budget for a financial year at any time before the end of the financial year,

then Council:

(i) resolves to amend the *Annual Plan and Budget 2020-21* by adopting the amended budget allocations for Programs 1 to 8, and Businesses and Council Providers in accordance with Attachment B (submitted on file).

**ADOPTED**

Chair: That concludes the Establishment and Coordination Committee Report.

Councillors, we’ll proceed to the City Planning and Economic Development Committee, please.

### CITY PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

The DEPUTY MAYOR (Councillor Krista ADAMS), Chair of the City Planning and Economic Development Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Fiona HAMMOND, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 18 May 2021, be adopted.

Chair: Is there any debate?

The DEPUTY MAYOR?

DEPUTY MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair, and just to the comments around the questions, I am sorry, I was remiss in not mentioning that in my speech, that the—there was a many, many, many questions that came from Councillor JOHNSTON about her local area.

We answered all the questions around the general questions of the difference between the LGIP and the LTIP and what had moved but as I said very clearly in my correspondence before close of business yesterday, to Councillor JOHNSTON, if she emails the City Planning team, they are more than happy and were waiting this morning to give her her briefing on how it affects the Tennyson Ward and all of those questions will be answered if she would like to take up the opportunity, as any other Councillor in this place can be briefed on the LGIP and the LTIP within their local area.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: No, no, no. Don’t—no interjections, please.

The DEPUTY MAYOR, please proceed.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: No, no. No interjections.

Councillor SRI: Point of order, Chair?

Chair: Point of order, Councillor SRI.

*Councillor interjecting*

Councillor SRI: Would Councillor ADAMS just take a quick question?

DEPUTY MAYOR: I’ll give them the email.

Chair: Hang on, hang on, there’s a lot of—-

DEPUTY MAYOR: It’s fine, Councillor.

Councillor SRI: Yes.

Chair: Sorry, so—well did you want to take a question?

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, please stop talking.

Councillor ADAMS, did you want to answer the question Councillor SRI was asking?

DEPUTY MAYOR: Look, cityplan.admin@brisbane.qld.gov.au.

Chair: Okay, thank you. Please proceed.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Which goes through the Chief Planner’s email. What’s happening this week in the Brisbane Hub? It is an absolute record-breaking week in terms of registrations for our workshops that are coming up. Boost Your Business with Social Media Marketing, CCIQ (Chamber of Commerce and Industry Queensland), is on Thursday from nine till 11. We’ve got 169 registered.

Glen Richards, the founder of Greencross and *Shark Tank* investor is On The Couch this week. That’s at five o’clock on Thursday afternoon. Currently, 200 are registered and there is a wait list so you might have to get on the wait list if you’re interested for that one.

Build Your Brand with a video masterclass from CCIQ next Tuesday from three till five. We’ve already got 112 registered, so hopefully people are listening to me and sharing that information with their local residents and they’re coming in and getting involved in the workshops.

We’ve also got some fantastic On The Couches coming up with very inspiring speakers that you may want to get into early to advertise to your residents. On 30 June, Cathie Reid, the co-founder of Epic Group, who is listed in one of the top 100 women of influence by *Australia Financial Review* and I do know she has been training, is booked onto the first flight of the shuttle with Virgin when it goes.

We’ve got 29 July with Alice Barbery, the CEO of Universal Store and 26 August has got Tracey Mathers from Mathers Shoes. So, a bit of a shoe thing there, Councillor MARX—-

*Councillors interjecting.*

DEPUTY MAYOR: —-if you’re interested in both of those.

By the end of this week, the Hub will have delivered 81 events. Over 2,000 event attendees and the drop ins over that time, 1,200 people have just dropped in to say hello and see how we can help them.

Well done to the team over in the Brisbane Hub. They’re going from strength to strength and again, I ask all in the Chamber to make sure that their residents know about it but don’t forget, if you’re on the northside of Brisbane, you’ve now also got the Suburban Business Networking Hub in Nundah Village as well.

Last week’s presentation was presented by the team at the Brisbane Hub, in particular Isaac, a senior industry manager in technology provided an update on the PropTech Initiative. So this was introduced this year as a part of our Intensive Industry Program and if you’re not familiar with what PropTech is, it is an emerging technology creating a product or service that benefits either all factions or individual parts of the property economy.

So obviously, digitation and rapidly advancing technologies mean that the property sector is increasing rapidly. Around 40,000 jobs by 2039, it will increase by and people are looking at ways to make sure it’s easier and technological advances can be used in this State.

We have the highest number of emerging PropTech companies in Queensland and greater Brisbane than any other region in Australia. Forty—40.2% of all PropTech companies are founded in Queensland and Queensland PropTech companies saw 17.2% revenue increase in the financial year 2020 to 2021.

So the Hub has been focussing on the South East Queensland—-

Councillor CUMMING: Point of order.

DEPUTY MAYOR: —-property sector.

Councillor CUMMING: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor CUMMING?

Councillor CUMMING: What’s a PropTech company, please?

Chair: I think that was a question. You may choose to answer it if you would like?

DEPUTY MAYOR: It was. I’ll take that. As I said, PropTech for—and I’ll read it exactly what I said. PropTech, for those of you who may not be familiar, is an emerging technology sector creating a product or a service that benefits either all parts or individual parts of the property economy.

So we were focussing on new and established property groups to adopt and leverage emerging technologies and further their capabilities.

So being the epicentre of PropTech, obviously with the capital in the biggest, most popular State for it, we thought a great opportunity was to have a launchpad here in the Hub. We actually had a program that engaged 33 new companies that were trying to pitch their technologies to 30 industry partners. We delivered more than 270 targeted industry development.

To date, the six-week program that we ran in the Hub created approximately 33 jobs. It had supported more than $12 million in angel and capital investment into those PropTech companies. It generated approximately 56 deals and created more than 80 industry engagements. That is what we’re talking about here in Schrinner Council. Supporting small businesses to do better, to make our economy thrive and make sure that we can go from strength to strength as we adapt out of last year’s *annus horribilis*.

Chair: Further speakers? Further speakers?

Councillor ADAMS?

I’ll now put the resolution.

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

The report read as follows⎯

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – PROPTECH INITIATIVE

**736/2020-21**

1. The Senior Industry Manager, Technology, Brisbane Economic Development Agency, attended the meeting to provide an update on the PropTech Initiative. He provided the information below.

2. The PropTech Initiative was introduced in 2021 and falls under the Industry Growth and Trade Strategy team, within the Brisbane Business Hub.

3. PropTech is an emerging technology business creating a product and/or service that benefits either all factions or individual factions of the property economy.

4. With digitation, employment in the South East Queensland property sector will increase by approximately 33,500 – 47,900 jobs by 2038-39, taking the total number of jobs in the property sector to approximately 49,000 – 63,400.

5. Brisbane’s PropTech sector coverage includes:

- commercial real estate

- construction

- residential real estate

- development

- major infrastructure

- tenant experience

- retail

- asset management.

6. Queensland and greater Brisbane has the highest number of emerging PropTech companies than any other region in Australia, with 40.2% of all Australian PropTech companies founded in Queensland. Queensland PropTech companies saw a 17.2% revenue increase in the 2020-21 financial year.

7. Objectives of the PropTech Initiative include:

- capability building – advancing South East Queensland’s property sector through the development of the PropTech ecosystem

- inspiration – inspire new and established property groups to adopt and leverage emerging technologies to further their capabilities

- promotion – promote South East Queensland as an epicentre for property technologies and the destination of choice for founders and property ventures to link with capital, research and infrastructure

- connection – connect the property sector in South East Queensland to the broader PropTech industry and demonstrate potential capabilities when emerging technologies are adopted.

8. Brisbane Economic Development Agency’s PropTech Initiative was created to develop and support a technology cluster in association with the property and construction economy in Brisbane. This is being achieved through the delivery of regular masterclasses, tailored programming and curated projects to better align the specific needs of the property sector with the capabilities of the PropTech industry.

9. The Committee was advised of the following 2021 PropTech Initiative outcomes:

- total companies engaged: 33

- industry partners engaged: 30

- hours of industry development delivered: more than 270

- satisfaction with the initiative: 9.3/10.

10. To date, the PropTech Initiative has created approximately 33 jobs, supported more than $12 million investments, generated approximately 56 deals and created more than 80 industry engagements.

11. The Committee was shown testimonials as a result of the PropTech Initiative.

12. Following a number of questions from the Committee, the Chair thanked the Senior Industry Manager for his informative presentation.

13. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

#### B PETITION – REQUESTING COUNCIL INVESTIGATE THE REZONING OF 4 KENNETH STREET, LUTWYCHE, FROM THE LOW MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (2 OR 3 STOREY MIX ZONE PRECINCT) TO A HIGHER DENSITY RESIDENTIAL ZONE AND RELAX THE CURRENT HEIGHT RESTRICTIONS

**CA21/218724**

**737/2020-21**

14. A petition from residents requesting Council investigate the rezoning of 4 Kenneth Street, Lutwyche (the site), from the Low medium density residential (2 or 3 storey mix zone precinct) to a higher density residential zone and relax the current height restrictions, was presented to the meeting of Council held on 2 March 2021, by Councillor Fiona Hammond, and received.

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

16. The petition contains three signatures.

17. The site comprises an area of approximately 1,080 m2 and is located on the corner of Kenneth and Conon Streets, with a frontage to Kenneth Street. The site contains a multiple dwelling complex that was constructed in or around 1966.

18. The petitioners raise concerns about the limited opportunity for increased development on the site, restricting the opportunity for property owners to take advantage of the improving real estate market and to attract more interest from developers in the future. The petitioners note that the zoning of the adjoining streets (High and Conon Streets) provides greater development potential and request the site be zoned similarly.

19. The Low-medium density residential zone (2 or 3 storey mix zone precinct) supports a variety of dwelling types including dwelling houses and multiple dwellings, such as apartments and townhouses, of two or three storeys in height. Where appropriate, community uses, small scale services facilities and infrastructure to support residents can also be supported. The Low‑medium density residential zone (2 or 3 storey mix zone precinct) extends across the entire block, bounded by Kenneth, Conon, McLennan and Stoneleigh Streets.

20. The site is included in the Lutwyche Road corridor neighbourhood plan (the neighbourhood plan). A review of the planning intent and zoning for the Lutwyche area was undertaken as part of the preparation of the neighbourhood plan. The neighbourhood plan was developed in consultation with the community and included careful consideration of where growth should occur to ensure residential amenity is maintained. The neighbourhood plan was adopted in 2010.

21. The neighbourhood plan provides for higher density development in the Lutwyche centre precinct (NPP‑001) to reflect its role as an established activity centre and its high level of accessibility to high‑quality public transport nodes. The Lutwyche centre precinct (NPP-001) includes the Lutwyche centre mixed use corridor sub-precinct (NPP-001a) and the Lutwyche centre residential corridor sub‑precinct (NPP‑001b).

22. The area to the west of the site, which includes Conon Street and High Street, is located in the High density residential (Up to 8 storeys zone precinct), which applies to well-located parts of Brisbane and supports residential development. This area is included in the Lutwyche centre residential corridor sub precinct (NPP-001b), which is intended to accommodate high density residential uses, with heights of between five and eight storeys, to take advantage of the accessibility to high-frequency public transport and centre uses and facilities.

23. Development or redevelopment along the western side of Kenneth Street is intended to have lower densities as it starts the transition between the Lutwyche centre precinct and the lower density residential area to the east. Given this circumstance, together with the site being further away from high-frequency public transport, centre uses and facilities along Lutwyche Road, Council is of the view that the current zoning of the site is appropriate.

Consultation

24. Councillor Fiona Hammond, Councillor for Marchant Ward, has been consulted and supports the recommendation.

Customer impact

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

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

27. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A**

**Draft Response**

**Petition Reference:** CA21/218724

Thank you for your petition requesting Council investigate the rezoning of 4 Kenneth Street, Lutwyche (the site), from the Low-medium density residential zone to a higher density zone and relax the existing height restrictions over the site.

The Low-medium density residential zone (2 or 3 storey mix zone precinct) supports a variety of dwelling types including dwelling houses and multiple dwellings, such as apartments and townhouses, of two or three storeys in height. Where appropriate, community uses, small scale services facilities and infrastructure to support residents can also be supported. The Low‑medium density residential zone (2 or 3 storey mix zone precinct) extends across the entire block, bounded by Kenneth, Conon, McLennan and Stoneleigh Streets.

