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## PRESENT:

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

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

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

## OPENING OF MEETING:

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

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

Apologies? Are there any apologies?

Councillor HUTTON.

## APOLOGY:

**302/2022-23**

An apology was submitted on behalf of Councillor Steven HUANG, and he was granted a leave of absence from the meeting on the motion of Councillor Sarah HUTTON, seconded by Councillor Angela OWEN.

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY.

**303/2022-23**

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

Chair: We have hybrid participants.

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Yes, so—

*Councillor interjecting.*

Chair: Okay, we have some technical issues to be resolved in regards to the hybrid meeting attendees. We’ll try and resolve that as the meeting progresses.

Councillors, Question Time.

## QUESTION TIME:

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

Councillor MACKAY.

**Question 1**

Councillor MACKAY: Thanks, Chair. My question is to Councillor MURPHY.

Councillor MURPHY, among many parks and other assets, some of our ferry terminals were severely damaged during the 2022 flooding event, leaving some of them out of service. Could you please update the Chamber on how the rebuild and recovery of our ferry terminals is going?

Chair: Councillor MURPHY.

Councillor MURPHY: Thanks to the question, Councillor MACKAY. With no less than three ferry terminals in your ward, I know that both yourself and your residents are keen to see our terminals back in working order. Last financial year, we carried 1.8 million passengers on the river across 130,000 services. With our new double‑decker CityCats hitting the water and new ferry terminals like Howard Smith Wharves coming online, getting around the city by CityCat or KittyCat is continuing to be popular, but as we know, in February this year, a number of our terminals sustained serious damage by the floods and full services have had to be put on hold. Since this time, our terminals have been undergoing serious repairs, making sure they can come back online as soon as possible.

Today, we reach a new milestone. I’m pleased to report that, on Thursday morning, Sydney Street, Holman Street and QUT (Queensland University of Technology) Gardens Point ferry terminals will reopen and will begin to take regular services once again. Residents in New Farm, Kangaroo Point and uni students from across the city will be happy to hear this news as they can once again have more travel options to get around our beautiful river city. Throughout the flood event, we saw a large amount of debris floating down our river, including pontoons and boats. The repairs to these terminals were not simple fixes. There were a number of moving parts with many components needing fixing, including handrails, signage, cladding and fender piles.

There were also works including repairs to the articulated gangways, land connections and replacement of buoyancy tanks which were damaged by the pressure of debris and strong river currents. Specialist marine contractor, Fitzgerald, have been repairing these gangways offsite at the Port of Brisbane before returning them to install at the terminals. Importantly, the key flood resilience features and design robustness of our terminals has ensured significantly less damage than would have otherwise occurred. This was one of the worst floods Brisbane has ever experienced, but we are building back better as part of our rebuild and recovery efforts.

As part of the repairs, we are lowering the water level at which the gangways will open during flood events by half a metre, further reducing the risk of damage. The repair of our river assets is challenging at the best of times, but like the entire construction industry at the moment, we have faced significant supply chain issues, material shortages and availability of tradesmen and women, but with these challenges, the project team has managed to work around these issues and recycled many parts of the existing terminals. This has saved time and money and has skipped right past some material shortage issues. It’s allowed us to bring our terminals back online in a matter of months from when the repairs first began.

Remember, Chair, in 2011, it took four years to have all of our ferry terminals back in operating order. This time, we will have completed the task in under 12 months. That is a really good outcome and it proves that our flood resilient infrastructure has paid massive dividends for our city and it has reduced the time taken to get our terminals back in working order. As I’ve mentioned many times, in February, we did not lose any terminals, unlike in 2011 and so the recovery effort has been limited to repair work, rather than having to rebuild whole new terminals from scratch.

While the flood may be long in people’s minds, the reality is that having the entire network back in working order in less than 12 months, compared to four years, is a good story to tell and I’ll keep telling it, Chair. By the time Christmas rolls around in a few weeks’ time, Milton, Maritime Museum and St Lucia ferry terminals are scheduled to reopen, as well. Shortly after that, both North Quay and Regatta will open in early 2023. Both North Quay and Regatta sustained the most damage out of all of our ferry terminals. As such, they require more work and attention, so they will be the final ones to come back online.

These flood-resilient terminals are a world first, I remind Councillors and we’ve learnt valuable lessons from the last flood to improve their design even further as a result of this flood event. It’s important, Chair, that we learn from every flood event and we make changes to improve and we have certainly learnt some lessons here. I would like to thank the team who have been working hard to get our terminals and services back online as soon as possible. Of course, firstly, the workers themselves, who have been completing the repairs to our terminals, but also to RiverCity Ferries, who have been a great partner to Council during this time, making sure that we can bring services back online as soon as terminals are ready.

I want to thank Dean Morse and his team at City Projects Office (CPO) who have led Council’s coordination on the repairs and Vicki Hoskins and her colleagues in Transport for Brisbane who have been ably supporting them to deliver the return of services. To repeat, Chair, from Thursday, we’ll have Sydney Street, Holman Street and QUT back online.

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

Further questions?

Councillor CASSIDY.

**Question 2**

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

LORD MAYOR, Brisbane residents are paying more and more but getting less and less. Today, you are asking all Councillors to sign a $400 million cheque to cover the latest blowouts on your key inner city projects. This means higher rates or less services in the suburbs. Which one will it be, LORD MAYOR?

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Well, Mr Chair, yet again, we’ve seen a basic lack of understanding of how the budget works from the Leader of the Opposition. He has said that there are only two choices here. He has said they are either higher rates or cuts. Now, this is the person who, I will remind you, last week we found out wants to cut the weekly collection service, waste collection service—

Councillor interjecting.

LORD MAYOR: —to fortnightly, so Cuts CASSIDY is all about the cuts. So, I understand why he would focus on higher rates and cuts, because that’s what Labor did when they were in office. Their rate increases four times were more than six per cent and we know that they shut down libraries and pools and now they want to cut the weekly waste collection service, the red top bin, to fortnightly, but we don’t believe in that. We believe there is another way when it comes to managing the budget—

Councillor interjecting.

LORD MAYOR: —and it’s called responsible financial management. It’s called running a budget that has a surplus, a surplus budget. Now, if you actually have a look at the budget document that was delivered in June last year, you will see a thing, a line called increase in operating capability. That figure there highlights a number that illustrates that we once again delivered a surplus budget. I have delivered every single budget as LORD MAYOR as a surplus budget—

Councillor interjecting.

LORD MAYOR: —and we’ve put aside money in case of unexpected challenges. It’s the reason we have a buffer zone—

Councillor interjecting.

LORD MAYOR: —in case of unexpected challenges.

Councillors interjecting.

LORD MAYOR: So, guess what’s happened? There’s been a pandemic, there’s been a flood and now there’s been a global inflation crisis.

Councillor interjecting.

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY, please.

Councillor interjecting.

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY, please.

Councillor interjecting.

LORD MAYOR: So, what we see here is justification of why we run surplus budgets. We put aside money for a rainy day and figuratively, it has been raining for the last three to four years in various ways. Pandemics, floods, inflation crises—

Councillor interjecting.

LORD MAYOR: —these things are real and this is exactly why we have a budget surplus. Now, the documents—and I know Councillor CASSIDY doesn’t understand the documents, but—

Councillor interjecting.

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY, please.

Councillor interjecting.

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor interjecting.

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY, cease interjecting, please.

Councillor interjecting.

LORD MAYOR: The documents coming through today very clearly show that what we will see is, in this current financial year, there will be a reduction in our surplus of $57.7 million this current financial year. There will be further reductions in the surplus next year and the year after, but guess what? Even with those reductions, there will remain a surplus. That is called responsible financial management. So, we reject the idea that there’s only two choices here. Labor’s choices are higher rates or cuts. We believe there’s a third way. Responsible budgeting allows us to cope with unexpected challenges, just like we’re doing today and that’s exactly what we will continue to do.

By budgeting responsibly, by putting aside a buffer zone financially, we can deal with these unexpected challenges. We’ve dealt with them in the past, we will continue to deal with them in the future and I would also point out, as well, that coming through today, the Queensland Treasury Corporation has once again given us a strong credit review, a strong credit review.

Councillor interjecting.

LORD MAYOR: That is an organisation at the State Government level that independently assesses our financial position and given us a strong credit rating year-in, year-out because they know—

Councillor interjecting.

LORD MAYOR: —that we budget responsibly. They know that not only can we fund record investment in infrastructure, building the infrastructure our city needs as it grows, but also we do so in a financially responsible way, a way that keeps the things being delivered out on the ground, the services being delivered out on the ground, building the new infrastructure, investing in—

Councillor interjecting.

LORD MAYOR: —better public transport, better parks and greenspace, better suburbs. We will continue to do those things, but we’ll continue to do them in a financially responsible way, Mr Chair.

Chair: Thank you. Further questions?

Councillor ADERMANN.

**Question 3**

Councillor ADERMANN: Yes, thank you, Chair. My question is to the Chair of the City Standards Committee, Councillor MARX.

Labor’s dive right in approach to FOGO (food organics and garden organics) will have massive, unintended consequences for our city. Can you please update the Chamber on how the Schrinner Council’s balanced approach to food waste is keeping Brisbane on the right track when it comes to managing food waste?

Chair: Councillor MARX.

Councillor interjecting.

Councillor MARX: Thank you, Chair and through you, I thank Councillor ADERMANN for the question. Last week in Question Time, the Leader of the Opposition, Councillor CASSIDY, called on the LORD MAYOR to establish FOGO in Brisbane, but what Councillor CASSIDY—through you, Mr Chair—seems to have forgotten is that the Schrinner Council was already in the pilot phase of the food waste recycling service—

Councillor interjecting.

Councillor MARX: —and we’re in the process of gearing up our capability for future stages. So, not only has this program been established, Mr Chair, but we have already had over 650 tonnes of food waste received—

Councillor interjecting.

Councillor MARX: —through our pilot households in their green bin. So, Brisbane City Council—

Chair: Councillor STRUNK.

Councillor MARX: —under the leadership of this Administration has a proud track record of creating a clean and green Brisbane for our residents. The introduction of a full FOGO kerbside collection service in Brisbane’s subtropical climate is a complex proposal. While it is correct that a number of councils in Australia have introduced a FOGO collection service of some description, you’ll find that most of them are located in regions which don’t face similar climatic problems to South East Queensland. This component presents a serious dilemma for Labor’s plan, which involves reducing the frequency of a basic service that the people of Brisbane rely on, their red bin collection.

Councillor interjecting.

Councillor MARX: On average, 427,500 refuse bins are collected each week across Brisbane. That is a lot of bins to reduce collection on without any kind of plan—through you, Chair, to Councillor CASSIDY. Mr Chair, as the Chamber is aware, the sheer size of our Local Government area also presents a challenge of how Council will—

Councillor interjecting.

Councillor MARX: —continue to—

Chair: Councillor STRUNK.

Councillor MARX: —scale up the program.

Councillor interjecting.

Councillor MARX: The sheer amount of food waste that BCC (Brisbane City Council) would collect in any one service is simply not comparable with any other council. It would undoubtedly present a serious resourcing challenge in current market conditions.

Councillor interjecting.

Councillor MARX: The proposition is clear between the Labor and the Schrinner Administration on this issue. Who do you trust to roll out a carefully considered approach to food waste recycling in Brisbane?

Councillors interjecting.