The site is included in the Lutwyche Road corridor neighbourhood plan (the neighbourhood plan). A review of the planning intent and zoning for the Lutwyche area was undertaken as part of the preparation of the neighbourhood plan. The neighbourhood plan was developed in consultation with the community and included careful consideration of where growth should occur to ensure residential amenity is maintained. The neighbourhood plan was adopted in 2010.

The neighbourhood plan provides for higher density development in the Lutwyche centre precinct (NPP‑001) to reflect its role as an established activity centre and its high level of accessibility to high‑quality public transport nodes. The Lutwyche centre precinct (NPP-001) includes the Lutwyche centre mixed use corridor sub-precinct (NPP-001a) and the Lutwyche centre residential corridor sub‑precinct (NPP-001b).

The area to the west of the site, which includes Conon Street and High Street, is located in the High density residential (Up to 8 storeys zone precinct), which applies to well-located parts of Brisbane and supports residential development. This area is included in the Lutwyche centre residential corridor sub‑precinct (NPP-001b), which is intended to accommodate high density residential uses, with heights of between five and eight storeys, to take advantage of the accessibility to high-frequency public transport and centre uses and facilities.

Development or redevelopment along the western side of Kenneth Street is intended to have lower densities as it starts the transition between the Lutwyche centre precinct and the lower‑density residential area to the east. Given this circumstance, together with the site being further away from high‑frequency public transport, centre uses and facilities along Lutwyche Road, Council is of the view that the current zoning of the site is appropriate.

Please let the other petitioners know of this information.

Should you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact Ms Megan Lawler, Principal Urban Planner, City Plan Operations Team, Strategic Planning, City Planning and Economic Development, City Planning and Sustainability, on (07) 3178 7450.

Thank you for raising this matter.

**ADOPTED**

Chair: Councillors, the Public and Active Transport Committee, please.

### PUBLIC AND ACTIVE TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

Councillor Ryan MURPHY, Chair of the Public and Active Transport Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Sandy LANDERS, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 18 May 2021, be adopted.

Chair: Is there any debate?

Councillor MURPHY?

Councillor MURPHY: Thanks, Chair. Look, before moving to the report before us, I’d like to acknowledge another major milestone in the Green Bridges Program. We’re moving ahead in leaps and bounds for all four green bridges now, having selected another two green bridge alignments and yesterday the LORD MAYOR released the designs for a key component of the Kangaroo Point Green Bridge.

So, we actually released the designs for the new walking and cycling connections to the bridge. We know that the bridge will connect into existing—the existing transport network and this is of great interest to local residents, so, officers did extensive work to ensure that the connections to the Kangaroo Point Green Bridge, particularly on the Kangaroo Point side, serve the needs of the local community.

For the Kangaroo Point side of the bridge, a new Main Street and Deakin Street connection will provide dedicated access for pedestrians and cyclists between the bridge landing at Scott Street and the eastern side of Kangaroo Point peninsula via a new underpass, which runs underneath the Story Bridge, where our existing works depot is.

There will also be a lift and stair connection from the bridge to the landing at C.T. White Park and riverside pathways. For the CBD side of the bridge, active travellers will be able to connect into the CityLink Cycleway via Edward and Alice Streets, noting that it’s currently a 12-month trial, as well as pedestrian cycle connections to the botanic gardens riverwalk via the botanic gardens.

These new cycle connections will make a use of access to the existing pedestrian and cycle network and will ensure that access is safe and well connected. I would encourage all who are interested in the Kangaroo Point Green Bridge to jump on Council’s website to have a look at the plans for the ongoing travel connections.

The green bridges team will also be hosting two information sessions in Maloney Park at Kangaroo Point on 29 May and on 5 June as well, for those who would like to learn more about how these connections will operate and I’m sure we’ll have a strong turnout from Brisbane’s cycling community, who are very interested in those ongoing connections and how they will work.

Now, moving to two of our other green bridges, the consultation outcomes for the West End green bridges were the topic of last week’s Committee presentation. I already talked about the outcomes at length last week but as a quick recap, 600 Coronation Drive to Orleigh Park has been selected as the preferred alignment for the Toowong to West End Green Bridge and for the St Lucia Green Bridge, Guyatt Park to Orleigh Park has been selected as the preferred connection.

It’s been great to listen to and to read, Chair, some of the hype about these two green bridges that it’s attracted in the media last week. It’s safe to say that many people are really excited that we’re now moving ahead with the Schrinner Council’s program for building green bridges—two alignments now in the advanced stages of procurement. Two more alignments selected and one more to go.

We know that the local community, and the broader community, really value their greenspaces, that came out in the consultation report, certainly for both Toowong and St Lucia. What the community has told us is they want the green bridges to deliver park-to-park connections but without impacting on those parks themselves. So, bridges that land into parks complementary with the greenspace.

Council is very much on the same page. We want these green bridges to enhance Orleigh and Guyatt Parks, and this is the focus that Council has now in developing the concept design for these preferred alignments.

We’re excited to be moving into the next phase for the West End green bridges. Two in a whole suite of green bridges championed by LORD MAYOR Adrian SCHRINNER.

Now, just before I come to the petitions last week, I’ll just cover off, Chair, on the situation with the electric buses and I think some of the questions that we heard in the Chamber earlier today around Yutong and the four out of a fleet of 1,200 buses that we have now in trial electric technology were unfortunate. They were unfortunate comments.

I know, I heard at one point, Councillor CASSIDY, who is now leaving the Chamber because he was leaving the Chamber literally as I started talking about him, Chair. Particularly when he screamed out Chinese Communist Party. It was really just an unhinged display today, Chair—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor MURPHY: —and I think we all have to demand and ask more of this Leader of the Opposition when he comes into the Chamber. Not only in reading the reports and knowing that we had actually already awarded a contract to Yutong, months and months and months ago. Maybe in the significant contracting plan when we went out to market, what we had actually specified in terms of our local buy and our performance requirements for the vehicle.

I just expect a little bit more attention to detail from him. A little bit more scrutiny. I mean, let’s not forget the only—the opportunity for Councillor CASSIDY to actually come across this whole thing—it wasn’t anything to do with Council or an announcement that Council made—it was a speech made in Federal Parliament by Anika Wells based off a media release issued by the Australian Manufacturing Workers’ Union, who were upset that Yutong had ceased manufacturing of buses at our Eagle Farm site.

Now, Chair, I don’t know about you, but the Australian Manufacturing Workers’ Union is no friend of manufacturing in Australia. It was that union that almost single-handedly destroyed the car manufacturing industry in South Australia with their outrageous wage demands and unreasonable—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor MURPHY: —unreasonable demands on car makers. It was the unions that pushed car makers offshore. It was not—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor MURPHY: —it was not—it was nothing that we did. It was nothing that the Liberals did, Chair—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor MURPHY: —so you know, I would just say to companies like Yutong, you know, I would say to companies like BusTech—

Chair: All right. Okay.

Councillor MURPHY: —watch out—

Chair: Councillor MURPHY.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Chair: All right, thanks everyone.

We’ve had a bit of fun with that.

Councillor MURPHY, please return to the topic.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor MURPHY: I would just say, Chair, that if companies are getting serious about Australian manufacturing, that local buses here in Brisbane or South East Queensland or more broadly in Australia, then they need to stay the hell away from those unions because those unions are the ones who actually drove manufacturing—brought it to its knees in this country. They are not the secret to bringing it back, I can tell you that.

Chair, the other thing is here, Councillor CASSIDY waxed lyrical about how Jim Soorley was the champion of local manufacturing and let’s not forget, Chair, that it was Jim Soorley who actually—and to his credit, he brought the CNG (compressed natural gas) buses here to Brisbane. What a great local manufacturing success story that was—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor MURPHY: Except they started to explode. Those buses did explode. So I thought—I thought, you know, of all the examples that Councillor CASSIDY could pick to talk about local manufacturing, that might be one that he would have just left in his top pocket but no, there it was.

Now, wrapping up, Chair, last week, the Committee considered a petition requesting Council reinstate the Dockside ferry terminal and, as an interim measure, allow CityCats to stop at the Holman Street terminal. As I’ve said previously in this place, Chair, the Dockside terminal is older infrastructure. It’s not compatible with modern KittyCat vessels because of the height difference between the terminal and the vessel. The freeboard height.

We’ve allocated $48.7 million over the next three years to upgrade ferry terminals and Dockside is one of the terminals that will be upgraded. We’re working our way through the design of the upgrade and in the process of obtaining necessary State approvals at the moment. Once we obtain these, we look forward to providing an update to the community about construction timing.

Now, Chair, in relation to Holman Street, this terminal is currently servicing cross‑river and CityHopper services. Unfortunately, CityCats are unable to use the Holman Street terminal right now due to congestion issues. Having all three services stopping at Holman Street was causing too much congestion on the network and it was impacting running times.

However, this will be reviewed as part of the full timetable review that is happening this year, as has been stated in the petition response. I will leave further debate to the Chamber, thanks, Chair.

Chair: Further speakers?

Councillor SRI?

Councillor SRI: Thanks. I can’t see the timer on my clock so hopefully—

Chair: It’s been reset as—you’ve got two seconds.

Councillor SRI: Yes, cool.

Chair: No, hang on.

There you are.

Councillor SRI: No, I can’t see it but anyway.

Chair: You can’t?

What do you mean?

Councillor SRI: Oh no, it’s here now. Thanks.

Chair: Okay.

Councillor SRI: Cheers. Yes, might speak briefly about the green bridges and then also about the ferry terminal petition. I’m obviously very supportive of the bridge projects and I’m excited to see that progress further. I just did want to highlight again for—particularly for the LORD MAYOR’s attention—that there is an opportunity there to offset the lost greenspace, simply by narrowing the road corridor immediately adjacent to the park and that will also serve a dual benefit of creating space for some wider bike lanes without taking away further greenspace.

I’ve raised this with Councillor MURPHY and I’ll provide that feedback again through other channels but I think early on in the process, the LORD MAYOR was a bit dubious about my suggestion that it was valuable, or worthwhile, or feasible, to offset the lost greenspace resulting from the bridge landings but it’s quite doable, we just simply have to be willing to narrow that roadway a little bit and that’ll essentially widen the park, create more public parkland that people can use and picnic in, *et cetera*. It also has the added benefit of ensuring that when you narrow the road, that makes the road feel a safer and more comfortable space and so parents who are letting their kids run around in the park are lightly less concerned about the fact that the park is next to a busy road corridor.

So, there’s quite a few benefits to be gained there if Council, as part of its green bridge concept designs, also identifies that opportunity to narrow parts of Hill End Terrace and Orleigh Street, *et cetera*. I do hope the Mayor will talk to Councillor MURPHY about that opportunity because I think it’s—it doesn’t require acquiring any private land.

It’s simply a repurposing of existing public roadway and it’ll mean more space for cyclists, better connections to the bridges, offsetting lost parkland and lost greenspace, and hopefully creating room for a few more street trees as well. So, there’s a lot of opportunities there.

I won’t go into detail about the consultation process that the Council ran or the alternative consultation process that we ran but I did just want to highlight that there are still a lot of local residents who aren’t convinced that the bridges represent the best use of money. Certainly, there was majority support for the bridges going ahead, but we heard from a lot of residents who said that there were other higher priorities in terms of local pedestrian crossings, local bikeways, the need for more parkland in the local area, *et cetera*.

I don’t think it has to be an either/or. I think we can fix up the local pedestrian crossings and black spots and deliver the bridges. My concern, unfortunately, is the Administration is acting like it maybe is an either/or.

They’re saying that we don’t have money for a new crossing at Hope Street in South Brisbane, for example. We don’t have money for further improvements to pedestrian safety and pedestrian crossings along Montague Road. We don’t have money to do the Vulture Street bike lanes, but we do have money for the bridges.

I think we have enough money for both, we just have to be a bit smarter about not wasting it all on road widening but I just did want to really highlight for the Administration that it’s going to be very, very important to get those local connections to the bridges right and that when the concept design for the West End bridges, particularly the Toowong Bridge is published, it would, I think, be advisable to also publish some details about what improvements will be made to the connections to the bridge.

I note that with the Kangaroo Point bridge, that the bridge was announced first and the reference design was released and it’s only now, a little while later, that we’ve seen a separate concept design for the underpass and the pathways connecting to that bridge.

I don’t think that’s an ideal approach and I would respectfully suggest that if the Administration has got the time, perhaps release the concept design for the bridge at the same time that you release the concept designs for the key links to get to the bridges.

A lot of residents have questions about the future of Montague Road—as compared to the future of Riverside Drive—and which of those corridors is going to be carrying the majority of cyclists, *et cetera*. So, there are a lot of still unanswered questions that sit alongside questions about the design of the bridge itself and those projects need to be conceptualised holistically.

Certainly, I as a local Councillor would really like to see a lot more detail about how Council anticipates that people will get to the bridges. I know Councillor MURPHY is alert to that need and I just want to make sure it’s on the LORD MAYOR’s radar as well, and also on Council McLACHLAN’s radar.

Because inevitably, if we’re going to be creating more—putting in more pedestrian crossings so that people can get to these bridges safely and if we’re going to be putting in more bike lanes, that’s going to mean taking away a bit of space from cars and the Administration needs to be comfortable with that.

I certainly am comfortable with that approach but we need to go into this open‑eyed that if we are to make it possible for people to safely access these important pieces of infrastructure, both on the West End side and in the St Lucia and Toowong sides, we’re going to have to repurpose a little bit of road space in order to deliver better bike lanes and maybe take away a few car parking bays in order to put in some new pedestrian crossings, *et cetera*. That’s okay. The sky won’t fall in if we do that.

Just turning to the public transport issues in Kangaroo Point, I just wanted to highlight that we lost the Thornton Street ferry terminal and we lost the Dockside ferry terminal. Then, as part of the Story Bridge restoration projects, Council also, fairly unceremoniously and with little warning, shut down the main bus stop for Baildon Street at the northern end of the peninsula.

It’s that cumulative impact of loss of public transport services that’s particularly frustrating to residents at a time when people think we should be improving public transport services. That seems like a logical way to develop a growing city is that we should be providing more public transport services, better services, more frequent, more reliable, greater coverage. Dare I say, more affordable would be nice?

But instead of improving public transport services, this Council has cut two ferry terminals and a bus stop for Kangaroo Point in a short space of time. Now, I accept that there are reasons for that but the level of frustration in the community is very high and I don’t think it satisfies residents when Council says, oh, the Dockside terminal will be restored at some point. We don’t know exactly when but it’s coming.

Because that’s no fixed timeline on that, it could be a year, it could be two years, it could be three years. Councillor ADAMS herself acknowledged previously that sometimes things can go wrong, and projects can get cancelled, or timeframes can blow out even further.

So, I’m still a little nervous about exactly when the Dockside terminal will be restored. Similarly with that Baildon Street bus stop, I’ve heard from quite a few residents who say that that’s been a real hard thing for them losing access to that bus stop. I don’t mean any disrespect but Councillor MURPHY, through you, Chair, I think perhaps you’re a little bit dismissive of the idea that it would be preferable to remove a few car parking bays so that the bus stop can remain there.

I really stand by that and I don’t think that’s a radical position, or an anti‑car position. Hundreds of people use that bus stop on Baildon Street and for Council to say, oh, we would rather take away the bus top all together than remove some parking bays temporarily—and I stress that, it’s only a proposal to temporarily remove some parking spots so that we can keep that bus stop in there during the Story Bridge restoration works—I think that would have been a good idea. It’s perhaps a little bit of a shame that wasn’t explored more closely.

I know the Administration is trying, and I don’t want to give you too hard a time, but the pattern here is for repeated cuts to services and meantime there’s no certainty or clarity about whether there’ll be any improvements to public transport services going forward.

I know a little while ago there was talk of a CityGlider network strategy or something along those lines and that Council was exploring the possibility of a Glider route along Main Street and over the Story Bridge. I think it pertains directly to this petition and I’d appreciate if Councillor MURPHY did have any more insights about the Glider strategy and whether there will be a new CityGlider running through Kangaroo Point to connect from Woolloongabba up to Fortitude Valley, I think that’s a really good idea.

I know residents are excited about that possibility and certainly, considering that we’re losing the Thornton Street ferry terminal and we’re not getting that one back, an improvement—a permanent improvement to bus services in the area is probably merited. Particularly when you consider that there have been literally thousands of additional apartments built in that area of the past few years.

I heard Councillor OWEN talk about the rapid growth out on the southside but we’ve actually had even faster growth in the inner city and the great tragedy, unfortunately, is that a lot of those residents are still driving. What should happen in inner city neighbourhoods is that as those areas get denser, public transport and accessibility improves and people shift away from car dependency to other modes of transport.

Unfortunately, in Kangaroo Point as many as 40%, perhaps close to 50%, of residents are still driving as their main mode of transport. Cutting public transport services is not going to turn that around.

Chair: Further speakers? Any further speakers?

Councillor MURPHY?

Councillor MURPHY: Just very briefly, Chair, just to respond to some of the things that Councillor SRI said. Look, firstly on services, ferry services in and around Kangaroo Point, I’ve said previously in this place—and I’ve offered apologies to the residents of Kangaroo Point for the unplanned stoppage of ferry services to their suburb with the taking off of the wood-monohull fleet. Many times, actually.

I can only repeat that sentiment and assure them that we are working as fast as we can to restore services and upgrade those terminals but these are long lead time items. You can’t fabricate terminals overnight. There are land tenure issues that need to be resolved so we’re working through those as quickly as we can so that we can restore services to residents in Kangaroo Point.

I would also just note, Chair, on the Baildon Street shuttle, this is a temporary shuttle which we’ve been running in order to provide a new, additional service to Kangaroo Point residents since we took the ferries—the CityHopper—away from many of those residents.

We are moving that service, but I just note that in the previous debate, Councillor SRI, he spent a lot of time talking us—talking to us about how we need to make more evidence-based decision-making. I can tell you that the officers looked at the cost-benefit of removing all the car parks from the various streets—the three streets it would need to be removed from—in order to get buses to be able to loop around to move that service—the cost-benefit simply wasn’t there.

So, I would suggest that you—the way you approach car parking is far more from an ideological position of opposing car parking, car usage, car spaces, than from an evidence-based perspective. I understand why, I get that. I’m not criticising that but I’m just saying, on this occasion, officers have made a decision based on the evidence that it wasn’t worth it.

It simply wasn’t worth it to go to the trouble of displacing that many residents, that many loading zones, that many pieces of managed parking in order to provide the bus a place to turn around for a few months. So, they came to that decision independently of any guidance from me and I back them every day of the week in that decision.

Now, also, just to recap, I agreed and have agreed previously that Kangaroo Point, the peninsula is fairly poorly serviced by public and active transport when it comes to walkability. There are not a lot of ways in which residents can walk around that suburb and get the services that they—that any suburb of that many people—needs and the Kangaroo Point Green Bridge is the answer to addressing that.

We know that at the moment, only one in eight residents uses walking as a mode of transport to get around Kangaroo Point but over 50% have said, when we’ve surveyed them, that they would use a Kangaroo Point Green Bridge daily. So that is a huge uplift for active travel in and around the peninsula.

So I think the best thing that we can do to provide residents an opportunity to say goodbye to the car or maybe to—for a family of two or three, to lose one of their cars at least—is to provide that bridge, which gets them into the CBD which allows them to use the services that are here in the heart of the city. So, I’ll—with those few words, Chair, I think I’ll leave it at that.

Chair: I now put the resolution.

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

The report read as follows⎯

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – GREEN BRIDGES CONSULTATION UPDATE

**738/2020-21**

1. The Project Director Green Bridges, Civil Major Projects, Major Projects, City Projects Office, Brisbane Infrastructure, attended the meeting to provide an update on the green bridges consultation. He provided the information below.

2. The Toowong to West End Green Bridge and St Lucia to West End Green Bridge (West End Green Bridges) will create a vital active travel network between the growing communities in West End, Toowong and St Lucia, including connections to the University of Queensland. Initial community consultation was undertaken in late 2019, as part of the early planning phase of Council’s Green Bridges Program. Following this initial feedback, the West End Green Bridges progressed as walking and cycling bridges only, with technical investigations on potential alignments and landing locations undertaken during 2020. Further community consultation was then undertaken from 23 November 2020 to 31 March 2021, on potential alignment options for each green bridge.

3. A map displaying the following potential alignment options for the West End Green Bridges was shown to the Committee.

- Toowong to West End Green Bridge:

- Option A – 600 Coronation Drive, Toowong, to Orleigh Park, near Forbes Street, West End

- Option B – Archer Street (mid-block), Toowong, to Orleigh Park, near Drury Street, West End

- Option C – Archer Street, near Glen Road, Toowong, to Orleigh Park, near Drury Street.

- St Lucia to West End Green Bridge:

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

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

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

4. Overall, more than 4,000 items of feedback across all consultation activities were received for the West End Green Bridges, including:

- 3,373 survey responses:

- Toowong to West End Green Bridge with 1,856 completed responses

- St Lucia to West End Green Bridge with 1,517 completed responses

- 565 attendees at six community information sessions, with 315 feedback forms completed

- 30 formal submissions received from key stakeholders

- approximately 310 items of feedback received by phone, email and other correspondence.

5. The overarching themes from the feedback received on the West End Green Bridges include:

- a strong interest in the new green bridges and proposed alignment options

- general community support for new walking and cycling connections between Toowong, St Lucia and West End

- an interest in how each alignment option would connect to the broader active and public transport network

- suggestions for specific design elements to minimise the impact of the green bridges and provide safe connections for all users

- an interest in the timing for delivery of the new green bridges.

6. From the online survey results on the potential alignment options for the Toowong to West End Green Bridge:

- 83% of participants supported Option A

- 40% of participants supported Option B

- 27% of participants supported Option C.

7. The key feedback themes received on the Toowong to West End Green Bridge indicate:

- a very strong support for Option A, with requests for Council to deliver new greenspace at 600 Coronation Drive

- less support for Option B and limited support for Option C

- an interest in the timing for delivery of the green bridge

- there are concerns regarding impacts to local residents and river users.

8. From the online survey results on the potential alignment options for the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge:

- 64% of participants supported Option A

- 22% of participants supported Option B

- 35% of participants supported Option C.

9. The key feedback themes received on the St Lucia to West End Green Bridge indicate:

- general positive support for Option A, with requests to minimise impacts to greenspace

- less support for Option B and limited support for Option C

- concerns about the impacts of Options B and C on private property requirements

- the green bridge being a low priority for some residents, with suggestions for other projects in the local area to be prioritised

- an interest in more information being made available.

10. Following the consultation outcomes and initial technical investigations and feasibility assessments, the preferred alignments for the West End Green Bridges have been identified as Option A for both green bridges. Options B and C for each green bridge will not progress. Council will prepare concept designs and preliminary business cases based on these preferred alignments for further discussion with the community later this year. Detailed business cases for each green bridge will be prepared by late 2021 for discussion with the Queensland and Australian Governments.

11. Upcoming community engagement activities include:

- Kangaroo Point Green Bridge:

- ongoing active transport connections (mid-2021)

- contract award (mid-2021)

- start of construction (late 2021)

- Breakfast Creek Green Bridge:

- detailed design and expected construction impacts (mid-2021)

- contract award and start of construction (late 2021)

- ongoing investigations into a potential fifth green bridge.

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

13. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

#### B PETITION – REQUESTING COUNCIL REINSTATE THE DOCKSIDE FERRY TERMINAL AND, AS AN INTERIM MEASURE, ALLOW CITYCATS TO STOP AT THE HOLMAN STREET FERRY TERMINAL

**CA21/160489**

**739/2020-21**

14. A petition from residents, requesting Council reinstate the Dockside Ferry Terminal and, as an interim measure, allow CityCats to stop at the Holman Street Ferry Terminal, was presented to the meeting of Council held on 16 February 2021, by Councillor Jonathan Sri, and received.

15. The Divisional Manager, Transport for Brisbane, provided the following information.

16. The petition contains a total of 333 signatures, with the majority of signatories residing in Kangaroo Point.

17. Council provides ferry and CityCat services through a contract with RiverCity Ferries Pty Ltd. There is also an agreement between Council and TransLink, in which TransLink provides integrated ticketing arrangements on ferry and CityCat services. Council works in conjunction with TransLink to ensure the residents and visitors of Brisbane have access to a reliable and accessible public transport network.

18. In July 2020, Council’s nine monohull ferries that provided the cross-river and CityHopper ferry services were removed from service due to safety concerns. The decision to remove them from service at short notice was not taken lightly and was made to ensure the safety of the passengers and crew.

19. Council sourced additional ferries and returned the only steel monohull, *Kalparrin*, to cover some of the cross-river and CityHopper ferry services as an interim measure while it assesses the capability of the fleet. In November 2020, RiverCity Ferries Pty Ltd began operating additional ferries known as KittyCats.