Councillor MARX: If you have any doubt, consider Councillor CASSIDY’s comments about this issue last week in Chambers. He said and I quote, ‘why does Council not tap into the environmental and economic phenomenon which is FOGO?’ This isn’t something we’re doing because it’s a phenomenon. The Schrinner Council has established the food waste recycling pilot as a part of our commitment to doing what’s right to protect the environment. This staged approach has already seen contamination results of less than one per cent, which is in line with industry’s best practice. Having visited the two locations where the end product ends myself, I have seen some of that contamination and I can tell you it’s not good. So I’m very, very proud of what our residents are doing. The pilot households are doing a fantastic job and I congratulate them on their work in this space.

Mr Chair, it is clear that Labor has no understanding of what Council is already doing in this space and what is even clearer is they continue to demonstrate their lack of administrative understanding by not comprehending how such a program would operate. They seek simplistic solutions and are quite prepared to have bins with rotting food in them sitting on the kerbside without truly looking at the impact this will have on the residents. I can tell you, having visited out at the Forest Lake Ward and the number of restaurants out there that have food in their bins, imagine sitting that around there for two weeks. I think it would not be nice. Food waste collected with nowhere to go. I want to be clear with the Chamber, Mr Chair, it is only this Administration with a strong commitment for food waste recycling in Brisbane. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you. Further questions?

Councillor JOHNSTON.

**Question 4**

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, yes, thank you. My question is to the LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR, Brisbane City Council did not provide any warning to Brisbane residents who live along Oxley Creek and its tributaries prior to the February floods, despite these tributaries being flooded in advance of the Brisbane River. What steps, if any, has Brisbane City Council taken to implement a warning system or protocol for flooding along Brisbane’s largest tributary, Oxley Creek, or will residents who live along the creek be flooded again without notice?

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Mr Chair, well, first of all, I reject the premise of the question. It is not accurate. We have a system known as the Severe Weather Alert system, which in the lead-up to the February 2022 floods was sending out literally millions of text messages. This is a system that geared up on the Thursday prior to the flooding on the weekend and started sending out millions of text messages. It is the same system that sent out messages yesterday. It is the same system that sent out messages several weeks ago, the last time we had major rainfall. This is a system which—

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: My question relates to flooding along Oxley Creek and whether there will be a warning system implemented for flooding along Oxley Creek and its tributaries.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor JOHNSTON. I believe the LORD MAYOR is responding to the question about the flood warnings.

Councillor interjecting.

LORD MAYOR: If Councillor JOHNSTON wants to support her residents, the best thing that she can do is to encourage them to sign up to the Brisbane Severe Weather Alert system, which is a system which provides immediate, immediate alerts to people and we actually saw it in the Council Chamber in recent weeks, where Councillors were getting messages through this system within minutes, within minutes of a BoM (Bureau of Meteorology) alert and now we know the State Government operated system—

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Again, Mr Chairman, this is a relevance issue. I’m asking about warnings from Brisbane City Council to residents who live along Oxley Creek and its tributaries. Are they going to get any warning if there is a future flood?

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, the LORD MAYOR is responding to the question as asked.

Councillor JOHNSTON: He’s talking about rainfall.

LORD MAYOR: I’m absolutely answering this question. Now, if Councillor JOHNSTON took the time to understand how the system works, we have a network—

Councillor interjecting.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON.

LORD MAYOR: We have a—

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

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair. We have a network of creek monitoring devices in place in all the creeks of Brisbane and at various locations along those creeks, there are river level detection devices. They detect rising creeks, falling creeks and alerts are sent out via our system automatically. In fact, in the recent event that we had a few weeks back, we got messages saying, water is rising in Rocky Waterholes Creek, came through. This is an automatic system that already exists and all people have to do is to sign up to it. So, as I said, Councillor JOHNSTON will be doing the right thing by her residents to encourage them to sign up to the system that exists, that works well and that sends out messages immediately when situations change.

Now, those messages are based on the direct BoM advice. Well, they are based on the direct river level monitoring devices which detect whether a creek is in flood or not. That already exists. It’s been in place for a long time and the best thing we can all do is get more and more people signed up. Now, we know that in recent times—and this year has seen a good, healthy jump in the number of people signed up to this system and we will continue to promote it. We have been actively and heavily pushing this system and encouraging people to sign upend we know that they have been. They have been. So, we’ve seen now thousands of extra people signing up. We’ve seen, even yesterday, 270,000 alert messages went out automatically and instantly to people across the city for the downpour that we had yesterday. So, this system exists.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

LORD MAYOR: It works well.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Again, my question is not about rainfall yesterday. It’s about whether residents who live along Oxley Creek and its tributaries are going to get a new warning system to give them some advance notice of flooding. It’s not about rainfall in Brisbane generally.

Chair: Thank you, Councillor JOHNSTON. I don’t uphold your point of order. I believe the LORD MAYOR is responding to the question.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair and for the third time, I’m happy to answer the question. The system exists. All people have to do is sign up to it. Now, I don’t know about you, Mr Chair, but if I lived in a flood-prone area, I’d want to be signing up to this system. So I think that, when you look at the coverage of the city and the number of households that have signed up, we have around 30% of all households getting these alert messages, but when you consider that around five per cent of the city flooded in February, it would be fair to assume that the vast majority of people in those flood zones have opted, have opted to sign up to the system. Why? Because they’re interested to know. They want to know if there is an alert being sent out and they want to get the information quickly.

They know that they can’t rely on the State Government operated system to give them timely messages. This is the system that we’ve repeatedly warned is taking anything from six to 12 hours to get a message out to the whole of Brisbane.

Councillor interjecting.

LORD MAYOR: That is a broken system. That is a broken system which we’ve warned about and needs to be fixed, but guess what? Our system, the Brisbane Severe Weather Alert system, works really well and it’s instantaneous.

Chair: Thank you. Further questions?

Councillor OWEN.

**Question 5**

Councillor OWEN: Thank you, Mr Chair. Mr Chair, my question today is to the Chair of the Transport Committee, Councillor MURPHY.

Councillor MURPHY, last week, we heard Councillor COOK whip up some outrage about local residents purchasing some wooden ferries. Could you please update the Chamber on the facts of this matter.

Chair: Councillor MURPHY.

Councillor MURPHY: Thank you, Mr Chair and through you, Councillor OWEN for the question. On this side of the Chamber, we’ve been working really hard to deliver a world class ferry network that allows residents and visitors to enjoy the beautiful river while providing travel that is sustainable, reliable and safe. As Councillors will know, in 2019 when we started work on disability access upgrades to the wooden monohull fleet, we found some defects in the ferries, including wood rot. As a result of those inspections, we removed the fleet of eight timber monohulls from service in light of significant safety concerns.

Last week, we heard the Labor Opposition once again mislead the people of Brisbane about Council’s ferry services. Councillor COOK claimed that the sale of the ferries had left hundreds of residents high and dry and she was of course referring to the closure of the Norman Park ferry. I’m not sure who those hundreds are, Mr Chair, because we know that less than one person was using the Norman Park ferry per crossing. Make no mistake, the condition of Council’s wooden ferries had nothing to do with the closure of the Norman Park ferry.

Instead, it had everything to do with the fact that no one was catching the Norman Park ferry. Chair, Labor’s plan for public transport in Australia’s fastest growing capital city is to reinstate the lowest patronised ferry service in Brisbane’s history, a service that has been cancelled several times before due to low patronage, including by none other than their hero, Labor’s Lord Mayor Jim Soorley.

Now, as we know, Chair, the monohulls were iconic to Brisbane, so we made the remaining vessels available for sale to the community. Brisbane residents love our monohulls, Chair, but there’s a saying. If you love something, let it go. That’s something we did, Chair and it’s something we would do again. All vessels were successfully sold via a blind auction, all going to good homes with local South East Queensland buyers. Many of them are now moored from Breakfast Creek to Norman Creek while they await repair and restoration. The new owners certainly have a big task ahead of them in returning the vessels to former glory.

The buyer of Gayundah has said, quote, ‘the hull has a huge amount of issues in it. In another couple of months, I’ll have it watertight’, unquote. I’m not sure Brisbane residents would like to be making their morning commute—

Councillors interjecting.

Councillor MURPHY: —on a boat that isn’t watertight, Mr Chair.

Councillor interjecting.

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor interjecting.

Councillor MURPHY: I take the interjection from Councillor CASSIDY, Chair, because what did Councillor COOK have to say on radio about the wooden monohulls? She said it was something like a lightbulb that needed replacing and questioned whether they were actually fit for re-entering service, so good own goal, Councillor CASSIDY—

Councillor interjecting.

Councillor MURPHY: —but I’m not asking you to believe what Council had to say about the condition of the ferries. Believe what the buyers have to say, because the cost of the vessel itself is one thing, Mr Chair, but the cost to make them operational and safe, again, is the most expensive part of the task. Even after they’re restored, it’s important to remember that private owners are not required to achieve the same levels of maintenance and safety compliance that Council is. While we operate the monohulls as a commercial public transport provider, private owners are not required to comply with the same levels of maintenance and disability and accessibility legislation. Add to that the significant work required to address our safety concerns about the vessels and it simply did not represent good value money for the ratepayer to restore them.

So, let’s recap, Mr Chair. Labor would have had us keep unsafe, rotting, wooden ferries in operation, when we now have a safe, high quality, modern alternative with our KittyCats that we went to great pains to obtain from Sydney. They maintain that this represents a cut to services, despite the fact that we are now servicing all of the cross river routes in exactly the same capacity with the KittyCats and they would have us return the worst performing public transport service in Brisbane’s history. I think it’s very clear, Chair, why this Labor Opposition have no ideas for the future of our city and that’s because they’re stuck in the past.

Whether it’s on issues like the Norman Park ferry, Chair, issues like the monohulls, bus driver safety barriers, the King George Square fountain debate that comes up again, the Nurran Street koala land, every day, Chair, in this Chamber that we come here is Groundhog Day for the Labor team. In fact, this Labor team is so bereft of ideas, Chair, that they are now using The Courier-Mail’s gossip column to conduct a recruiting campaign for their next Lord Mayoral candidate—

Councillor interjecting.

Councillor MURPHY: —desperately trying to pressgang former politicians into a role which is traditionally known in Brisbane as a poisoned chalice.

Councillors interjecting.

Councillor MURPHY: If Kate Jones is smart, Chair, she will run a million miles from that role because it always ends in tears, Mr Chair. Just like the monohulls, Chair, the Opposition is full of rot. They’re leaking on all sides and they will go down at the next election.

Chair: Thank you. Further questions?

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN.

**Question 6**

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

LORD MAYOR, I think we can all agree that the housing crisis has gotten pretty bad and that there are a lot of people sleeping rough across our city and I’m sure you and I would both agree that the best solution is to get those people housed and to provide support services, but in an immediate sense, there are lots of people sleeping in Council parks and squares and other public spaces who don’t have access even to basic shower facilities and toilet facilities. Now, I know Orange Sky Laundry is providing some limited shower facilities in some locations, but would you be open to a conversation about providing more public shower facilities in Council toilet blocks so that those rough sleepers at least have somewhere to take a shower when they need one?

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Well, Mr Chair, I’ve made my position on this issue very clear. The approach espoused by the Greens and Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN is akin to giving up. It’s basically saying that we’re going to accept that people should just live in parks, live in public spaces and we’re going to make it as comfortable for them there as possible. That is a city that has given up on finding homes for people and we are not going to give up on this challenge that we’re facing. We are not going to become like those broken American cities that just have given up and their parks become tent cities because they provide no solutions to people. They just let people live in a park.

Now, we have had an ongoing situation down at Kurilpa underneath the bridges there, where there have been people camped out there and sleeping rough or living in tents. What’s our response to that been? Our response has been to engage the State Government, to get our great Council officers out there and to offer support to those people and to find them homes. That’s exactly what we have done and we’ve seen the reduction in the number of people down there because they have been offered support and they have been offered assistance and the State Government has worked with us to provide options for these people, options that don’t involve sleeping in a park.

So, I will always say that making it as comfortable for people in a park is giving up on the problem of homelessness. That is not what a bighearted city should do. That is not what a bighearted city should do. We should be striving to provide roofs over the heads of people that are sleeping rough. That is the way we should be going and that’s where our focus should be. Now, there are a whole range of great charity organisations. There’s a whole range of social enterprises. There’s a whole range of government departments that exist to provide support and services to people that are sleeping rough and that is a good thing, but we should never institutionalise people sleeping in parks. We shouldn’t, because it’s not acceptable in a wonderful, modern, forward looking and progressive city like Brisbane to say that that is okay, to say that is the end outcome.

The end outcome should be a roof over people’s heads. The end outcome is a pathway out of homelessness, not providing a shower and a tent in a park. That is not what our city should be aspiring to. I’ve said it in the past and I’ll repeat it again.

Chair: Thank you. Further questions?

Councillor LANDERS.

Yes, Councillor LANDERS, can you hear me?

**Question 7**

Councillor LANDERS: Thank you, Chair. My question is to the Chair of the Community, Arts and Nighttime Economy Committee, Councillor HOWARD.

Councillor HOWARD, the Schrinner Council is continuing to create more to see and do right across our city. Could you please update the Chamber on how events like the Valley Fiesta are helping contribute to this, as well as supporting our night time economy?

Chair: Councillor HOWARD.

Councillor HOWARD: Oh, thank you, Mr Chair and through you, I thank Councillor LANDERS for the question because there really is so much more to see and do every day in Brisbane and that’s thanks in no small part to the Schrinner Council and our continued investment in Brisbane’s nightlife and our fearless and unwavering support of our small businesses, artists, creators and the thousands of people whose jobs rely upon them. We held fast last year and refused to let COVID get the better of us.

We knew how much our nightlife sector was struggling during what seemed to be endless restrictions and some told us it wouldn’t be possible, but we made sure that Valley Fiesta went ahead last year. In doing so, we supported a whopping 150 artists across 21 venues, an amazing feat and something that wouldn’t have been possible without the support of the Schrinner Council. To make that work, Valley Fiesta did look a little different to what we’re used to, with the entire program being within venues. That was also part of a concerted effort to give as much support to our struggling venues. The team did incredible work to run Valley Fiesta last year and this year was no different.

I was proud to join the team in opening Valley Fiesta on Friday at King Street Food Festival with an all ages event to kick off Brisbane’s biggest annual party and I was delighted that Councillor MATIC joined me and it was really fantastic to be there in King Street with, I think, three stages and really so many people milling around, it was fantastic. So, over the weekend, we saw more than 45 artists performing across 13 of Brisbane’s most iconic music venues. We’re so lucky to have an incredible number of artists and live music that call Brisbane home and Valley Fiesta is the perfect opportunity to champion our homegrown heroes.

The massive line-up was totally free and included some big names too, like WIIGZ, Gordi and I know there are a few of us here in the Chamber that are big fans of Holy Holy, who put on epic performances at the Fortitude Music Hall, again all for free. As well as a stellar line-up of live music, we had a jam-packed program of free, family friendly, daytime activities, including food trails, workshops, art installations and market stalls. What’s more is that we did it all in an inclusive and accessible way. The Schrinner Council is proud to lead Australia’s most inclusive city and the team went above and beyond this year in making sure that Valley Fiesta offered a space for all residents to enjoy the best Brisbane has to offer. We were very proud to present an accessible and diverse program from creative workshops, markets, performances and everything wonderful about our valley.

The Sound Garden hosted the brand new, access-all-areas stage presented by Spinal Life Australia and featured a space made accessible for everyone to experience the thrill of live music without barriers. This year’s program was entirely free, taking over some of the valley’s greatest music venues, including the Sound Garden, Fortitude Music Hall, The Brightside, Woolly Mammoth, Ric’s Backyard and many more. The free program was something we were, again, very proud to deliver. With the cost of living on the rise, offering free events like this removes barriers across our community and allows everyone to enjoy the fun. Now in its 25th year, Valley Fiesta truly is the jewel in the crown of our live music scene, never failing to deliver a program that’s bursting at the seams with things to see and do. It was great to see thousands of people out and about over the three days, enjoying the best of Brisbane and we are extremely proud of the significant impact this festival makes to our city’s economic and cultural landscape. Festivals like Valley Fiesta contribute to our vibrant and creative city, providing more to see and do and smile about while supporting our arts and events industry.

I want to thank everyone who took part in organising last weekend’s events. It was exciting to see the rich tapestry of artists come together in celebrating Brisbane’s boundless creativity and I’m extremely proud to be part of this Schrinner Council that continues to deliver this incredible festival and I look forward to supporting many, many more in the future. So, if you missed out this year, don’t worry, we’ll be back again in 2023. In the meantime, we’ve always got lots of activities and events to keep you occupied. This Friday, we’re kicking off the festive season. Jingle bells will be ringing right across the city as we step into the Christmas cheer. We have carols and live music at Seventeen Mile Rocks on Friday 2 December, the Fairfield Christian Family Christmas Fair and Carols in the Park, Jingle All the Bay at Sandgate, the famous Brookfield Bush Christmas and Jindalee State School Christmas Carols and last but not least, the Manly Harbour Village Christmas Lights, which will continue shining throughout the month for everyone to enjoy. Thank you, Mr Chair.

Chair: Thank you. Further questions?

Councillor CASSIDY.

**Question 8**

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair. My question is to the LORD MAYOR and on the theme of paying more and getting less, today you are proposing a $33 million cut in infrastructure projects and an $18 million cut from the Lifestyle and Community Services budget. These programs cover things like community services, sporting clubs and homelessness support, as well as road projects. Which projects are you cutting from the budget, LORD MAYOR?

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Well, Mr Chair, one thing that we know is that when Councillor CASSIDY makes a claim, you’d better check it twice because time and time again, he’s been caught bending the truth, misrepresenting the facts and he will stop at nothing. We even saw him today, claiming that we are going to reduce Council sittings by a week—

Councillor interjecting.

LORD MAYOR: —a week.

Councillor interjecting.

LORD MAYOR: Since when do we ever sit for a week? We sit for one day, but that’s all right, the truth doesn’t get in the way of a good story for the Opposition. He makes stuff up all the time and we’ve seen him in this question making some more stuff up. So, what we’ll be cutting is the size of the surplus. That’s what we’ll be cutting. If you want to talk about cuts, the only thing we’ll be cutting is the size of the surplus. There’ll be a $57.7 million reduction—

Councillor CASSIDY: Point of order, Chair.

LORD MAYOR: —in the size of the surplus.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: My question was relating to capital expenditure cuts in the second budget review of $33 million in the Infrastructure for Brisbane program and almost $18 million in Lifestyle and Community Services. I didn’t talk about the surplus and I know the LORD MAYOR doesn’t have any idea of what’s before us or the sitting calendar, but there were specific items—

Chair: Councillor—

Councillor CASSIDY: —that I asked about, if you could bring him back to the question.

Chair: Thank you. LORD MAYOR, to the question.

LORD MAYOR: Yes, thank you, Mr Chair. Look, we know the Leader of the Opposition, whenever a budget review comes up, reads the same old speech that someone’s written for him that says the same things every time and—

Councillor CASSIDY: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Under the Meetings Local Law, the LORD MAYOR is required to answer the question, not debate the question. It was very clear the question was about cuts to the Infrastructure for Brisbane program and the Lifestyle and Community Services program, which is in his budget review he’s bringing today. Could you bring the LORD MAYOR back to the question, please?

Chair: LORD MAYOR. I believe—I don’t uphold your point of order, Councillor CASSIDY. I believe the LORD MAYOR is responding to the question.

Councillor interjecting.

LORD MAYOR: When it comes to infrastructure, Mr Chair, this current financial year’s budget provides more funding for infrastructure than any other year in the city’s entire history.

Councillors interjecting.

LORD MAYOR: In 100 years, more money is being provided this year for infrastructure than any other year in the city’s history.

Councillor interjecting.

LORD MAYOR: Councillor CASSIDY has the hide to talk about cuts. Like, what—

Councillor interjecting.

LORD MAYOR: —what is he on about? The reality is, we are—

Councillor interjecting.

LORD MAYOR: —investing more than ever before in infrastructure. In fact, there’s been a provision of over $1 billion this year for capital works and infrastructure. Why? Because our city is growing quickly. Now, as Councillor CASSIDY well knows, in any budget review, various timing changes to projects come through. Some projects run behind where we would like them to be and that is a reality for so many projects right across the three levels of government right now. We see projects under incredible stress from global inflation, from supply chain issues, from worker shortages and a whole range of other challenges. Now, Councillor CASSIDY would like to think that these challenges don’t exist.

Councillor interjecting.

LORD MAYOR: He would like to think that they don’t exist, but if you talk to—

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY.

LORD MAYOR: —his colleagues up in George Street, they will tell you these challenges are real.

Councillor interjecting.

LORD MAYOR: They will tell you the challenges are real and when, for example, Minister Bailey talks about the challenges he’s facing on his projects—

Councillor interjecting.

LORD MAYOR: —it is interesting to see what he says. He’s made some very—

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY.

LORD MAYOR: He’s made some very interesting claims. Let me quote Minister Bailey. ‘The Opposition’s lack of basic economic understanding is embarrassing.’

Councillor CASSIDY: Point of order, Chair.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor.

Councillor CASSIDY: If the LORD MAYOR wants to talk about Mark Bailey, he can do it in his E&C (Establishment and Coordination Committee) report, but this was a specific question—

Councillor interjecting.

Councillor CASSIDY: —about Infrastructure for Brisbane program and Lifestyle and Community Services in the budget review shows a cut of $33 million in capital in Program 2 and an $18 million cut in capital in Program 5. He needs to answer that question.

Chair: LORD MAYOR, can I bring you back to the question, please?

LORD MAYOR: Yes, thank you, Mr Chair. I was answering the question and I have answered the question already, which is we’re spending more on infrastructure, we’re investing more on infrastructure than ever before, so any suggestion that we’re somehow spending less—

Councillor interjecting.

LORD MAYOR: —is just false, is just false, but I was simply putting this in context of the challenging construction environment that we are under for building things at the moment and the best way to do that is to use the words of Councillor CASSIDY’s Labor colleagues up in George Street. I go on to say, the Opposition’s basic lack of economic understanding is embarrassing. Anyone building a house or renovating at the moment would be experiencing this, as is every other state. The Opposition must want us to cut projects or put them on hold or descope them all—

Councillor interjecting.

LORD MAYOR: —while our population booms and we get ready for the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games. Is that what they are seriously proposing? Now, that’s Minister Bailey talking about the challenges that he’s had for projects, but Minister Bailey is pressing ahead with his projects. We are pressing ahead with our projects, as we should as the population booms. So, this, Mr Chair, is a purely political question from the Leader of the Opposition designed to misrepresent the facts, designed to try and confuse people and con people about what is actually happening, but the people of Brisbane know that no administration has ever invested more in infrastructure than this one and no budget has ever provided more funding for capital works and infrastructure than this year’s budget, Mr Chair.