20. Council reviewed the network by examining the compatibility of the existing terminals with the KittyCats, the patronage of each service and the vessel numbers needed to service the network. The KittyCats are similar in performance to Council’s CityCats and have similar requirements for berthing at terminals.

21. As Dockside Ferry Terminal is an older terminal, it is not currently compatible with the modern KittyCats due to the difference in height between the terminal and vessel.

22. Council has allocated funding over the next three years to upgrade terminals to improve accessibility for all users and will continue to keep Kangaroo Point residents informed of the plans for this terminal.

23. As an interim measure to service Kangaroo Point residents when the monohull ferries were removed from service, Council added Holman Street to the CityCat timetable. Modelling has shown that having all three services stopping at Holman Street creates a significant congestion problem, resulting in CityCats, CityHopper and cross-river services being ‘parked’ in the river waiting for an opportunity to berth.

24. A decision was made to prioritise the free CityHopper service at the Holman Street Ferry Terminal and as the cross-river and CityHopper services have now resumed from Holman Street, the CityCats have ceased servicing it. Council will undertake a full timetable review in 2021.

25. Kangaroo Point residents can access the Brisbane CBD from Holman Street using the Kangaroo Point cross-river ferry and free CityHopper services, or by using the route 27 free shuttle bus service.

Consultation

26. Councillor Ryan Murphy, Chair of the Public and Active Transport Committee, has been consulted and supports the recommendation.

Customer impact

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

28. The Divisional Manager recommended as follows and the Committee agreed, with Councillors Jared Cassidy and Jonathan Sri dissenting.

29. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A**

**Draft Response**

**Petition Reference:** CA21/160489

Thank you for your petition requesting Council reinstate the Dockside Ferry Terminal and, as an interim measure, allow CityCats to stop at the Holman Street Ferry Terminal.

Council provides ferry and CityCat services through a contract with RiverCity Ferries Pty Ltd. There is also an agreement between Council and TransLink, in which TransLink provides integrated ticketing arrangements on ferry and CityCat services. Council works in conjunction with TransLink to ensure the residents and visitors of Brisbane have access to a reliable and accessible public transport network.

In July 2020, Council’s nine monohull ferries that provided the cross-river and CityHopper ferry services were removed from service due to safety concerns. The decision to remove them from service at short notice was not taken lightly and was made to ensure the safety of the passengers and crew.

Council sourced additional ferries and returned the only steel monohull, *Kalparrin*, to cover some of the cross-river and CityHopper ferry services as an interim measure while it assesses the capability of the fleet. In November 2020, RiverCity Ferries Pty Ltd began operating additional ferries known as KittyCats.

Council reviewed the network by examining the compatibility of the existing terminals with the KittyCats, the patronage of each service and the vessel numbers needed to service the network. The KittyCats are similar in performance to Council’s CityCats and have similar requirements for berthing at terminals.

As Dockside Ferry Terminal is an older terminal, it is not currently compatible with the modern KittyCats due to the difference in height between the terminal and vessel.

Council has allocated funding over the next three years to upgrade terminals to improve accessibility for all users and will continue to keep Kangaroo Point residents informed of the plans for this terminal.

As an interim measure to service Kangaroo Point residents when the monohull ferries were removed from service, Council added Holman Street to the CityCat timetable. Modelling has shown that having all three services stopping at Holman Street creates a significant congestion problem, resulting in CityCats, CityHopper and cross-river services being ‘parked’ in the river waiting for an opportunity to berth.

A decision was made to prioritise the free CityHopper service at the Holman Street Ferry Terminal and as the cross-river and CityHopper services have now resumed from Holman Street, the CityCats have ceased servicing it. Council will undertake a full timetable review in 2021.

Kangaroo Point residents can access the Brisbane CBD from Holman Street using the Kangaroo Point cross-river ferry and free CityHopper services, or by using the route 27 free shuttle bus service.

Please let the other petitioners know of this information.

Should you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact Ms Selena Beaverson, Executive Assistant, Divisional Manager’s Office, Transport for Brisbane, on (07) 3407 2216.

Thank you for raising this matter.

**ADOPTED**

Chair: The Infrastructure Committee, please.

### INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE

Councillor David McLACHLAN, Chair of the Infrastructure Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Peter MATIC, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 18 May 2021, be adopted.

Chair: Is there any debate?

Councillor McLACHLAN.

Councillor McLACHLAN: Thank you, Mr Chair. We’ve already had a brief preamble on this from Councillor STRUNK earlier in the LGIP debate talking about the Ipswich Road Project, which was indeed the Ipswich Motorway Upgrade Project, which was indeed the topic of our Committee presentation last week.

I’d like to commend the State Government and the Federal Government for working on this upgrade, a $400 million upgrade project that took four years to develop—to deliver, but a great project it is indeed, to provide necessary connection over the flood plain in that part of the city over Rocklea.

So, the other element though that was of interest to the Committee, which was why this was worth bringing to the Committee, was the manner in which the upgrade project included a Council officer, a senior engineer, to be part of the project team from beginning to end, which helped Council to deliver—develop and deliver assets—as a part of that project that would help our road infrastructure, our road network as well.

That, in particular, was the adjoining road through Boundary Road connection, which is now an important part of the approved plan solution in that neck of the woods and by all reports, doing a very good job of delivering on what was intended with that design.

But I’ll be brief, Mr Chair, I won’t speak too much more about it other than to say, great to see infrastructure being delivered at different levels of government. Council plays its part. The State Government plays its part. Both of us supported by the Federal Government, as this project was, and good to see it completed.

Chair: Further speakers? Further speakers?

There being none, Councillor McLACHLAN?

We now put the resolution.

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

The report read as follows⎯

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – IPSWICH MOTORWAY UPGRADE WORKS INTEGRATION

**740/2020-21**

1. The Asset Management Project and Innovation Manager, Asset Management, Brisbane Infrastructure, attended the meeting to provide an update on the Ipswich Motorway Upgrade Project (the project). He provided the information below.

2. The project was delivered by the Department of Transport and Main Roads (TMR), at a cost of approximately $400 million. The project costs were equally funded by the Queensland and Australian Governments. Stage 1 of the project involved the upgrade of 3 km of the Ipswich Motorway, between Granard Road, Rocklea, and Oxley Road, Oxley, with construction commencing in October 2017. Stage 1 of the project was formally opened on 27 April 2021.

3. The Committee was shown a photo of the Granard Road section of the project.

4. The project work consists of:

- upgrading the motorway from four lanes to six lanes

- constructing higher bridges over Oxley Creek, including seven new bridges (four of which will be contributed to Council)

- the new 1.5 km Boundary Road connection road linking Boundary Road, Rocklea, across the Oxley floodplain through to the Blunder Road intersection at Oxley (Council asset)

- a new northern service road over the Oxley Creek floodplain (Council asset)

- new traffic signals at the Suscatand Street intersection, Rocklea (Council asset)

- a two-way, separated on-road cycle path along the northern service road, between Oxley Creek and the Granard Road interchange, and a shared pedestrian and bike path running the full length of the project.

5. Benefits of the project include:

- linking the industrial precincts either side of Oxley Creek without having to enter the motorway, reducing congestion, improving safety, and enhancing economic development

- extending the shared path network from the motorway and provides a path connection for the Oxley Creek Transformation Project’s proposed ‘Greenway’ shared path

- providing the ‘missing link’ of Boundary Road across the Oxley Creek floodplain.

6. Benefits of the Boundary Road connection include:

- improved motorway operations by encouraging local trips off the motorway

- improved safety and efficiency for vehicles using the motorway, particularly for the significant number of freight vehicles by reducing congestion

- realising the benefits of the Ipswich Motorway upgrade investment by providing an approximate 1.5 km missing link in a 12 km supporting parallel road to encourage local trips off the motorway between the industrial areas of Rocklea and Carole Park

- improving road network robustness as an alternative route in the event of an incident on the Ipswich Motorway.

7. TMR sponsored a Senior Engineer from Council to form part of the project team, who was involved from design through to construction and handover. This created a central point of contact onsite for the project and construction team to provide guidance on standards and ensured accelerated turnaround time and minimised delays in progressing the project.

8. Following a number of questions from the Committee, the Chair thanked the Asset Management Project and Innovation Manager for his informative presentation.

9. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

Chair: Councillors, the Environment, Parks and Sustainability Committee, please.

### ENVIRONMENT, PARKS AND SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE

Councillor Tracy DAVIS, A/Chair of the Environment, Parks and Sustainability Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor James MACKAY, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 18 May 2021, be adopted.

Chair: Is there any debate?

Councillor DAVIS.

Councillor DAVIS: Thank you, Chair. Last week’s Committee presentation was on Brisbane City Council’s Green Heart Fair. I spoke at length about this fantastic event during Question Time today, but I will take the opportunity again to encourage residents to come out and about on Sunday to 7th Brigade Park.

I know Councillor HAMMOND is waiting there and welcoming people in Marchant Ward. I know she enjoys hosting this particular event out her way and certainly for those Councillors on the northside of Brisbane, come along and have a great time, and we’re looking forward to hosting someone from the west in Councillor MACKAY to come out as well.

Mr Chair, the Committee also considered a formal park naming of the playground in Sandgate Foreshores Park, Sandgate, as ‘Peebo and Dagwood Place’, and a petition requesting that Council install a basketball hoop and circle in Biami Yumba Park, Fig Tree Pocket. I’ll leave further debate to the Chamber.

Chair: Further speakers?

Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair. I just rise to briefly speak on Clause B. This is the final step in the process to formally name the playground along the Sandgate Foreshore at Fifth Avenue, ‘Peebo and Dagwood Place’, in honour of two of Brisbane’s favourite clowns and amazing advocates for organ donation.

To say I’ve been proud to work alongside David Bissell, otherwise known as ‘Dagwood’, and my local community on this legacy project for Peebo and Dagwood, would certainly be an understatement. So, thank you to Councillors in here and Council officers for supporting this petition and bringing continued joy to my community.

Chair: Further speakers?

Councillor MACKAY.

Councillor MACKAY: Thank you, Chair. I rise to speak on item C and you’ll be pleased to know I’ll be very, very brief—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Councillor MACKAY: Just with regards to Biami Yumba Park, it’s a large local recreation park and of course it includes the normal embellishments like toilets, playgrounds, significant lake as well, which is unusual for most parks but that was a Traditional Owners’ significant place.

In 2019, we did significant community consultation about what people wanted to see in, and around, Biami Yumba and in Fig Tree Pocket, and just for some background, people suggested things such as a community garden, more shelters, more park benches, better lighting, footpaths, nesting boxes, picnic tables, gym equipment, pontoon, and a basketball court.

So, I just wanted to put it on record that I do appreciate the community putting forward these ideas. We do have a lot of competing demands and I look forward to working with locals to embellish the park further.

Chair: Further speakers? Any further speakers?

Councillor DAVIS?

I’ll now put the resolution.

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

The report read as follows⎯

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – BRISBANE CITY COUNCIL’S GREEN HEART FAIRS

**741/2020-21**

1. The Manager, Natural Environment, Water and Sustainability, City Planning and Sustainability, attended the meeting to provide an update on Council’s Green Heart Fairs. He provided the information below.

2. The Green Heart Fair was established in 2009, and achieves the following outreach annually across its two events:

- approximately 40,000 attendees

- more than 260 sustainable exhibitors and sponsors

- provides 6,000 free native plants to the community

- reaches more than 3 million people through media activities each year.

3. Green Heart Fairs focus on sustainability and offer the following initiatives:

- waste sorting stations

- waste warriors (volunteers)

- mug libraries

- no single-use plastics

- upcycled furniture

- locally sourced and sustainability-focused food vendors.

4. Due to the impacts of COVID-19, Council held a virtual Green Heart Fair in 2020. The virtual event achieved the following outreach:

- 211,600 people reached through social media channels

- more than 14,600 virtual attendees

- a social media following of 17,233 people

- media promotions including ABC radio and Council’s Living in Brisbane publication

- 47 local business participated.

5. The Committee was shown a site map of an upcoming Green Heart Fair and images from previous events.

6. The upcoming Green Heart Fairs will be held at:

- 7th Brigade Park, Chermside, on 30 May 2021 from 9am to 3pm

- Carindale Recreation Reserve, Carindale, on 5 September 2021 from 8am to 2pm.