Chair: Thank you. That ends Question Time.

Councillors, I was distracted at the beginning of the meeting by trying to get our hybrid attendees on board—and my apologies—and I missed confirmation of the minutes.

So, I actually—LORD MAYOR, could I ask that you move an amendment under section 11(2)(b) to move a motion to allow for the moving of the minutes? That needs to be seconded. So this is to move the agenda, change the agenda.

Councillor interjecting.

Chair: That should be amended under section 11(2)(b).

**Alteration of order of business in Agenda**

**304/2022-23**

In accordance with section 11(2) of *Meetings Local Law 2001*, the LORD MAYOR moved, seconded by Councillor Greg ADERMANN, to alter the order of business set out in the Agenda by bringing the Confirmation of Minutes to be the next item of business.

Chair: Can I have confirmation of the minutes, please?

## MINUTES:

**305/2022-23**

The Minutes of the 4697 meeting of Council held on Tuesday 22 November 2022, copies of which had been forwarded to each Councillor, were presented, taken as read and confirmed on the motion of Councillor Sarah HUTTON, seconded by Councillor Greg ADERMANN.

Chair: My apologies, Councillors, for being distracted by the hybrid meeting issues that we have now resolved.

LORD MAYOR, Establishment and Coordination Committee meeting, please.

## CONSIDERATION OF COMMITTEE REPORTS:

### ESTABLISHMENT AND COORDINATION COMMITTEE

The Right Honourable, the LORD MAYOR (Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER), Chair of the Establishment and Coordination Committee, moved, seconded by the DEPUTY MAYOR (Councillor Krista ADAMS), that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on Monday 21 November 2022, be adopted.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, I have two points of order. The first one is, I am seeking the further following information about item B and C, and that is, do the impacts of State Government masterplans and priority areas, priority urban development areas, form part of the planning assumptions that are used to model the infrastructure needs for the LGIP (Local Government Infrastructure Plan) and the LTIP (Long Term Infrastructure Plan) and I’m seeking further information about that prior to the debate.

Chair: Thank you.

Councillor JOHNSTON: I have another point of order, if that’s okay.

Chair: Okay, sure.

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

|  |
| --- |
| Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON requested that Clause B, AMENDMENT TO *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014* – LOCAL GOVERNMENT INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN – AMENDMENT 1B; and Clause C, TAILORED AMENDMENT TO *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014* – LONG TERM INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN – AMENDMENT 1B, be taken seriatim *en bloc* for debating purposes. |

**Seriatim *en bloc* for debate - Clauses G, H, I and K**

|  |
| --- |
| Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON requested that Clause G, STORES BOARD SUBMISSION – AMENDMENT TO SIGNIFICANT CONTRACTING PLANS AND A SOLE SOURCE SUBMISSION; Clause H, STORES BOARD SUBMISSION – AMENDMENT OF SIGNIFICANT CONTRACTING PLAN FOR THE PROVISION OF TRAFFIC CONTROL MANAGEMENT SERVICES; Clause I, STORES BOARD SUBMISSION – SIGNIFICANT CONTRACTING PLAN AMENDMENT FOR KERBSIDE LARGE ITEMS COLLECTION AND RECYCLING SERVICE; and Clause K, STORES BOARD SUBMISSION – AMENDMENT OF SIGNIFICANT CONTRACTING PLAN FOR THE PROVISION OF FIELD COMMUNICATIONS, be taken seriatim *en bloc* for debating purposes. |

Chair: Voting, yes.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Voting, yes. Sorry, yes and seriatim voting.

Chair: Okay.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Thank you. Sorry, yes.

Chair: All right. B and C, seriatim together and G, H, I and K separately, each item, for debate and voting. Okay.

Councillor interjecting.

Chair: That’s what you said. You said separately for debate and voting, yes?

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, yes.

Chair: Each item individually?

Councillor JOHNSTON: No, no.

Chair: As a block?

Councillor JOHNSTON: B, C—

Chair: Yes.

Councillor JOHNSTON: —are taken together.

Chair: Yes.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Then separately from those—

Chair: Yes.

Councillor JOHNSTON: —G, H, I and K are taken together.

Chair: As a block?

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, not in—yes.

Chair: Okay, not separately, as you said? Okay, fine.

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Okay, thank you, Mr Chair. Last night, tonight and Wednesday night, we’ve lit up all our assets in purple for the Lord Mayor’s Charitable Trust Annual Christmas Appeal which is now underway. The Annual Christmas Appeal raises funds for the Christmas Grant program where we distribute much needed funds right in the lead-up to Christmas, at a time when they are desperately needed in the community, at a time when those frontline charities are providing critical services in the lead-up to Christmas. Obviously, for many of us, we hope that Christmas is a happy time of year, but for too many people in our community, it is a time where they are lonely and lacking in support and there’s so many great organisations that are out there providing frontline services.

Through the Christmas Appeal, the Lord Mayor’s Charitable Trust can support those charities. We do each year and we aim to do so again this year. So, we are raising awareness of that grants program. Obviously, anyone can donate to the Lord Mayor’s Charitable Trust and it is tax deductable, as is your donation for other charities.

On Thursday night, the Story Bridge, Victoria Bridge, Reddacliff Place and the Tropical Dome will be lit up in red to support World AIDS Day. Since 1988, World AIDS Day has been held globally on 1 December. It’s a day for the community to show their support for people living with HIV and to commemorate people who have also died of AIDS related conditions.

Also on Thursday night, City Hall will be lit up in purple to support the Endeavour Foundation’s Imagine What’s Possible Ball. The Ball is being held here at City Hall and we’re lighting the building up purple in honour of that Endeavour Foundation Ball.

On Friday night, our assets will be lit up in green to support Disability Action Week. It’s a week that’s being organised by Sporting Wheelies, who do a fantastic job in our community as one of the leading providers of inclusive sports, recreation and rehabilitation therapy in Queensland.

On Saturday night, Reddacliff Place and the Tropical Dome and Victoria Bridge will be lit up in blue, orange and green to support International Day of People with a Disability. The day is held on 3 December each year and is also a United Nations observed day aimed at increasing public awareness and understanding of people with a disability.

Finally, on Sunday night, the Story Bridge will be lit up in purple and yellow to support 75 years of Lions’ service to the community. Lions Australia has grown to be the largest service club in Australia and since it was first formed in 1947, there are now 1,200 clubs and more than 25,000 members across the country. We had originally proposed to light up our assets earlier, but it coincided with the passing of Her Majesty the Queen and, obviously, there were no light-ups during that period. So we’ve rescheduled this one and I particularly want to thank Councillor Steve TOOMEY for his advocacy and ensuring that we didn’t forget this important light-up opportunity, so thank you, Councillor TOOMEY.

I also did want to mention briefly the end of an era in some ways with yesterday, after 10 years on the Board, chairing the Board of the Museum of Brisbane, former Lord Mayor Sallyanne Atkinson has stepped down from that position after a decade of guiding the Museum of Brisbane as Chair of the Board. So it was a very sad day yesterday in many ways, but also one to celebrate the contribution that Sallyanne Atkinson has made to our city and, particularly, the Museum of Brisbane, which continues to go from strength to strength.

It is a wonderful thing when someone not only serves the city in an elected role, as she did as Lord Mayor, but also continues to give back to the community and be actively involved and active in community life, but also supporting the Council that she loves so much, the city that she loves so much. Ten years as Chair of the Board of Museum of Brisbane is a wonderful milestone and we thank her for that long service. Yesterday, we agreed to make Sallyanne Atkinson the official patron of the Museum of Brisbane, so while she is no longer the Chair of the Board, she will continue on as patron and continue to encourage people to support the museum and donate to the museum and attend museum events. So, thank you to Sallyanne Atkinson.

Item A in front us, Mr Chair, is the Council and Standing Committee meeting dates and recess periods for 2023. We bring through a submission like this each year, so that Councillors can plan out the coming year and this one goes through until early 2024, as well, so that people can map out and plan the rest of the term of office. So we’re bringing this through in the normal manner. There is a reduction of one normal meeting, one normal meeting, not a week, one normal meeting. All up, if you include budget meetings, we will have 30 meetings where we come together to decide important matters.

There is one meeting reduction in this schedule proposed. I’m sure we’ll hear Labor say that it’s the death of democracy and make various outrageous claims, but we know that Labor’s contribution in these meetings is always very limited. They claim that they are the most important thing ever, but it’s a dog ate my homework approach where they roll out the same tired speeches recycled every time in their responses. If it wasn’t for Councillor JOHNSTON speaking on every item, we could reduce the number of meetings even further and the time of those meetings, because we know the contribution that Councillor JOHNSTON makes.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order to you, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: I don’t set the agenda at Council, Mr Chairman. The LORD MAYOR’s comments are not only false, they’re offensive. The agenda is actually set by the LNP. I can’t change it.

Chair: Yes. LORD MAYOR, could you please not refer to Councillor JOHNSTON unless she’s mentioned specifically in the agenda?

LORD MAYOR: I’ve been censored, have I? Apparently, I’ve been censored. So, okay, I can’t mention—

Councillor interjecting.

LORD MAYOR: —Councillor JOHNSTON ever again. Look, the reality is there is a one meeting reduction proposed for just over the next 12 months and it is something that will see the business of Council continue. All of the important things that we need to do will continue happening. Councillors will have unlimited opportunities to speak as they do at the moment, as Councillor JOHNSTON continues to take up at every opportunity. They will continue to have those opportunities. So, let’s hear the hyperbole that we will hear in response to this. It’ll be interesting.

Item C—no, that’s part of the bulk, so we’re on D now.

Chair: D, E, F and J.

LORD MAYOR: Item D is the major amendment to the Brisbane City Plan and Sandgate District Neighbourhood plan. So, this is coming through in its final stage. This has got an interesting history to it. We see an opportunity to increase supply in a beautiful part of Brisbane and one that is very liveable and one that more people no doubt would love to live in if they had the opportunity, but we see a case where the local Councillor has actively opposed new development in his area. We see that playing through in the outcome today. We know that in the current planning arrangements for the Sandgate area, the maximum height limit is just four storeys, despite the fact that a comparable place like Wynnum has much higher limits because there’s an opportunity for more people to live in Wynnum.

Wynnum is a beautiful place that goes from strength to strength, but what we saw is our initial proposal was to allow a modest increase from four storeys to six storeys in some locations. That was the original proposal. That was vehemently opposed by the anti-development local Councillor, Councillor CASSIDY, who ran an entire election campaign against, against that proposal. There were banners and signs everywhere saying no to six storeys in Sandgate, even though there were only limited sites that were proposed for six storeys. He was very clearly anti-development and anti-growth of his area and we’ve seen this play out now in this plan.

So, as we do, we listened to the feedback and we made a sensible compromise which would see the height limit raised from four storeys to five storeys in some locations, which is short of the six storeys which was originally proposed, but what we see here is that ultimate plan coming through. Now, Councillor CASSIDY has claimed multiple times that he wants to see more affordable housing. We’ve thrown down the gauntlet to him to offer suggestions and he has helpfully come back with just one or two suggestions in his area where you could see more affordable housing. In one of those suggestions, he expected the ratepayers to buy the land, to buy the land to build affordable housing.

So, this is quite extraordinary. He’s against development, he’s against growth in his area and his big suggestion to increase affordability is for ratepayers to buy land and build affordable housing. This is quite clearly, this is quite clearly trying to let the State Government off the hook for what they should be doing in this area, but what Council should be doing is providing more supply, more supply, something which Labor Councillors oppose again and again in this place.

Chair: LORD MAYOR, your time has expired.

**306/2022-23**

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

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Our very clear role—and this is a role that is actually set up by State Government frameworks and legislation—is to provide for supply for the city and in fact, the State Government wants us to provide anywhere from 10 to 15 years of available supply in our city. So, we faithfully go about the process of trying to identify new areas for supply and time in, time out, Labor Councillors oppose those changes that would enable more supply. So, if they tell you they care about affordable housing, they are forgetting that supply is a critical part of the equation when it comes to ensuring that housing is affordable.

So, you can’t say that you care if you continue to oppose something like 80% or 90% of all the plans that come through that would enable more supply. Now, I think, if my figures are correct—I’m not sure if they’ve been updated with the recent plans that have come through, but out of the 16 Neighbourhood plans that came through in recent years, Labor voted against 14 of them, 14 of them. These are all plans that identified sensible increases in supply, but Labor opposed in something like 80% or 90% of the times.

So, once again, we will see an opportunity in the Sandgate area to provide some modest increase in supply, something that was opposed by the local Councillor as part of a political campaign and something now where we have a compromise, not six storeys but five storeys over and above the existing level of four storeys maximum. So, this is what it is, I would simply say. This is a case of Councillor CASSIDY has made his bed and now he’s sleeping in it.

Which item next?

Chair: E.

LORD MAYOR: Item E? Item E, Mr Chair, the Second Budget Review. As I flagged last week, this budget review is part of our ongoing commitment to responsible financial management and the delivery of major infrastructure, the delivery of services in the suburbs and this allows us to continue the good work that has been done in recent years by tapping into the surplus to the tune of $57.7 million. So, as I flagged last week, the surplus that we have put aside this financial year will decrease by $57.7 million to allow us to absorb some of the cost increases that are coming through, thanks to the global inflation crisis, but we will also flag that the cost impacts of circa $400 million that we’re facing at the moment are not all being faced in the current financial year. They are being faced over the coming several years.

So, some of them are this financial year, some of them are projected next financial year, some of them are projected in the financial year after, but we are proactively dealing with the issue now and we’re making adjustments to the surplus this year and also the anticipated surplus next year and the year after, to help absorb those costs and cater for the growth of our city and the continued investment in infrastructure and projects. So, we know that the price of so many basic things has gone through the roof. These are challenges faced by all levels of government, by the private sector, even by mums and dads as they deal with their weekly household budgets. These challenges are real.

I would also point out, when Councillor CASSIDY talks about the rate increases, this year’s rate increase was significantly lower than inflation, significantly lower than inflation. So, we’ve seen in the past Labor increased rates by at least six per cent on four occasions, on four different occasions. The average rate increase this year was 4.93 per cent, compared to an inflation rate right now of over seven per cent—

Councillor interjecting.

LORD MAYOR: —over seven per cent. So, Labor will selectively quote these figures here, but they are trying to con the people of Brisbane by really distorting the reality here. The reality is, we are investing more than ever before in building infrastructure. We are investing more than ever before in building a better Brisbane and providing services to the people of Brisbane and we have to do this now because our city is growing quicker than ever before. If we were in a situation where the city was reducing in population, we had population decline, in that sort of circumstance, maybe you could think about taking the foot off the accelerator, but we do not have that choice.

We do not have that luxury, because the city continues to grow at a record rate, at the highest rate we’ve seen in many decades. Australia’s fastest‑growing capital city is Brisbane and we are at the heart of the fastest‑growing region, South East Queensland. So, this submission that comes through continues to keep the foot on the accelerator, to use the surplus to help absorb some of that cost impact, because it’s the right and responsible thing to do.

Item F is the Queensland Treasury Corporation’s credit review. I mentioned this before. For the 10th consecutive year, we have seen a strong credit rating with a neutral outlook. This is despite the extraordinary challenges, extraordinary challenges that we have seen. So, not only on the one hand are we building more infrastructure and budgeting to fund more infrastructure than any year in the city’s history—and in 2025, this city will turn 100. So the Council, the Greater Brisbane Council was established in 1925. We are now approaching 100 years. In all of those almost 100 years, there has never been a year we’re investing more in infrastructure.

Despite that and despite the fact that we’ve had a pandemic which hit the budget to the tune of $220 million, a flood which hit the budget to the tune of $330 million and now a global inflation crisis which is driving up the cost of building infrastructure and we’ve seen that coming through today to the tune of $400 million over the coming three years, we still, we still have a strong credit rating with a neutral outlook. So, that is indicative of the fact that we continue to run a strong and responsible budget, so credit to all of the team in Council that works very hard to keep the budget strong, balanced and responsible, to put aside the money each year to create a surplus for unexpected things to happen and they do happen and they have happened.

So, just at the same week where Labor makes false claims about cuts or increases in rates, we have the Queensland Treasury Corporation giving us, once again, a strong credit rating. They’ve done that independently. They’ve done that in a way that now, for 10 years in a row, has rated Council’s management very strongly. I would have expected, after two or three years of a pandemic and a flood that the outlook would have been downgraded. This would not have been a surprise to me. In fact, I was anticipating a strong credit rating with either a developing outlook or a negative outlook because of the sheer volume of the shocks. That would not have surprise me at all, but we’ve seen the return of the strong credit rating with a neutral outlook which is a good, positive outcome for the city.

So, item J is the next one. This one is the lease of land at 34 Amesbury Street, Kangaroo Point. Council has leased this land to the Queensland Government since 2002. The land accommodates wharf structures over the Brisbane River, adjacent to the Naval Stores building. The lessor is the Department of Resources. They’ve offered a new 21-year lease. This lease is required to maintain the existing use of the wharf structures. State Government has conditioned that the lease land forming the wharf area must only be used in conjunction with the adjoining land use occupied by the Naval Stores. We obviously agreed to that condition. The new lease will commence on 14 March next year and expire on 13 March 2024. This is a pretty straightforward matter, which I no doubt expect will get everyone’s support.

That’s all the items in the first block, Mr Chair, is that correct?

Chair: That’s correct, LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you.

Chair: Thank you. Further debate on items A, D, E, F and J?

Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks very much, Chair.

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

|  |
| --- |
| Councillor Jared CASSIDY requested that Clause A, COUNCIL AND STANDING COMMITTEE MEETING DATES AND RECESS PERIODS FOR 2023; Clause D, MAJOR AMENDMENT TO *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014* – SANDGATE DISTRICT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN; and Clause E, 2022‑23 BUDGET – SECOND REVIEW, be taken seriatim *en bloc* for voting purposes. |

**Seriatim *en bloc* for voting - Clauses F and J**

|  |
| --- |
| Councillor Jared CASSIDY requested that Clause F, QUEENSLAND TREASURY CORPORATION’S 2022 BRISBANE CITY COUNCIL CREDIT REVIEW; and Clause J, LEASE OF LAND AT 34B AMESBURY STREET, KANGAROO POINT, be taken seriatim *en bloc* for voting purposes. |

Councillor CASSIDY: Yes, correct. On Clause A, starting at Clause A, you know, ratepayers are now, because of this LORD MAYOR’s incompetence, bracing for a $400 million budget blowout on a couple, just a couple of his inner city pet projects. Ratepayers aren’t silly. They will see this for what it is. They’ll see right through the LORD MAYOR’s spin and they would expect when they see this and they read news of this $400 million blowout on LORD MAYOR Adrian Schrinner’s watch that Councillors and the LORD MAYOR would get in and roll their sleeves up and work hard for the following year, to make sure that we can mop up this LORD MAYOR’s mess.

You’d think that he would be a little embarrassed about that, about a blowout on his pet project going from—what did it start at, $944 million, the Metro? Then to $1.2 billion, then to $1.7 billion and now racing towards a $2 billion project that is delivering a lot less than was promised initially. So you would expect that the Administration would say, we need to deal with these wicked issues that are facing Brisbane, these massive budget blowouts, the housing crisis in Brisbane and get the work rolling on that homelessness strategy he’s been holding back, get the work rolling on a housing strategy that he’s been holding back, deal with the significant issues, address the suburban congestion that’s now making Brisbane not just the fastest growing capital city in Australia, but also the most congested city in Australia, but no. No, what we have is an extra week off.

Just a couple of years ago, a few years ago, there were 32 Tuesday meetings.

Councillor interjecting.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thirty-two Tuesday—not even quite that long ago, Councillor JOHNSTON, I’ll take the interjection. Just a couple of years ago, there were 32 Tuesday meetings, excluding budget meetings in here and the LORD MAYOR has the gall to come in and say, amidst all of these wicked problems that are facing Brisbane, well, cut another one. There’s 29 this year, it’s 28 next year. So, you’d think ahead of an election, there’d be an awful lot of work to be done. I’m not sure whether the LORD MAYOR will be giving bus drivers an extra week off work or librarians or Council cleaners or the hardworking staff—what’s left of them—out in the field cutting concrete and trimming trees and things like that an extra week off, but he’s giving his Administration another week off. So, meeting less next year is not the answer to Brisbane’s problems that we need, so we won’t be supporting this item before us today.

Clause D is the major amendment to Brisbane city Plan for the Sandgate District Neighbourhood plan and this is the final step for the flawed Sandgate Neighbourhood plan. Now, I was initially enthusiastic about the possibility of a new Neighbourhood plan in working with the community and having a holistic approach to the way in which Sandgate, Shorncliffe, Deagon and Brighton grows over the next 20 years, what I got and my community got, though, was a politicised process where the LNP Administration did things in secret, briefed the media before the local Councillor and failed to appreciate how attuned the community was to the political actions of the LNP.

We could have had an outcome where not only the character of our tin and timber homes was preserved and strategic locations are identified for higher density, but also didn’t fundamentally and fatally alter the village character of Sandgate itself. That was possible if we had an administration willing to go on that process with the community, but we didn’t. We didn’t have an LNP Administration and an LNP MAYOR who was willing to do the hard work. I think the 300 additional dwellings that have been identified could have been higher if a proper conversation was had with the community. I would have been part of that process, had it not been bastardised from the very beginning by the political motivations of this LORD MAYOR.

I want to thank the Council officers who’ve worked on this Neighbourhood plan. They certainly took the enormous amounts of feedback that was provided at every single stage by the community and wound back a whole lot of the LNP’s initial proposals and while the LNP will lie and lie and lie about this—that’s in their DNA, of course—

Councillor interjecting.

Councillor CASSIDY: —I did provide constructive feedback, Chair, at every stage of the process. Some of this was taken onboard and some was not and every opportunity I had with Council officers to provide that feedback was around where that increased density would be appropriate and where it would not be appropriate and my views were in line with the community. So, at the end of the day, this is a good example of a bad process that the community fundamentally felt shut out from. It’s no good for the LNP to come in here today and say, this Neighbourhood plan is about the current housing crisis, when this same LNP Administration refuses to do any work on a housing strategy they promised back in 2019. So, I cannot support this plan in its current state.