7. Following a number of questions from the Committee, the Chair thanked the Manager, Natural Environment, Water and Sustainability, for his informative presentation.

8. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

#### B PARK NAMING – FORMAL NAMING OF THE PLAYGROUND IN SANDGATE FORESHORES PARK, SANDGATE, AT THE END OF FIFTH AVENUE, AS ‘PEEBO AND DAGWOOD PLACE’

**161/540/567/216**

**742/2020-21**

9. The A/Manager, Asset Services, Field Services, Brisbane Infrastructure, provided the following information.

10. On 12 March 2021, Council received a petition requesting Council name the playground in Sandgate Foreshores Park (D0276, B-RE-1875), Sandgate, at the end of Fifth Avenue, as ‘Peebo and Dagwood Place’. The petition received 1,184 signatures, and the recommendation to proceed with the playground naming was adopted by Council, at its meeting held on 11 May 2021.

11. The playground has recently been replaced under Council’s 2020-21 Capital Works Program.

12. Mr Peter ‘Peebo’ Bissell and Mr David ‘Dagwood’ Bissell were popular clowns in Brisbane and, despite ongoing health issues, the twins spent 20 years bringing joy to countless residents. Mr Peter Bissell passed away in March 2020.

13. It is considered that there has been an important contribution to the local and wider Brisbane community by Mr David Bissell and the late Mr Peter Bissell.

Funding

14. Funding for the name sign is available in the North Region, Asset Services, Field Services, Brisbane Infrastructure, recurrent budget allocation for 2020-21.

Consultation

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

Customer impact

16. Formally naming the playground at Sandgate Foreshores Park, Sandgate, at the end of Fifth Avenue, as ‘Peebo and Dagwood Place’, will acknowledge the important contribution by Mr Peter Bissell and Mr David Bissell to the local and wider Brisbane community.

17. The A/Manager recommended as follows and the Committee agreed.

18. **RECOMMENDATION:**

**that approval be granted to formally name the playground at Sandgate Foreshores Park, Sandgate, at the end of Fifth Avenue, as ‘Peebo and Dagwood Place’, in accordance with Council’s *OS03 Naming Parks, Facilities or Tracks Procedure*.**

**ADOPTED**

#### C PETITION – REQUESTING THAT COUNCIL INSTALL A BASKETBALL HOOP AND CIRCLE IN BIAMI YUMBA PARK, FIG TREE POCKET

**CA21/121434**

**743/2020-21**

19. A petition from residents, requesting that Council install a basketball hoop and circle in Biami Yumba Park, Fig Tree Pocket, was presented to the meeting of Council held on 9 February 2021, by Councillor James Mackay, and received.

20. The Executive Manager, City Standards, provided the following information.

21. The petition contains 33 signatures.

22. Biami Yumba Park (as shown in Attachment B, submitted on file) is a large local recreation park in Fig Tree Pocket, classified under *Brisbane City Plan 2014* as ‘local open space’.

23. The park has open recreation spaces and facilities including toilets, a playground, as well as a large lake that provides valuable habitat for local wildlife.

24. Biami Yumba Park would be suitable for the installation of a basketball court as the distance from neighbouring residences is greater than 100 metres.

25. Currently, there is no funding available for the installation of a basketball hoop and circle at Biami Yumba Park. Council has listed these works for consideration as part of Council’s future capital works program.

26. This request has also been forwarded to Councillor James Mackay, Councillor for Walter Taylor Ward, for his consideration as part of the Walter Taylor Ward Suburban Enhancement Fund.

Funding

27. Funding may be obtained from Council’s future capital works program or the Walter Taylor Ward Suburban Enhancement Fund.

Consultation

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

Customer impact

29. It is anticipated the installation of a basketball court in Biami Yumba Park would have a positive customer impact for park users.

30. The Executive Manager recommended as follows and the Committee agreed.

31. **RECOMMENDATION:**

**that the draft response, as set out in Attachment A,** hereunder**, be sent to the head petitioner.**

**Attachment A**

**Draft Response**

**Petition Reference:** CA21/121434

Thank you for your petition requesting that Council install a basketball hoop and circle in Biami Yumba Park (Fig Tree Pocket Recreation Reserve), Kenny Street, Fig Tree Pocket.

Council has completed an onsite investigation and considered your request.

Council has listed the installation of a basketball hoop and circle in Biami Yumba Park for consideration as part of Council’s future capital works program.

Each June, all listed projects are prioritised and assessed against the overall needs of the city.

Your request has also been forwarded to Councillor James Mackay, Councillor for Walter Taylor Ward, for his consideration as part of the Walter Taylor Ward Suburban Enhancement Fund.

Each local Councillor nominates which new park projects are funded from their Suburban Enhancement Fund. In the 2020-21 financial year, $14.68 million has been distributed evenly between each ward to enable the delivery of ward-focused projects relating to pedestrian infrastructure, parks, road reserve and community facility improvements.

If you would like to discuss your request directly with Councillor Mackay, please contact the Walter Taylor Ward Office on (07) 3407 0005.

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

Should you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact Mr Shane Klepper, Regional Coordinator Parks, West Region, Asset Services, Field Services, Brisbane Infrastructure, on (07) 3407 0639.

Thank you for raising this matter.

**ADOPTED**

Chair: Councillors, the City Standards, Community Health and Safety Committee, please.

Councillor MARX.

Councillor MARX: Thank you, Mr Chair, I’m making sure I didn’t miss the call this week.

### CITY STANDARDS, COMMUNITY HEALTH AND SAFETY COMMITTEE

Councillor Kim MARX, Chair of the City Standards, Community Health and Safety Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Steven TOOMEY, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 18 May 2021, be adopted.

Chair: Is there any debate?

Councillor MARX.

Councillor MARX: Yes, thank you, Mr Chair. Just briefly, the reason we’re all rushing through our reports is because it’s like an igloo here in the Chambers, as seen by Councillor SRI, is actually wearing a hat—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor MARX: So, I just want—

Chair: For interest, I have increased the temperature so it should be warmer.

All right?

Councillor MARX: Okay, well let’s see how we go. So, I want to just—last week’s Committee report was the Illawong Way drainage project. It was a project out there in the Pullenvale Ward. Councillor ADERMANN has addressed the Chamber previously about this project, so I’m quite happy to leave it at that and there was also a petition and I’m happy to leave any of that debate to the Chamber.

Chair: Further speakers?

Councillor JOHNSTON.

**Seriatim - Clause B**

|  |
| --- |
| Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON requested that Clause B, PETITION – REQUESTING COUNCIL REMOVE THE CADAGHI TREE OUTSIDE 32 ROBERTSON STREET, SHERWOOD, AND REPLACE IT WITH A SUITABLE NATIVE TREE, be taken seriatim for voting purposes. |

Chair: Please proceed.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, I note that Council is refusing to remove the Cadaghi outside the Loban property in Robinson Street—ah, Robertson Street, Sherwood. This is incredibly disappointing as the Loban family are extremely concerned about the size of this tree and its adverse impacts on their safety.

Their neighbours and many people in Robertson Street have signed the petition supporting removal of the tree and it is a matter about which the Loban family have written to Councillor MARX on several occasions.

Tonight, I’m going to read the submission that Mrs Loban made to Councillor MARX and to this Council and I urge Council to vote against the response here today, which is to retain the tree.

‘The petition’—this is Mrs Loban’s words—'the petition requests the replacement of the very, very large Cadaghi for a smaller, more suitable native tree. There is no dispute about the health and vigour of the tree, the concerns are the impact of this weed tree on the environment, health and safety of residents and visitors and property.

As residents of Robertson Street for nearly 40 years, we have observed changes that have occurred in the neighbourhood and the arboretum. The arboretum is a well-planned and restful place. There are over 1,000 trees. It’s the fourth most‑visited park in Brisbane’.

It’s—it goes on to talk about—more about the arboretum. Mrs Loban then notes, ‘Robinson Street provides street access to the arboretum. It’s used extensively on weekends, Easter, Christmas and other celebratory occasions.

Brisbane City Council has made a concerted effort to ensure the plants in the arboretum are appropriate and reflect changes in plant philosophy. The Cadaghi, a north Queensland rainforest tree, is deemed by BCC (Brisbane City Council) to be a Class R weed. Council has an intent to reduce these weed populations. The identification of the Cadaghi as recognised as a weed selected for removal is reflected information provided by a number of councils, including Logan, Mackay and many others’.

She goes on to say that ‘the Cadaghi is a fast-growing tree and has previously been used as a street and garden tree further south than its natural range, particularly in the 1970s and 1980s.

Brisbane City Council has an excellent site on weed identifications and it’s been active in ensuring the Cadaghi is removed from in, and around, the Sherwood Arboretum’. Remember, Robertson Street leads to the Sherwood Arboretum.

She goes on to say that ‘during the 1990s, the Sherwood Arboretum had several large Cadaghi trees that were removed by Brisbane City Council’. Back in the 1990s, Mrs Loban approached Council to remove the tree from her frontage at Robertson Street, but she was told it would not be removed.

In around 2000, a Cadaghi was removed from the footpath on Dewar Terrace, overlooking the eastern end of the arboretum and, again, it was not removed from Robertson Street when she asked. In March 2021, there was heavy lopping of a tree in the Francis Lookout, a Cadaghi tree, and the removal of unsuitable species including poinsettia trees in Robinson Street, Sherwood, in 2001. Residents believed at that time it was a commitment by Council to plant more attractive and appropriate trees.

All of the petitioners are residents of, or close to, Robertson Street, Sherwood. Some have lived in this locality for many years. Several of the petitioners are associated with the Friends of Sherwood Arboretum. Petitioners have well cared for and well planted gardens. The petitioners have requested Council remove the environmental weed species as it is a hazard and risk to pedestrians, vehicle drivers, private property, due to the large branches that fall off on a regular basis and the gumnuts that litter the street.

They produce tiny—this is me now—not Mrs Loban. They produce tiny little balls that are very slippery and a trip hazard. They also produce a black soot which is sticky and it gets on everything.

A weed species—Barbara goes on to say, ‘a weed species may include native plants that have been included outside their native range. That includes the Cadaghi, which is a plant from north Queensland introduced into Brisbane.

Weeds share a common set of characteristics that include rapid seedling growth, production of large amounts of seeds, vigorous vegetative growth and an ability to survive in a range of environments. The Cadaghi has all these characteristics.

The problem with weed trees is that they compete for light, nutrients, water and space. They compete for pollinators and seed dispersers. They are fast growing and compete out native species, thereby reducing their populations and biodiversity.

Unsuitability of the particular species for urban environment. Although, the Cadaghi has positive characteristics, it’s unsuitable for planning in urban areas. It is a large tree of up to 30 metres in height and width. The flowers are fragrant, white and attractive.

The states of Queensland and New South Wales both recognise the Cadaghi, *Corymbia torelliana*, as an environmental weed with Queensland acknowledging it is becoming a serious weed. Suitable alternative natives are available. Landcare organisations advocate removing this weed tree. The impacts on the environment, economic productivity and health—it impacts on environment, economic productivity and health.

Controlling the spread of the weed is—will reduce the threat to native vegetation. Arborists recommend removing them in Brisbane. The Cadaghi releases thousands of seeds. The seeds are regularly washed into Council drains, transported by the tyres of tread, through fauna and dispersed through wind, rain and natural drift. The seeds regularly germinate across property and need to be removed by hand. Not removing this tree, the opportunities for the weed to continue to propagate are enormous.

Unknowing residents encourage and allow the seedlings to grow. Preventing the spread of the weeds at their source is an important strategy for containing them. Seeds should be removed where they are found.

Sooty fungus often grows on the tree, discolours objects underneath it. Long branches break off and drop without warning. The Cadaghi has an impact on the native bee populations.

In conclusion’, it goes on—it’s quite long—'Brisbane City Council has identified the need to remove the weed trees from Brisbane residential areas. Planting appropriate species in their habitat—and recognises that planting appropriate species in their habitat has positive benefits for local biodiversity.

Removal of this tree, the Cadaghi, will limit damage to buildings, to car, people, property, fauna and limit its spread and eliminate risks associated with the flowers, gumnuts, street sweeping, branch removal and tree pruning’.

It’s an extensive submission that I’ve just summarised from the Loban family. Sadly, Council will not remove this tree. It is massive. It is inappropriate for its location and it should be replaced with a native species, which all the residents in the street happily agree to, as does the Loban family.

There is the power under the NALL (*Natural Assets Local Law 2003*) to do this. This tree is a weed tree. The fact that Council—Councillor MARX thinks she’s got no power and this Council has no power to order removal of this tree is absolutely, fundamentally wrong.

I urge all Councillors to vote against this decision today. The decision today is to retain the tree, which is causing enormous distress to this family and to residents in the street. I support removal of the tree and replacement with a more suitable native, indigenous to the area.

It is critically important that we don’t allow these types of weed trees to flourish. It’s critically important that we respect the views of residents. This is a huge tree on their frontage, and I urge all Councillors to vote against the decision today, which retains the tree.

I do not support this. I support the Loban family and their neighbours’ request for the removal of this tree and replacement with a more suitable native species. I encourage all Councillors here today to vote no to the recommendation before us.

Chair: Further speakers? Further speakers?

Councillor SRI: Just real quick.

Chair: Councillor SRI.

Councillor SRI: Yes, just on the petition. I’m obviously the—always very dubious and sceptical of any attempts to remove street trees so I would just be interested in Councillor MARX responding to some of the issues Councillor JOHNSTON has raised and understanding exactly why—because I did think Cadaghi was an invasive as well.

But I’m genuinely interested in this conversation because I think there is sometimes some value in retaining existing trees, even if they are invasive because they offer a range of other habitat and landscape and amenity benefits.

But yes, I would just be keen to understand exactly what the thinking is here and why the Council is retaining this tree. I’m genuinely not sure how I’m going to vote in—on this one. It sounds like a corker.

Chair: Further speakers? Further speakers?

Councillor MARX.

Councillor MARX: Thank you, Mr Chair. To address a couple of the points that were brought up. Basically, the Council arborist deemed that if a tree is healthy, it stays. The—it might be a weed species, as is a Leopardwood, those of us who have Leopardwoods across our wards that were planted some 30, 40 years ago, Bracken Ridge has a lot. Marchant has a lot. I have a lot—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Councillor MARX: Yes, Councillor ADAMS has a lot and Wynnum Manly. There you go. So pretty much every ward across the city has the Leopardwoods, which we all love to hate because they are one of these trees that cause a great deal of nuisance for us, our footpaths and our residents but just because it’s on the weed species list, doesn’t mean to say we go around removing them.

We do try and look at a replacement program where we can and where it’s appropriate but, ultimately, it’s a—the health and safety of—the health of the tree that the arborists make their decisions on and, as a Councillor, and as a Chair, in this place, if you don’t know that you cannot direct a Council officer, can I tell you now, you cannot direct a Council officer. It will put you in jail, and I’m sorry but I don’t feel like going to jail over a tree. Thank you.

Chair: All right, we’ll now put the resolution for item A.

**Clause A put**

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

Chair: Now for item B.

**Clause B put**

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

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

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 15 - Councillors Greg ADERMANN, Adam ALLAN, Tracy DAVIS, Fiona HAMMOND, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Sarah HUTTON, Sandy LANDERS, James MACKAY, Kim MARX, Peter MATIC, David McLACHLAN, Angela OWEN, Steven TOOMEY and Andrew WINES.

NOES: 1 - Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON.

ABSTENTIONS: 4 - The Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Jared CASSIDY, and Councillors Peter CUMMING, Charles STRUNK and Jonathan SRI.

The report read as follows⎯

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – ILLAWONG WAY DRAINAGE PROJECT

**744/2020-21**

1. The Manager, Construction, Brisbane Infrastructure, attended the meeting to provide an update on the Illawong Way drainage project (the drainage project). He provided the information below.

2. Council undertook the drainage project to address significant erosion and to improve stormwater management. The project had an allocated budget of approximately $2.3 million.

3. The Committee was shown images of the drainage project completed along Illawong Way, Karana Downs, including:

- an overview of the eroded area before construction

- neighbouring properties before construction

- a diagram of the project scope

- installation of geofabric and rock fill

- construction of a headwall and inlet structures

- final shaping and preparation for landscaping works

- completion of an access track for maintenance purposes.

4. Following a number of questions from the Committee, the Chair thanked the Manager, Construction, for his informative presentation.

5. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

#### B PETITION – REQUESTING COUNCIL REMOVE THE CADAGHI TREE OUTSIDE 32 ROBERTSON STREET, SHERWOOD, AND REPLACE IT WITH A SUITABLE NATIVE TREE

**CA21/189039**

**745/2020-21**

6. A petition from residents, requesting Council remove the Cadaghi tree outside 32 Robertson Street, Sherwood, and replace it with a suitable native tree, was presented to the meeting of Council held on 23 February 2021, by Councillor Nicole Johnston, and received.

7. The Executive Manager, City Standards, provided the following information.

8. The petition contains 17 signatures.

9. Council records indicate that since October 2017, there have been four tree removal requests claiming, as shown in Attachment B, the Cadaghi tree is dropping branches, gumnuts and flowers. Since June 2015, the tree has had 14 recorded small (4), medium (9) and large (1) branch failures. The most recent tree works undertaken were completed on 25 February 2021.

10. On 11 March 2021, the Regional Coordinator Arboriculture, South Region, Asset Services, Field Services, Brisbane Infrastructure, performed Council’s Tree Risk Rating on the Cadaghi tree and it was identified that medium risk level remedial works were required to be undertaken as part of the routine pro-active maintenance program. On 16 March 2021, further works were completed under the supervision of the Regional Coordinator Arboriculture, to mitigate any risk. Such tree works included lateral branch reduction over private property, deadwood removal and reducing the canopy balancing over the roadway.

11. The Cadaghi tree does not meet Council’s tree removal criteria under the tree risk rating or the nuisance guidelines.

Consultation

12. Councillor Nicole Johnston, Councillor for Tennyson Ward, has been consulted and does not support the recommendation.

Customer impact

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

14. **RECOMMENDATION:**

**that the draft response, as set out in Attachment A,** hereunder**, be sent to the head petitioner.**

**Attachment A**

**Draft Response**

**Petition Reference**: CA21/189039

Thank you for your petition requesting Council remove the Cadaghi tree outside 32 Robertson Street, Sherwood, and replace it with a suitable native tree.

Council has completed an onsite investigation and considered your request.

Council values the trees in our city as they contribute significantly to the environment both ecologically and aesthetically. These values are supported by Council’s tree policy which ensures the preservation of Council trees.

An inspection of the tree was undertaken on 16 March 2021, and it was identified that maintenance works were required. These works have now been completed. The works included lateral branch reduction over private property, deadwood removal and reduction of canopy balancing over the roadway.

Leaf fall, seed pods, flowers and fruit are natural processes within the lifecycle of trees. Generally, if a tree is found to be in good health and structure and has no arboricultural or public safety reason for removal, the tree will remain. The tree outside 32 Robertson Road, Sherwood, has met these criteria and therefore will not be removed in this instance.

Please let the other petitioners know of this information.

Should you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact Ms Anastasia Browne, Regional Coordinator Arboriculture, South Region, Asset Services, Field Services, Brisbane Infrastructure, on (07) 3407 0639.

Thank you for raising this matter.

**ADOPTED**

Chair: Councillors, the Community, Arts and Nighttime Economy Committee, please.

Councillor HOWARD.

### COMMUNITY, ARTS AND NIGHTTIME ECONOMY COMMITTEE

Councillor Vicki HOWARD, Chair of the Community, Arts and Nighttime Economy Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Sandy LANDERS, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 18 May 2021, be adopted.

Chair: Is there any debate?

Councillor HOWARD.

Councillor HOWARD: Thank you, Chair. We had a Committee presentation on the Resilient Clubs Support program. This program is an initiative of Council in partnership with CitySmart and aims to future-proof Brisbane’s community groups and sporting clubs by identifying and implementing practical options to improve the efficiency of water, energy and turf management.

The program is a free service for participating clubs. So, we heard that the program has two sub-programs, water and energy efficiency and energy efficiency direct assistance program.

So, the Committee was shown the program journey, including the process of club invitations and audits, water and energy infrastructure works, and the coaching program. It was a very interesting presentation and I know that we all asked lots of questions and gained quite a bit of information from it. So, I would just recommend it to the Chamber.

Chair: Further speakers? Further speakers?

Councillor HOWARD?

I now put the resolution.

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

The report read as follows⎯

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – RESILIENT CLUBS SUPPORT PROGRAM

**746/2020-21**

1. The Healthy and Vibrant Communities Manager, Connected Communities, Lifestyle and Community Services, attended the meeting to provide an update on Council’s Resilient Clubs Support Program (the program). They provided the information below.

2. The program, an initiative of Council in partnership with CitySmart, aims to future-proof Brisbane’s community groups and sporting clubs (clubs) by identifying and implementing practical options to improve the efficiency of water, energy and turf management. The program is a free service for participating clubs.

3. The program has two sub-programs including:

- Water and Energy Efficient Program (WEEP) managed by Connected Communities

- Energy Efficiency Direct Assist Program (EEDAP) managed by Natural Environment, Water and Sustainability, City Planning and Sustainability.

4. Under WEEP, clubs benefit from:

- water and energy efficiency audits

- water efficiency infrastructure fittings, upgrades and interventions

- water data monitoring

- water and energy efficiency coaching

- a water and energy efficiency action plan.

5. The objectives of EEDAP are to deliver solar power infrastructure to a minimum of 30 sites (or 400 kilowatts of solar panel capacity) and provide energy data monitoring at up to 50 sites. Under EEDAP clubs receive:

- solar energy system installations

- water and energy smart metering

- energy efficiency upgrades and interventions

- energy data monitoring.

6. The Committee was shown the program journey including the process of club invitations and audits, water and energy infrastructure works, and the coaching program.

7. The Committee was shown a video testimonial and video footage of a turf and irrigation audit.

8. Clubs benefit from the program through improved water and energy use and the associated cost reductions over time, as well as improved playing surfaces and less downtime for maintenance.

9. Following a number of questions from the Committee, the Chair thanked the Healthy and Vibrant Communities Manager, Connected Communities, Lifestyle and Community Services, for their informative presentation.

10. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

Chair: Councillors, the Finance, Administration and Small Business Committee, please.

Councillor ALLAN.

### FINANCE, ADMINISTRATION AND SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Councillor Adam ALLAN, Chair of the Finance, Administration and Small Business Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Steven HUANG, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 18 May 2021, be adopted.

Chair: Is there any debate?

Councillor ALLAN.

Councillor ALLAN: Thank you, Mr Chair. In last week’s Committee presentation, we were provided with an update on the economic stimulus portfolio of successful grants and significant funding contributions to Council.

With the global impacts of COVID-19, both the Australian and Queensland Governments have made economic stimulus grant funding available through different programs to foster growth, employment and economic benefit to the local community. The Council is required to procure construction delivery through local providers. The infrastructure for economic stimulus portfolio includes five different grants. I’ll quickly cover those.

The Australian Government had a total of $53 million in grants in the LRCI (Local Roads and Community Infrastructure) Phase 1 program, which included $11.71 million allocated to 24 Council projects. The program of works need to be completed by 30 June 2021.

The LRCI Phase 2 included $40.7 million allocated to over 41 projects and these need to be constructed by 30 December 2021. In the context of Queensland Government grants, which potentially total $14 million, we had a Works for Queensland grants of $5 million over four projects.

We also had a unite and recover community stimulus grant of $2 million, which was allocated over three Council projects. There is also a South East Queensland community stimulus program where $26 million is available through a competitive bid process with $7 million allocated to Council.

We are currently in the process of waiting for an outcome on those submissions which we expect by June 2021 and we also have three projects which were submitted under the competitive application process at a total of $10.9 million. Construction of these particular projects will need to be completed by 30 June 2024.

In total, we had 73 projects approved, receiving grants valued at $60.2 million and we are pending the outcome of a further $7 million.

In addition to the presentation, we also had a regular Committee report on financials—the financial reports and receivables, rates and provisions on malls for the period ended March 2021. I’ll leave further debate to the Chamber.

Chair: Further speakers? Any further speakers?

Councillor ALLAN?

I now put the resolution.

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

The report read as follows⎯

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – INFRASTRUCTURE FOR ECONOMIC STIMULUS

**747/2020-21**

1. The Manager, Project Management, City Projects Office (CPO), Brisbane Infrastructure, attended the meeting to provide an update on the Economic Stimulus portfolio (the portfolio) of successful grants and significant funding contributions to Council. He provided the information below.