The next item, item E, is the budget second review. This budget review sees the transition of a budget not that long ago that was a dog’s breakfast now into a steaming pile. This budget, as all budgets, are a statement of the priorities and values of our elected leaders. In our case, it’s a unique position where the LORD MAYOR of Brisbane has the sole responsibility of delivering a budget for Brisbane. This review confirms that the priorities and values of this LNP MAYOR do not align with those of the people of Brisbane. We’re seeing a trend towards more debt and higher rates for the people of Brisbane, but not much to show for them in the suburbs. There’s more debt, the LNP takes on increasing debt for their glitzy, inner city projects and we’ll see less and less out in the suburbs of Brisbane.

There’s a $33 million cut to the Infrastructure for Brisbane budget. Now, the LORD MAYOR perhaps hasn’t read what was prepared. You’d hope he would, because it was his responsibility. It’s his budget. On page 11 of this budget review, it makes it very clear, not for this quarter, but for this year’s budget there’s a $33.5 million reduction in capital expenditure for the Infrastructure for Brisbane program. That’s from an initial budget of $395 million. The LORD MAYOR was throwing figures around before, saying there’s $1 billion for infrastructure. Well, in the Infrastructure for Brisbane part of the budget, there was $395 million allocated and that’s been cut by $33.5 million, almost 10% of that suburban infrastructure budget has been gutted by this LORD MAYOR.

There’s a $17.7 million cut to the Lifestyle and Community Services budget in this review, as well, not for this quarter, but entirely cut from this year’s budget in that program. So, this program, Lifestyle and Community Services, does things like work with homelessness services to make sure that we can get people who are sleeping rough connected with services. Sports fields remediation, upgrades to Council-owned facilities that we lease to community organisations are doing it really tough at this time of year. Now, we put the question to the LORD MAYOR in Question Time today and say, which items will be cut from this year’s budget? Because we know that there’s a suburban schedule of works addendum to the budget, but we also know that doesn’t form part of the budget itself.

All the LORD MAYOR is required to do these days is to bring a single line item to this Council and expect us to support it, to say, please allow me to cut $33 million from the infrastructure budget and please allow him to cut nearly $18 million from the Lifestyle and Community Services budget without telling Councillors and without telling the people of Brisbane where those cuts are occurring, what projects are going to be cut, what congestion-busting projects are going to be cut, what zebra crossings are going to be cut, what rat running projects, LATM (Local Area Traffic Management) are going to be cut, what sports fields won’t get remediated, what projects at which community lease sites aren’t going ahead.

The LORD MAYOR is not being upfront and forthright with the people of Brisbane, I suspect because he’s embarrassed by his decisions and so he should be. There’s less infrastructure for our suburbs. There will be higher rates and higher debt. When this LNP Administration came to power, the average rates bill for suburban Brisbane was around $900 a year. It’s now around $1,800 a year. It’s doubled in that time, but have suburban services doubled? No. There’s less drainage projects, less congestion busting projects, less public transport out in the suburbs. They’re cutting that left, right and centre. Nothing about housing whatsoever and homelessness.

The people of Brisbane are paying more and getting less under this LNP Administration. You’d think that this LNP Council would have learnt a thing or two about transparency and accountability from the former Morrison Government in the way in which they approached keeping all of those projects secret and decisions they were making secret, but I suspect they’ve learnt absolutely nothing from that experience and they’re going to be punished harshly for that.

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY—

Councillor CASSIDY: Moving on to—

Chair: —your time has expired.

**307/2022-23**

At that point, Councillor Jared CASSIDY was granted an extension of time on the motion of Councillor Kara COOK, seconded by Councillor Charles STRUNK.

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Moving on to item F, which is the Treasury Corporation’s credit review. This is interesting. I think the LORD MAYOR—I mean, maybe he does know what it is and he was sort of fluffing around, or perhaps, which is worse, he doesn’t really understand how these credit reviews work. So, in the eyes of the QTC (Queensland Treasury Corporation), Council can continue to borrow. That’s what this is about. It’s about Council’s ability to borrow more money to fund blowouts on projects. They say, Council can continue to borrow because in their words, Brisbane City Council has a capacity and willingness to adjust rates, to maintain sufficient revenue, to fund operations and service debt. What does that mean in plain speak? That this LNP Council, led by Adrian Schrinner, will raise rates, raise suburban rates to fund historic levels of debt that they have lumped Brisbane residents with, plain and simple.

That’s what this credit review says. It actually confirms what we all knew all along, but it’s good to have it from an external, as the LORD MAYOR says, independent body, in showing that this Council, because it has a large and diverse rates base, we see from answers to QoNs (Questions on Notice) today, is 450,000 rateable properties. The QTC say, sure, you can borrow as much as you want and jack up rates as high as you want, but it doesn’t account for that pain that that inflicts on average ratepayers. So, they’re very clear that they can do this. They’re very clear that the LORD MAYOR can go and borrow another $400 million to cover his stuff-ups on the Brisbane Metro and his inner city bridge program. He can do it, but should he? It doesn’t talk about this Council’s priorities and values.

This talks about its ability to continue to jack up rates, to continue to put pressure on working families around Brisbane, to continue to put pressure on housing affordability and continue to put pressure on rental affordability, because if you’re jacking up rates at the cap—and that might be at seven and a half per cent in a lot of suburbs this year to fund the enormous amounts of debt that this LORD MAYOR is running up, they’re going to be passed on. They’re going to be felt by homeowners and it’s going to be felt by renters right around Brisbane. The rates bill in Brisbane for the average suburban ratepayer has doubled since this LNP Administration came to power, but what do people have to show for it? Nothing in the suburbs of Brisbane. It’s getting worse and worse out there.

Item J is the lease at Kangaroo Point. I have that somewhere. This is something that Council entered into 20 years ago, I believe it was and is an important lease that Council has, so we’ll be supporting this. It’s a pretty good rate at $3,000 per annum for a further 21 years. That’s something that we will be supporting today.

Chair: Thank you. Further debate?

Councillor CUNNINGHAM.

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: Thanks, Mr Chair. Just briefly on item A, it’s an approximate reduction, Councillors, in the number of hours we are meeting and that’s proposed today to be five hours. Not five days, not a week, five hours. There will still be unlimited opportunities for Councillors to speak. Now, I was thinking about this and I note with interest today that the Labor Federal Government has reduced the Senate’s estimates hearing not by five hours, but by 25%. So, how do you spell hypocrisy?

Councillors interjecting.

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: They should look at—thank you. They should look at their Federal mates. They should look at the State, who also didn’t start their meetings until late February this year. How dare they come in here and accuse us—

Councillor interjecting.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, please.

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: Mr Chair, item E is the Second Budget Review. The LORD MAYOR foreshadowed this review in the Chamber last week. It’s an important opportunity to update our community on their Council’s finances, noting the challenges that the external environment has thrown our way this year, in addition to the immediate and ongoing challenges that have been triggered by the pandemic.

Mr Chair, we mustn’t forget that the pandemic cost this Council over $200 million in direct costs and foregone revenue. The pandemic, together with the Russian invasion of Ukraine, has impacted the global economy in a number of ways and this flows through to Council just like all other levels of Government, the private sector and our households. We have seen impacts from supply chain disruptions associated with world events, economic conditions and market volatility impacting Council’s costs of operations and capital program delivery.

Mr Chair, we have a tight labour market impacting Council labour and contracted works. Of course, we have contractual cost escalations and price escalations across a number of key materials and services. Locally and indeed across the nation, flooding has compounded challenges in terms of materials and labour availability and costs. We are still projecting that the total cost of Council to—sorry, the total cost to Council of the floods earlier this year will be over $300 million. So it is clear, Mr Chair, that we are living in challenging times and it’s important to bring forward this review to the Chamber today and reflect on the impact that these conditions will have on our budget.

In this budget review, our operating capability surplus decreases by $57.7 million. Revenue is materially unchanged, with submissions resulting in a net increase of under $1 million. Expenses have increased by nearly $60 million, with about half of that as the result of cost escalations. Our electricity costs have increased by $11 million. Fuel costs have increased by $1.5 million. Our price escalation estimates for waste contracts are over $7 million. As the LORD MAYOR has discussed in this place, cost escalation on our capital projects, both large and small, will have an impact in the coming years. In this review, the net impact of the review increases to our capital spend of $6.3 million this financial year and $119.4 million and $123.7 million in the two following years.

These challenges are not unique to Council, but they are challenges that we must deal with in the interests of delivering the infrastructure and services that our growing city needs. Because of years of careful financial management, we’re in a far better position to manage the challenges than we would have been if we had taken the advice of those opposite. It should be remembered, Mr Chair, that the Labor Party criticised the Schrinner Council for running a surplus during the pandemic. Cameron Dick complained that, quote, Council didn’t even go into deficit, as if it was a bad thing. By carefully managing the budget over the past decade, we are in a far better position today and we can continue to deliver the projects that our residents expect.

Now, through you, Mr Chair, to Councillor CASSIDY, regarding changes in Programs 2 and 2. In Program 2, these are largely due to project rephasing, not cuts.

Councillors interjecting.

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: Projects rephasing. This is necessary changes in timing. Now, in Program 5—

Councillor interjecting.

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: In Program 5, Mr Chair, it’s a change in accounting treatments, from CapEx (capital expenditure) to OpEx (operational expenditure). Now, I’m sure that this will be a disappointment to Councillor CASSIDY and his fear campaign and I’m sure he won’t let the truth get in the way, but those are the facts, Mr Chair.

item F is the outcome of Brisbane City Council’s credit review. Council is required to submit an annual credit review. It’s undertaken by Queensland Treasury Corporation as part of the approval for our annual borrowing program to deliver capital projects. The credit review undertaken by QTC is a similar process to that undertaken by the credit rating agencies such as Moody’s and S&P Global, being an independent assessment on Council’s long-term financial sustainability and ability to service current and future debt obligations. The credit review assesses Council’s creditworthiness and provides a recommendation to the State for Council’s proposed annual borrowing program.

QTC reviews Council’s forecasting assumptions and key financial factors, such as operating performance, serviceability, leverage, liquidity and asset sustainability. QTC also conducts sensitivity analysis on the forecast financials and a domestic and global peer comparison to understand relative leverage and debt servicing capacity. Consideration is also given to qualitative factors affecting Council’s financial sustainability, such as regional economic outlooks and key business operational and financial risks. Based on this assessment, QTC assigns a credit rating between very strong and distressed and a ratings outlook of either neutral, positive, negative, or developing. As set out in the papers, Mr Chair, we are pleased to report that Council has maintained a strong credit rating with a neutral outlook for the 10th consecutive year.

The Schrinner Council has a proven track record of sensible financial management. Responsible management is not something that is easy and it is not something that is always popular. It’s something which requires leadership and it requires hard work and the financial position of Council is the product of many years of hard work. A strong operating performance, capable management and continuous delivery of major projects continues to be a key factor in the maintenance of a strong rating. I would really like to place on record my thanks to the corporate finance team for their continued hard work and dedication to our city, which has delivered this great result.

Finally, Mr Chair, item J is the lease of land at 34b Amesbury Street, Kangaroo Point. This is land which Council has leased from the Queensland Government Department of Resources since 2002. The land houses wharf structures over the river, next to the pathway to Kangaroo Point Cliffs Park and the Naval Stores building and Council has, as I mentioned earlier, leased this for some time. The lease is required to maintain the existing use of the wharf structure and it seeks approval for a new 21-year lease commencing 14 March next year and expiring in March 2044and I commend it to the Chamber.

Chair: Thank you. Further debate?

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Thanks, Chair. Can you just clarify which items we’re speaking on at the moment?

Chair: Currently—

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: A, B—

Chair: —A, D, E, F, J.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: That’s right, thanks. Cheers. Yes, just a few quick comments on the relevant items. With item A and the Council meeting dates, I do share concerns about the reduction in the number of meetings. I think Councillor CUNNINGHAM was wrong to imply that this is not a significant change. I think I heard her—through you, Chair—say that we have unlimited opportunities to speak at Council meetings and we don’t. We only get to speak once in General Business and other than that, we can only speak to the particular items that have been put on the agenda by the LNP.

So, the LNP controls the agenda, they control what we’re allowed to talk about, except for one comment in General Business each week. As Opposition Councillors, we also only get to ask a few questions in Question Time each Council meeting. So, cutting further meetings means fewer opportunities to ask questions of the Administration in Question Time and it means fewer opportunities to raise issues of importance to our residents in General Business. So, I don’t think this is a small thing. I don’t think it’s the end of the world. I’m not going to cry about the democratic sky falling in or whatever, but I do think there’s a reduction in accountability by reducing the number of public meeting sand I think that’s something that residents ought to be concerned about.

Just on the budget review and Councillor CASSIDY’s comments about rate increases, I don’t want to quibble too much because I share a lot of the concerns he’s raised, but I don’t think there’s any hard evidence that increasing rates necessarily leads to higher rents for renters. I know there’s a lot of commentary around that from certain landlords and it’s frequently cited by the Property Council as an argument against the increase in rates, but I think we should be cautious about accepting that at face value. If, for example, a landlord whose negative geared finds that their rates bill is increasing, most likely they just claim that as an additional deduction.

There’s no strong evidence that I’m aware of that increasing rates does—increased rates do generally get passed on to tenants. There are many other factors that are much more significantly impacting rent and I think we should be concerned about those issues and I’m very, very concerned about rising rents in this city. I think both the major parties have done a very poor job of protecting the rights of renters, but if Councillor CASSIDY does have any hard economic data on how or to what extent increases in rates are passed on as increased rents, I’d be interested in hearing that because I think a lot of landlords cry poor about that and they say, oh, if you put our rates up, we’re going to pass it on to renters, but that’s not really how things work in practice, in my experience, at least.

I think we should be very cautious about that, because I think sometimes there is a case for charging particularly property investors higher rates, as distinct from owner-occupiers and I don’t want to go into a long debate right now about what rates are appropriate for what categories of land use, but I think it would be perhaps politically unwise to back oneself into a corner where you oppose any kind of rates increase for any class of properties, when the reality is that, for example, short-term accommodation investment properties are still underrated. The rates are nowhere near high enough at the moment for properties that are rented out as transitory accommodation. I think we should be increasing those rates and I think increasing those rates would not result in higher costs for short term accommodation that’s provided by Airbnb. I think the investors would just absorb that loss.

I might just also really briefly say, with item J, the lease at Kangaroo Point, I don’t have any concerns about this, but it would have been nice to see just a little bit more detail in the papers about the lease and particularly, I would have liked a little bit more information about who bears what maintenance obligations. I know that that structure is getting pretty old and I assume there’s going to be debates at some point in the next 21 years about lease life, that there will be debates about whether the State Government or the Council is responsible for repairing cracked timbers or what happens the next time it’s damaged in a flood.

I assume those details have been worked out somewhere, but they don’t appear to be in the papers that have been provided to us. So I think if we’re being asked to vote on a lease for such a significant period of time, a little bit more clarity and a bit more detail in the relevant report or in the relevant item explaining who is going to be responsible for maintaining what would have been greatly appreciated and would have given me just a little bit more confidence about supporting that one, but I’ll leave it at that.

Chair: Thank you. Any further debate?

DEPUTY MAYOR.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair. I just rise to speak on item A and I’ll take on notice—and I didn’t ask you for your ruling but, you know, we just sit here and listen to Councillor CASSIDY saying, liar, liar, liar continually. They will jump immediately when I say this, but Councillor CASSIDY, you simply cannot be believed in anything you say in this place. You just said only a couple of years ago, there were 32 meetings of this Council. Let’s go back to the actual meetings of this Council. 2021, there was 29. In 2020, there was 23, it’s an election year. 2019, there was 29. 2018, there was 29. 2017, there was 29. 2016, there was 24, it was an election year. 2015, there was 29. 2014, there was 29. How much further back do I have to go?

Councillor interjecting.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Oh, over 10 years? They’re the first ones to complain when we bring anything up that’s over 10 years and this is not counting the budget meetings that we have, always two budget meetings, if not three sometimes with an extraordinary, which is probably where he has extrapolated his always 32 meetings in a year. Councillor CASSIDY, you’re a liar.

Chair: Further debate?

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order, Mr Chairman.

Councillor interjecting.

Councillor JOHNSTON: I’ve been expelled for calling a Councillor a liar. I’ve had my name noted in the minutes.

Councillors interjecting.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Just a—yes, just a moment, if that’s okay, please. Now, Councillor MURPHY has just been shouting out across the Chamber, who cares, no one cares. I care because the rules are applied in one way to me and not to other Councillors in this place. Mr Chairman, Councillor ADAMS has called Councillor CASSIDY a liar. That is grounds for inappropriate conduct in the minutes. Will you apply the law in the same way to her as you do to me?

Chair: DEPUTY MAYOR, I ask that you withdraw those comments, please.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Point of order, Mr Chair. Look, I will definitely withdraw that Councillor CASSIDY is a liar. I didn’t want to bundle the others into it, so I will just say, the ALP lie.

Chair: Thank you for withdrawing those comments.

Further debate?

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, just on the point of order. The comments from Councillor MURPHY, will they be withdrawn, as well?

Chair: Councillor MURPHY, could I ask you not to interject across the floor, please and observe the general good behaviour of this Chamber, please?

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, thank you. I rise to speak on items A, possibly D, E and F. Firstly, with respect to the Council meeting dates for 2023, we know, we know that the LNP in this Council are in trouble when they start quoting the Labor Party to justify their own bad behaviour. I’m sure Labor are going to be going, oh, hang on, but this is what happens. When they get desperate, they will go down and they will draw on the bad behaviour of the Labor Party at other levels of government to justify their own bad behaviour. Without question, we are seeing the LNP trying to hide accountability in the running of this city from Councillors and from the City of Brisbane, from the people of Brisbane. That is what they are doing.

Now, Councillor CUNNINGHAM stood up and said, we get five hours to have a chat, there’s not a time limit on Council, but perhaps she just can’t handle the 25 minutes she has to do at E&C as part of her role as the Finance Chairman. Perhaps that’s too much.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, can I ask you to refer to Councillors by their proper title, please.

Councillor JOHNSTON: I’m sorry?

Chair: Could I ask you to refer to Councillors by their title, not by her or she?

Councillor JOHNSTON: Councillor CUNNINGHAM?

Chair: Thank you.

Councillor JOHNSTON: What?

Councillor interjecting.

Chair: That’s one of the Meetings Local Laws.

Councillor interjecting.

Chair: Yes.

Councillor JOHNSTON: I did say Councillor CUNNINGHAM.

Chair: Yes.

Councillor JOHNSTON: So, I’m sorry, you’re saying we can’t say she, he, they? Just to be clear on your rule here, because if that’s where you want to go, that’s what we can do. Is that your rule?

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, that ruling has been made previously, thank you.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Okay. You’re sure you want to do that? Just giving the chance to back the bus up now.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON you have the floor. If you’d like to continue.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Righto. Councillor CUNNINGHAM obviously has a little bit too much trouble handling the extra 25 minutes a week with E&C. But let me be clear, the LNP are cutting back Council meetings. When I started there were around 30 a year. It’s now—went down to 29 and now it is down to 28. The impact of that is there is less scrutiny of this Council Administration by the people of Brisbane and by the democratically elected Councillors.

You combine that with the way in which this LNP Administration has delegated decision making to unelected Council officers. You combine that with the level of extraordinary secrecy that they’re bringing in with respect to the cost of projects. There are hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars of ratepayers’ money that is being bandied around by the LNP Council and they don’t want anyone to know. It’s secret, it’s confidential, we can’t talk about it.

I mean there’s an ATM (Automated Teller Machine) now down in the lobby of City Hall, they’re treating the ratepayers of Brisbane like an ATM machine. It is appalling to watch what this LNP Administration is doing to the good governance of this city and taking away opportunities to debate the issues of the day weakens the administration and governance of our city.

I mean Councillor CUNNINGHAM stood up and said that the new Albanese Government was having less sittings. So you know justifying their own behaviour. That’s appalling, that is just appalling. It is a bad decision and I don’t support it. We are paid to be here to make decisions, that’s why I don’t support delegations. We are paid to turn up and discuss the business of the city. This Administration has changed the Meetings Local Laws multiple times since I’ve been a Councillor, to restrict our ability to do that. To restrict it and it’s still going on today. It is shameful behaviour by the LNP who are tired, out of touch and unaccountable.

Now, with respect to the Sandgate District neighbourhood plan. I think this is where the LNP have just—they just cannot, cannot, in their tiny minds, work out that if we don’t agree with them, if we don’t agree with them. If we have other ideas about what should happen, opposing the plan means you’re against all development. That’s what they’re trying to say. Now that is absolutely not the case.

When the neighbourhood plan for my area when through we were very clear. This Administration didn’t change a single thing, not a single thing to reflect the views of hundreds and hundreds of residents. But this LNP Administration now cannot stand somebody else with an alternate idea. They immediately oppose that as, you don’t support us. Well, guess what? You are getting these neighbourhood plans wrong. The adverse impacts are being felt in communities around the city and it is going to catch up with you the hard way. It is going to catch up with you.

The Queensland Treasury Corporation, City Council Credit Review. Firstly, QTC is not an independent organisation from Council. They are our financial enablers, so to speak. They think Brisbane City Council is doing a cracking job. So I will agree with the LORD MAYOR. There’s no question they think that Council’s rolling along okay. But why is it rolling along okay? Let’s have a little look-see.

The strong rating reflects BCC’s financial profile and operating results. The rating is underpinned by BCC’s diverse revenue stream. Which provide a high degree of financial flexibility and, importantly here, their capacity and willingness to adjust rates to maintain sufficient revenue to fund operations and service debt.

Councillor interjecting.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Ching ching, ching ching. In the libraries we’re going to start seeing ATM machines maybe. In the pools we’re going to start seeing ATM machines. This Administration wants to put ATM machines in everywhere. Because the seven per cent a year residential cap on rates that they’ve been jacking up rates, not 3.5% like this LORD MAYOR says. In my ward there are multiple suburbs that hit the rates’ cap at seven per cent. Over the time that I’ve been a Councillor rates have doubled under the LNP.

You don’t need to go back and look at the ancient history of the Labor Party, who I’m sure got it wrong too. It’s this LNP Administration that are profligate, irresponsible and are treating the residents of Brisbane like a cash cow. It is absolutely being endorsed by the QTC. Because they want to safeguard their investment in us. Because where do we get our money from? The Queensland State Government.

So this is the thing that the LORD MAYOR will not tell you. He will not tell you that rates are going to continue to go up to support the work that the LNP are doing here. It’s not like they’re spending the money well. It’s not like they’re spending the money in a responsible way. We’re seeing half a billion dollars or project disasters being rushed through the Council today. We can’t even talk about the figures. They’re secret, they’ve been redacted. The LNP don’t want people to know.