2. With the global impacts of COVID-19 and flow on impacts to the economy and employment, both the Australian and Queensland Governments have made economic stimulus grant funding available through different programs. These programs have been implemented to foster growth, employment and economic benefit to the local community, and have a determined eligibility criteria as part of the funding agreements. As part of the funding, Council is required to procure construction delivery through local providers.

3. CPO, Brisbane Infrastructure, was tasked to lead the coordination and oversight of these stimulus programs, reporting to the Divisional Manager, Brisbane Infrastructure; the Executive Management Team; and Councillor David McLachlan, Chair of the Infrastructure Committee. The portfolio engaged all of Council’s programs for project nominations. Due to the size of the portfolio, the Infrastructure for Economic Stimulus Oversight Committee, which is comprised of Council officers, was established.

4. The Infrastructure for Economic Stimulus portfolio is currently made up of the following grants:

- Queensland Government:

- 2020-21 COVID Works for Queensland (W4Q) – $5 million allocated to Council over four projects with construction required to be completed by 30 June 2021

- Unite and Recover Community Stimulus (URCS) – $2 million allocated to Council over three projects and an additional $760,000 received through a competitive-bid process for one project. Construction is required to be completed by 30 June 2021

- South East Queensland Community Stimulus Program (SEQCSP) – $26 million is available through a competitive-bid with Council being allocated $7 million (pending approval). Once approved, construction is required to be completed by 30 June 2024

- Australian Government:

- Local Roads and Community Infrastructure (LRCI) Phase 1 – $11.71 million allocated to Council over 24 projects, with construction to be completed by 30 June 2021

- LRCI Phase 2 – $40.77 million allocated to Council over 41 projects, with construction to be completed by 30 December 2021.

5. Seventy-three Council projects have been approved to receive grant funding to the value of $60.2 million, with an additional six projects, valued at $7 million, pending approval through SEQCSP. Once SEQCSP funding is approved, there will be a total of 79 projects with grant funding of $67.2 million. A table showing the grant funding split across Council’s budget programs was shown to the Committee.

6. The current status of Queensland Government projects are as follows:

- W4Q:

- delivery by 30 June 2021, with a value of $5 million

- includes four bikeway projects, with one project completed and three projects on schedule and on budget. Practical completion is expected by June 2021

- variation approvals include cost transfers within the program and additional scope

- URCS:

- delivery by 30 June 2021, with a value $2.7 million

- includes four projects currently on track, pending Queensland Government variation approvals

- variation approvals include additional scope and minor extensions of time

- SEQCSP:

- delivery by 30 June 2024, at a value $7 million-plus

- outcome of Council’s submission is expected by June 2021

- includes six projects submitted under the $7 million allocation

- three projects were also submitted under the competitive application process at a total of $10.9 million.

7. The current status of Australian Government projects are as follows:

- LRCI Phase 1:

- is to be delivered by 30 June 2021, at a value of $11.7 million

- includes 24 projects

- has nine variation requests submitted, including validation of scope and cost transfers within the program

- program of works is on track, pending variation approvals

- LRCI Phase 2:

- is to be delivered by 31 December 2021, at a value of $40.7 million

- includes 41 projects

- has the majority of projects in planning and procurement phases

- involves innovative procurement initiatives, including bulk pre-markets and a significant contracting plan approved with expedited approval timeframes.

8. To date, funding revenue contributions have all been received in accordance with each grant guideline. Tables showing Australian and Queensland Government revenue payment portions received were shown to the Committee.

9. The portfolio’s success can be attributed to a One Council collaboration with significant contributions from Council’s Corporate Finance, Organisational Services; Strategic Procurement Office, Organisational Services; various budget program areas; City Legal, City Administration and Governance; Council delivery areas within CPO, Field Services and Brisbane Infrastructure; and the Executive Management Team.

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

11. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

#### **B COMMITTEE REPORT – FINANCIAL REPORTS (RECEIVABLE, RATES, PAYABLE, PROVISIONS AND MALLS) FOR THE PERIOD ENDED MARCH 2021**

**134/695/317/1133**

**748/2020-21**

12. The Chief Financial Officer, Corporate Finance, Organisational Services, provided a detailed report (submitted on file) on Council’s position relating to accounts receivable, rates, payables, provisions and malls for the period ended March 2021.

13. The Chair and the Committee noted the report. The financial report on Council’s position relating to accounts receivable, rates, accounts payable, provisions and malls for the period ended March 2021 is now presented for noting by Council.

14. **RECOMMENDATION:**

**THAT THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THE REPORT**,as submitted on file, **BE NOTED.**

**ADOPTED**

Chair: Councillors, are there any petitions?

## PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS:

Councillor CASSIDY: Thank you, Chair. I have two petitions. One on behalf of Councillor COOK, requesting Council fund and develop toilet facilities at Hardcastle Park, Hawthorne, and one on behalf of Councillor GRIFFITHS, regarding Millicent Street trees.

Chair: Any other petitions?

May I please have a—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Sorry, Councillor JOHNSTON, I asked and you didn’t say anything.

Do you have a petition?

Councillor JOHNSTON: You didn’t call me.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Thank you. Yes, I have a petition for residents of Sherwood calling for a street tree in Hall Street—in Palm Avenue, I’m sorry, to be retained.

Chair: Any other—

Councillor ADAMS.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair. I have a petition on behalf of Councillor CUNNINGHAM for a development in East Brisbane.

Chair: Any other petitions?

May I please have a resolution to receive them?

**749/2020-21**

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

The petitions were summarised as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **File No.** | **Councillor** | **Topic** |
| CA21/562978 | Jared Cassidy on behalf of Kara Cook | Requesting Council fund and develop toilet facilities at Hardcastle Park, Hawthorne. |
| CA21/562768 | Jared Cassidy on behalf of Steve Griffiths | Requesting Council prevent the removal of seven trees on the nature strip at 5-9 Millicent Street, Moorooka. |
| CA21/562857 | Nicole Johnston | Requesting Council prevent the removal of the fig tree at 13 Palm Avenue, Sherwood. |
| CA21/563194 | Krista Adams on behalf of Fiona Cunningham | Requesting Council reconsider the approved development application for 51 Gresham Street, East Brisbane (A0041313175). |
| CA21/563287 | Krista Adams on behalf of Fiona Cunningham | Requesting Council reconsider the approved development application for 51 Gresham Street, East Brisbane (A0041313175). |

## GENERAL BUSINESS:

Chair: Councillors, General Business.

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

Councillors, are there any matters of ordinary General Business?

Councillor MURPHY.

Councillor MURPHY: Yes, thanks very much, Chair, I just want to talk about the passing of Irene Edwards OAM (Medal of the Order of Australia). It’s with great sadness that I share the passing of an extraordinary member of the eastern suburbs community today. Irene Edwards OAM spent a large part of her life serving the community with her great fundraising skills and getting beside people when they needed it most. My deepest condolences go out to her family and friends in this time.

A closed service was held yesterday to commemorate Irene and her incredible life. In 2018, Irene received one of the highest honours and was awarded a Medal of the Order of Australia by His Excellency, the Honourable Paul de Jersey AC (Companion of the Order), Governor of Queensland, for her outstanding contribution to our State and nation.

I was one of the very few people invited into their home to do the service in their house, which is not something that I understand regularly happens but it’s such a great honour that she was afforded.

Irene and her husband, Ken, played a major part in running the delivery of the invaluable Wynnum and Manly Meals on Wheels service for over 30 years. The Wynnum and Manly districts facility delivers around 600 meals to around 140 clients in—every week.

*At that time, 6.37pm, the Deputy Chair, Councillor Steven TOOMEY, assumed the Chair*

Councillor MURPHY: As Meals on Wheels volunteer, team leader, management committee member and historical officer, Irene has provided countless comforting meals, a patient listening ear and a friendly smile to all.

As you might know, Deputy Chair, the Wynnum Manly District Meals on Wheels moved into a new facility on Manly Road near Wakerley District Sports Park in May last year.

As chief fundraiser, Irene would have had a massive role to play in funding and delivering this $7.2 million project that will continue to impact and support the local community for many decades to come.

Ken and Irene’s dream for the new facility began in 1995, and they worked tirelessly over the next 25 years to raise over $1.5 million, of which Irene was a major driving force.

Irene also spent a decade fundraising for the Brisbane branch—Brisbane East Branch, I should say—of the National Serviceman’s Association of Australia, to support our local veterans.

Alongside the Medal of the Order of Australia, Irene received the Medal of Merit from the Lions Club of Moreton Bay, as well as the Paul Harris Fellowship Award from the Rotary Club of Wynnum and Manly for her volunteer work. Irene’s passion, her skill, her massive heart for people in our community, is never going to be forgotten.

The mark that has been left by this woman of service will have a lasting effect for many years to come so we thank you, Irene Edwards OAM, for the constant joy, kindness and the many hours of volunteering that you gave us. My thoughts and prayers are with her family and friends and particularly to her life-long partner in crime and best friend, Ken Edwards. I know that he, as we all are, will be missing her dearly.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Deputy Chair: Thank you, Councillor MURPHY.

Any further business?

Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks, Deputy Chair. I rise to speak on Koobara Kindy. Koobara Kindy has, over the decades of service to the community, become a real institution in my ward. There are generations of local Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people who have been through those gates on Beams Road, and in many cases, now enrolling their children there as well.

Koobara was established in 1974 by local Aboriginal mothers whose children’s rights to an early learning experience that reflected their diverse identities and cultures were not being met by non-Indigenous services. Their goal is to provide a culturally responsive program for the personal development of the diverse children of the community and to provide a safe place where Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children are celebrated.

Koobara’s story is one that would be very familiar to First Australians—one of struggle. Beginning in the backyards and church halls of Zillmere in 1970s, this service received the recognition it deserved by the Soorley Labor Administration in 1996, when a 25-year lease was awarded on their current site.

This followed a lot of work that was done in developing their community development plan in 1995. The work that has occurred at Koobara since has been phenomenal. They’ve had a constrained and challenging site at Beams Road, being a former sewage treatment plant, but have transformed that into a sanctuary of early learning and cultural education.

As they have come to the end of their 25-year lease, they are now seeking a further 25-year lease but this Administration does not have the foresight of the Soorley Labor Administration, unfortunately. They’ve been offered just 10 years and funding streams available to them are now under jeopardy.

We ask the question, if a football club can be offered a 30-year lease funded by pokies, why can’t an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander kindy be offered a 25‑year lease? They have a proven track record and strong plans for the future, so I wonder what is going on here, Deputy Chair.

Uncle Lewis Orcher recently remarked to me that one of his political heroes was Jim Soorley because of the work he did in advancing the interests of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders here in Brisbane. Labor has a proud legacy in this space, and I wonder, Chair, what the LNP’s legacy will be at Beams Road?

Deputy Chair: Thank you, Councillor.

Is there any further items of General Business?

Councillor HOWARD, you have the call.

Councillor HOWARD: Thank you, Mr Deputy Chair. Mr Deputy Chair, I also rise to speak about Koobara Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander kindergarten.

We absolutely support renewing the lease on this premises. We’ve been talking to the kindy and it’s important—it is a really important part of our local community—so I just really very briefly want to say that we will be supporting a 25-year lease. Thank you.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Deputy Chair: Thank you, Councillor HOWARD.

Any further items of General Business?

I see no one rising to their feet. I, therefore, declare the meeting closed.

Thank you, Councillors.

## QUESTIONS OF WHICH DUE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

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

**Submitted by Councillor Steve Griffiths on 20 May 2021**

**Q1.** Please advise the total amount spent on catering at meetings of the Establishment and Coordination Committee for each of the following years:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **YEAR** | **TOTAL AMOUNT SPENT ON CATERING** |
| 2021 (year to date) |  |
| 2020 |  |
| 2019 |  |
| 2018 |  |
| 2017 |  |
| 2016 |  |

**Q2.** Please advise how many reports have there been lodged for collection of illegal dumping from April to June 2019, July to September 2019, October to December 2019, October to December 2020 and January to March 2021?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Apr-Jun 2019** | **Jul-Sep 2019** | **Oct-Dec 2019** | **Oct-Dec 2020** | **Jan-Mar 2021** |
| On the footpath |  |  |  |  |  |
| In Council parks |  |  |  |  |  |
| On Roads |  |  |  |  |  |
| On Bikeways |  |  |  |  |  |

**Q3.** Please advise how many fines were issued for illegal dumping from April to June 2019, July to September 2019, October to December 2019, October to December 2020 and January to March 2021?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **MONTH** | **TOTAL NO. OF FINES ISSUED** |
| Apr-Jun 2019 |  |
| Jul-Sept 2019 |  |
| Oct-Dec 2019 |  |
| Oct-Dec 2020 |  |
| Jan-Mar 2021 |  |

**Q4.** Please advise how much revenue was received by Council after issuing infringement notices for dumped waste for the following months:

| **MONTH** | **TOTAL REVENUE FROM FINES** |
| --- | --- |
| April 2019 |  |
| May 2019 |  |
| June 2019 |  |
| July 2019 |  |
| August 2019 |  |
| September 2019 |  |
| October 2019 |  |
| November 2019 |  |
| December 2019 |  |
| January 2020 |  |
| February 2020 |  |
| March 2020 |  |
| April 2020 |  |
| May 2020 |  |
| June 2020 |  |
| July 2020 |  |
| August 2020 |  |
| September 2020 |  |
| October 2020 |  |
| November 2020 |  |
| December 2020 |  |
| January 2021 |  |
| February 2021 |  |
| March 2021 |  |
| April 2021 |  |

**Q5.** Please provide a list of all petitions presented to Council between March 2020 and April 2021 including the date submitted, the date Council’s response was determined (or whether the response has not yet been determined), the total number of signatures and the Ward/s the petition relates to:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PETITION NAME** | **DATE SUBMITTED** | **DATE OF RESPONSE** | **TOTAL NUMBER OF SIGNATURES** | **RELATED WARD/S** |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**Q6.** Please advise the dates when the traffic and parking surveys and modelling was undertaken in relation to the draft Enoggera Creek Sport and Recreation Precinct Plan released in March 2021?

**Q7.** Please provide a summary of the results of the traffic and parking surveys and modelling which was undertaken in relation to the draft Enoggera Creek Sport and Recreation Precinct Plan released in March 2021?

**Q8.** Please provide a breakdown of expenditure for the BrisBetter advertising campaign for 2019, 2020 and 2021 (to date)?

**Q9.** Please provide the total final cost of each of the following intersection upgrades (including a description of works undertaken, the project timeline, breakdown of the costs and whether there were any external funding sources):

* Raymont and Webster Roads, Grange
* Maygar Street and Lutwyche Road, Windsor.

**Submitted by Councillor Nicole Johnston on 20 May 2021**

**Q1.** How many properties in the following Suburbs are impacted by the flood overlay mapping in the minor amendment to City Plan 2014 known as Package J?

1. Chelmer
2. Graceville
3. Sherwood
4. Corinda
5. Oxley
6. Tennyson
7. Fairfield
8. Yeronga
9. Yeerongpilly
10. Annerley.

**Q2.** Please provide a list of properties in the following suburbs whose flood risk has increased following changes to the flood overlay mapping in the minor amendment to City Plan 2014 known as Package J?

1. Chelmer
2. Graceville
3. Sherwood
4. Corinda
5. Oxley
6. Tennyson
7. Fairfield
8. Yeronga
9. Yeerongpilly
10. Annerley.

**Q3.** Please provide a list of properties in the following suburbs whose flood risk has decreased following changes to the flood overlay mapping in the minor amendment to City Plan 2014 known as Package J?

1. Chelmer
2. Graceville
3. Sherwood
4. Corinda
5. Oxley
6. Tennyson
7. Fairfield
8. Yeronga
9. Yeerongpilly
10. Annerley.

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

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

**Submitted by Councillor Nicole Johnston (from meeting on 18 May 2021)**

**Q1.** How many park or sportsfield remediation projects are being undertaken Wilston? I apologise as there must be so many remediation projects that my question last week regarding Finsbury Park, Wilston was unclear to the Chair. Please provide the answer in the table below. If 10 spaces is not enough please expand the table.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Place Names | Street Address | Lead Levels | Cost |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

***A1.*** *There is one project in Wilston involving partial remediation currently programmed. As part of building a new dog off leash area in Langley Avenue Park, Wilston, topsoil and new turf will be installed.*

**Q2.** What is the street address of the fenced section of Finsbury Park, Wilston off Murray Street, undergoing remediation due to high lead levels as publicly announced by Cr Andrew Wines on 24 April 2021 at an onsite public meeting?

***A2.*** *There is not a fenced section of Finsbury Park, Wilston, undergoing remediation.*

*It is assumed that this question may relate to a section of a nearby park, Langley Avenue Park, (72 Murray Street, Wilston, as noted on Council’s website) which is fenced and subject to a remediation project.*

*Questions related to any comments of Councillors announced at onsite meetings would need to be directed to them.*

**Q3.** Please provide a list of projects, their location/address and cost submitted as part of the South East Queensland Community Stimulus Program?

***A3.***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***2021-24 South East Queensland (SEQ) Community Stimulus Program*** | | | | | |
| ***Project Name*** | ***Address*** | ***Suburb*** | ***Funding Amount*** | ***BCC Contribution*** | ***Total Project Cost*** |
| ***Allocated $7M*** | | | | | |
| *Murarrie Recreation Reserve - Brisbane International Cycle Park* | *Murarrie Recreation Reserve, 1238 Wynnum Road* | *Murarrie* | *$2,500,000.00* | *$2,500,000.00* | *$5,000,000.00* |
| *Everton Park Bowls Club Car Park* | *7 Gearside Street (Bowls Club)* | *Everton Park* | *$650,000.00* |  | *$650,000.00* |
| *Sports Field Lighting* | *Various - sites still to be confirmed from stockpile of audited Brisbane City Council sites* | *Various sports field sites* | *$500,000.00* |  | *$500,000.00* |
| *Animal Rehoming* | *501 Gooderham Road, Willawong, Qld* | *Willawong* | *$1,000,000.00* |  | *$1,000,000.00* |
| *Albert Street Amenity Block Greening Project* | *Cnr Albert and Queen Street - Queen Street Mall* | *Brisbane* | *$1,350,000.00* |  | *$1,350,000.00* |
| *Roof replacement – SES Morningside* | *Jean Howie Drive* | *Morningside* | *$1,000,000.00* |  | *$1,000,000.00* |
| ***Sub-Total*** | | | *$7,000,000.00* | *$2,500,000.00* | *$9,500,000.00* |
| ***Competitive bid for the $26 million*** | | | | | |
| *Western Freeway to Indooroopilly Riverwalk Bikeway* | *8A Twigg Street* | *Indooroopilly* | *$4,700,000.00* | *$540,000.00* | *$5,240,000.00* |
| *Prebble Street bikeway* | *154 Prebble Street* | *Wishart* | *$3,700,000.00* | *$480,000.00* | *$4,180,000.00* |
| *Pinkenba Access Road improvements* | *From 412 Main Myrtletown Road, Pinkenba Qld 4008 to 21 Brownlee Street, Pinkenba Qld 4008.* | *Pinkenba and Brisbane Airport* | *$2,500,000.00* | *$375,000.00* | *$2,875,000.00* |
| ***Sub-Total*** | | | *$10,900,000.00* | *$1,395,000.00* | *$12,295,000.00* |
| ***TOTAL*** | | | *$17,900,000.00* |  |  |

**Submitted by Councillor Steve Griffiths (from meeting on 18 May 2021)**

**Q1.** Please provide a full breakdown of the amount expended so far on the BrisbaneMetro vehicles via the $6.7M Pilot Vehicle Hedge.

***A1.*** *Please note, the total value of payments expended so far on the Brisbane Metro vehicles via the pilot vehicle hedge is equivalent to $1,670,429.98 AUD. However, these payments were made in CHF (Swiss Francs).*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***CHF PILOT VEHICLE*** | |
| ***Claim*** | ***AUD equivalent*** |
| *Claim 1* | *$551,726.35* |
| *Claim 2* | *$145,786.17* |
| *Claim 3* | *$25,726.83* |
|  | ***$723,239.35*** |
| ***CHF CHARGING EQUIPMENT*** | |
| ***Claim*** | ***AUD equivalent*** |
| *Claim 1* | *$544,230.44* |
| *Claim 4* | *$135,374.78* |
| *Claim 5* | *$267,585.32* |
|  | ***$947,190.54*** |

**Q2.** Please provide a full list of the companies which received payments so far on the BrisbaneMetro vehicles with a breakdown of the amount paid.

***A2.***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Vendor*** | ***Description*** | ***Cost to Date*** |  |
| *SNC* | *Vehicle Consultant* | *$26,242.65* |  |
| *Tiger spider* | *Heavy Vehicle* | *$52,470.15* |  |
| *Indec* | *Project Verifier* | *$700,720.95* |  |
| *Carrosserie HESS AG* | *Pilot Vehicle and Charging Equipment* | *$1,777,163.51* | *This total includes $1.67M AUD equivalent total above (Q1), plus $107k AUD that was not paid via the hedge.* |
| ***TOTAL*** | | ***$2,556,597.26*** |  |

**Q3.** Please advise the expected delivery date of the BrisbaneMetro Pilot Vehicle prototype.

***A3.*** *The Metro pilot vehicle is scheduled to be delivered to Brisbane in February 2022.*

**Q4.** Please advise the total weight of rubbish collected from illegal dumping by Brisbane City Council for each of the following months:

| **MONTH** | **TOTAL WEIGHT** |
| --- | --- |
| April 2019 |  |
| May 2019 |  |
| June 2019 |  |
| July 2019 |  |
| August 2019 |  |
| September 2019 |  |
| October 2019 |  |
| November 2019 |  |
| December 2019 |  |
| January 2020 |  |
| February 2020 |  |
| March 2020 |  |
| April 2020 |  |
| May 2020 |  |
| June 2020 |  |
| July 2020 |  |
| August 2020 |  |
| September 2020 |  |
| October 2020 |  |
| November 2020 |  |
| December 2020 |  |
| January 2021 |  |
| February 2021 |  |
| March 2021 |  |
| April 2021 |  |

**Q5.** Please provide a breakdown by suburb of the total weight of rubbish collected from illegal dumping between April 2019 and March 2020.

**Q6.** Please provide a breakdown by suburb of the total weight of rubbish collected from illegal dumping between April 2020 and March 2021.

***A4-6.*** *Council officers advise the weight of illegally dumped material is not recorded as it is included as part of all waste and resource recovery streams.*

**Q7.** Please advise the average wait times for pedestrians at signalised crossings.

***A7.*** *This can’t be quantified as it depends on the specific characteristics of each location and when the pedestrian arrives at the crossing.*

**Q8.** Please advise the minimum wait times for pedestrians at signalised crossings.

***A8.*** *Zero seconds, if the pedestrian arrives when the green man is activated.*

**Q9.** Please advise the maximum wait times for pedestrians at signalised crossings.

***A9.*** *150 seconds, if the pedestrian arrives at the start of the red man activation (this is the maximum cycle time for Councils traffic signals).*

**Q10.** Please advise whether pedestrian wait times have changed since the Move Save Brisbane Report was released in 2018.

***A10.*** *As outlined in Q7, average wait times can’t be quantified. They are constantly changing as a result of customer contacts, minor modifications and intersection upgrades. Traffic signals are also dynamic in how they operate through Sydney Coordinated Adaptive Traffic System (SCATS).*

**Q11.** Of all the individual waste vouchers issued to residents in the 2020/21 financial year, how many individual waste vouchers have been presented at Waste Recovery Centres across Brisbane in this time?

***A11.*** *1,012,200 individual waste vouchers have been presented year to date 30* *April 2021.*

**Q12.** How many Waste voucher booklets were issued to households and Ward Offices in the 2019/20 financial year?

***A12.*** *520,000 booklets.*

**Q13.** How many Waste voucher booklets were issued to households and Ward Offices in the 2020/21 financial year?

***A13.*** *540,000 booklets.*

**Q14.** Please provide the number of businesses that the Better Brisbane Proposal had community engagement with from 2016 to 2021?

***A14.*** *Between January 2016 and May 2021, Better Brisbane Proposals has engaged with 495 businesses through enquiries or formal proposals.*

**Q15.** During the Infrastructure Committee Meeting on Tuesday the 11th of May it was advised that the suburb of Forest Lake has the most registrations of motorcycles compared to the rest of Brisbane. Please provide the amount of motorcycles that are currently registered in each of the other Brisbane suburbs.

***A15.*** *Data on registrations of motorcycles is provided by the State Government.*

**RISING OF COUNCIL: 6.47pm.**

**PRESENTED: and CONFIRMED**

**CHAIR**

**Council officers in attendance:**

Victor Tan (Council and Committee Coordinator)

Ashleigh O’Brien (Senior Council and Committee Officer)

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