These major projects around the city are blowing out. It’s the war in Ukraine, it’s okay. It’s the floods. These things are happening all the time. I’ve been here for 14 years, it’s the second lot of floods. They’re going to keep happening. You’d think Brisbane Council—Brisbane City Council finance chairs and there’s multiple of them sitting here. I think the LORD MAYOR’s had a go at it, Councillor CUNNINGHAM’s had a go at it. Councillor ADAMS had a go at it. Councillor ADAM ALLAN’s had a go at it. I think that might be it. I don’t know if anybody else has been finance chair.

But they’re not learning. They’re not learning, they’re not adjusting. They’re doing the same things that are getting our city into financial strife time and time again. Now the LORD MAYOR will tell you, as he did today, trying to justify these cost blowout on these seven major projects. Oh, it’s okay, we’ve got a little bit of a surplus. It’s fine, there’s a surplus. What the LORD MAYOR does not want to tell you is he has blown out the credit card. He’s taken on second and third and fourth mortgages. The cost of debt for every single person in Brisbane is skyrocketing. It is absolutely skyrocketing.

This year it’s about—let me just pull it out. This year it is $2,200. Next year—per person, per person in Brisbane. Next year it’s going to bump up to $2,655, the next year $2,814. It is blowing out. It’s money on the credit card, it’s money that we’ve borrowed and this LNP Administration, it’s their dirty secret that they don’t want to talk about. Because they’re not going to be—

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON your time—

Councillor JOHNSTON: —-responsible for paying it back.

Chair: —has expired.

Any further debate on these items?

Councillor ADAM. Councillor ADAM ALLAN, thank you. Over there.

Councillor ALLAN: Thank you, Mr Chair, I wish to join the debate on item D, the Sandgate District neighbourhood plan. Since March 2019, Council has been working with the community and local residents in and around Sandgate, Deagon and Shorncliffe to update the Sandgate District neighbourhood plan. This neighbourhood plan will guide future planning and development in the area and continue to support inclusive housing choices to be located close to public transport and centres.

It also supports the economic activity within Sandgate. Mr Chair, I pondered today about just how the Opposition would vote on this neighbourhood plan. But I’m not really surprised that Councillor CASSIDY has indicated today that his side of the Chamber will not be supporting this neighbourhood plan. As the LORD MAYOR said earlier, they have voted against 14 neighbourhood plans since 2016. Across these 14 neighbourhood plans, there is a potential to provide an additional 25,000 dwellings.

Councillor interjecting.

Councillor ALLAN: Twenty-five thousand additional dwellings not supported by the Opposition. It seems like the Opposition want to pick a fight with this side of the Chamber for no other reason than simply voting against the Schrinner Council. Yet when good planning scheme changes come through the Chamber, changes that will lead to housing supply, diversity and choice and they are encouraged to support them, they have not done so. Mr Chair, I’m not surprised, I’m just disappointed.

I did find it really interesting when Councillor CASSIDY spoke earlier and he said that he’d provided constructive feedback at every stage of the process. Well, the truth is that he’s actually worked actively against the process. He hasn’t provided local leadership. He talks about getting a better outcome, but he hasn’t provided local leadership. He hasn’t taken the community with him.

On one end of the spectrum he’s got people who don’t want any change. On the other end of the spectrum he’s got people who want significant change. He hasn’t provided guidance to those groups. He hasn’t achieved the outcomes that he sought because he hasn’t really been engaged in the process.

So, in the context of this neighbourhood plan, he didn’t provide a formal submission which might outline some of his concerns. He went to briefings and ultimately when he had his final briefing, he just noted it. So you know at the end of the day you can’t stand up in the Chamber and have a crack at the process, without actually having provided leadership on the ground. Ultimately, in this case, Councillor CASSIDY has let his community down. Thank you, Mr Chair.

Chair: Sorry, any further debate on these items? Any further debate on these items. Okay.

We’ll move to the vote on items A, D and E. That was the first voting block, A, D and E.

**Clauses A, D and E put**

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

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

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 19 - The Right Honourable, the LORD MAYOR, Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER, DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Krista ADAMS, and Councillors Greg ADERMANN, Adam ALLAN, Lisa ATWOOD, Fiona CUNNINGHAM, Tracy DAVIS, Fiona HAMMOND, Vicki HOWARD, 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 Kara COOK, Peter CUMMING, Charles STRUNK, Jonathan SRIRANGANATHAN and Nicole JOHNSTON.

Chair: Thank you. Councillors, please return to your seats. Councillors we now move to debate on items B and C. Items B and C, LORD MAYOR.

Councillors interjecting.

Chair: Sorry?

Councillor WINES: Point of order, Mr Chair. Can you check my memory? I recalled that for debate and vote it was A, D, E, I and J. But then we separated A, D, E and I and J.

Councillors interjecting.

Councillor WINES: Excuse me, A, D, E for one vote and F and J was the other vote. We haven’t concluded that second vote yet.

Chair: Okay, my apologies, okay. Councillors, we now move to the vote on items F and J. items F and J.

**Clauses F and J put**

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

Chair: The next voting block was G, H, I and K.

Councillors interjecting.

Chair: Okay. Thank you. Councillors we move to the debate on items B and C, items B and C.

LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair. items B and C are the LGIP, Local Government Infrastructure Plan and the LTIP, Long Term Infrastructure Plan. In relation to, I’m not sure if it was answered before. There was a question from Councillor JOHNSTON about State Government planning in Priority Development Areas. We certainly do take into account the known information about expected growth. But that information is obviously subject to change, we don’t have control over Priority Development Areas. They can change quite significantly from one year to another based on the State Government’s priorities. But we do try and take into account all the information that is known.

I would also point out though that these plans are about collecting infrastructure charges to help support investment in infrastructure. With a State Priority Development Area, we do not get any charges.

Councillor interjecting.

LORD MAYOR: So there’s significant chunks of the city where no contribution at all comes to Council for the provision of infrastructure. There is a significant issue that grows and grows each year. Where the State Government allows significant increases in growth and development without appropriate provision of infrastructure or without the provision of infrastructure charges to help support investment in infrastructure. So we do take into account, Councillor JOHNSTON, what is known. But that is subject to change over time as State Government planning requirements change.

Item B is the LGIP, the Local Government Infrastructure Plan. This amendment is the five yearly review. We have expanded the planning horizon to 15 years, from 2021 to 2036. As I said, having an LGIP allows Council to continue levying infrastructure charges for approved new developments. As well as conditioning future trunk infrastructure.

Now there are cases where an applicant or a builder will provide the infrastructure themselves. Then there are cases where government, such as Council, will build the infrastructure. So there’s two different options here and the LGIP allows for both options. In cases where Council builds the infrastructure, the funds collected from each new development proposal helps fund that. But it is far from a source that covers the majority of the cost of building infrastructure. In fact, it only covers a fraction of the cost of building infrastructure.

Councillors interjecting.

LORD MAYOR: In recent times, with the escalation of cost in building infrastructure, we haven’t seen anywhere near the increase in infrastructure charges to allow us to even cover the cost. So we are going backwards, this year, significantly, when it comes to our ability to provide infrastructure going forward with the infrastructure charges cap that’s in place. So as costs escalate far more than inflation, every year the charges that come in through developments are, in real terms, going backwards.

So not a good outcome and obviously we’ve advocated previously for a change to the way that infrastructure charges are capped and calculated and the way that those are escalated. They should be more reflective of increases in the price of building things than they are at the moment. Because the current cap does not take into account those major cost increases that we’re seeing in building infrastructure.

But having said that, this plan does allow us to collect charges. To put it in perspective, on average we are seeing around $200 million per annum going into trunk infrastructure investment through LGIP projects. But that represents only a portion of the—more than $1 billion dollars we’re spending this year, for example. In the past, even when we’ve seen lower levels of infrastructure investment, the infrastructure charges that have come in have only covered a fraction of the cost.

So if anyone is suggesting or anyone suggests in this debate that this list in front of us represents the only infrastructure investment we’re making, it’s simply not true. This is just a list of projects that we will collect charges towards. But that we have to significantly top up. But it is also far from the only list of projects that we will be building. There are many other projects that we invest in each year. This is just a part of the equation.

The amendment will see trunk infrastructure including transport, stormwater, public parks and land for community facilities identified. It will see the capital expenditure increased by $1.2 billion within this 15-year period. Once again, only a fraction of what we’ll be spending. Since the LGIP was adopted into City Plan in 2018, Council has facilitated the delivery of more than 200 trunk infrastructure items across the city. Either through Council-led initiatives or developer-led construction.

This financial year we’ll also continue to deliver suburban and metropolitan trunk projects, including the Moggill Road corridor upgrade, Green Bridges and Victoria Park projects. In the past we’ve seen contributions towards some of our major infrastructure including the Kingsford Smith Drive upgrade, opposed by Labor. Wynnum and Lytton Road upgrades and Telegraph Road. As well as the District and Metropolitan park upgrades at Bridgeman Downs, Chermside, Darra, Mt Coot-Tha, Pallara, Sandgate, West End, Windsor, Wavell Heights, to name just a few.

Item C, the Long Term Infrastructure Plan is primarily about the identification of land that needs to be preserved for future infrastructure or public open space. Including infrastructure such as roads stormwater and the provision of parkland. Now in the long-term infrastructure timeframe, we are not able to collect charges in this longer-term timeframe. But we are able to designate land for preservation for future infrastructure. So this has the primary purpose of setting aside land that will be needed for future infrastructure.

So the LTIP and the LGIP are important documents to go hand in hand with the future of our city. Identifying land for future use is really important. Because the earlier it is identified, the earlier it is set aside, the more affordable the provision of infrastructure will be for the people of Brisbane. Land is not getting any cheaper, every year it increases in value. So if it can be identified early, in this case on a long-term horizon, that will save ratepayers significantly down the track when the infrastructure is built.

The LTIP amendment today provides updates for our plan. This is going beyond 2036. There are 14 new items going into the LTIP as part of this amendment. Additionally, there are 141 projects being removed from the LTIP and being brought forward into the LGIP. So these are projects that were previously in the long-term plan that are being put into the LGIP, which is the current plan. So they’re being moved forward and brought into the timeframe where not only we’re looking at delivery. But also where we can collect charges from new developments towards them as well.

So this particularly long-term plan is about future proofing and setting aside land, as I’ve said. I commend these two items to the Chamber.

Chair: Thank you.

Councillor interjecting.

Chair: Councillor HUTTON.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

|  |
| --- |
| **308/2022-23**  At that time, 3.03pm, it was resolved on the motion of Councillor Sarah HUTTON, seconded by Councillor Greg ADERMANN, that the meeting adjourn for a period of 15 minutes, to commence only when all Councillors had vacated the Chamber and the doors locked.  Council stood adjourned at 3.05pm. |

**UPON RESUMPTION:**

Chair: Thank you Councillors. Further debate on items B and C?

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Oh yes, excuse me. Thank you, I rise to speak on items B and C. The LGIP and the LTIP. Unfortunately, my experience of city planning in this place is Council forcing change on to communities that don’t support it. Then ripping away the infrastructure that the community has needed for more than two decades. That’s our experience of the LGIP and the LTIP. Particularly with the last amendments that went through a few years ago.

The stormwater drainage upgrades that are desperately needed in Yeronga were completely removed. Backflow valves aren’t listed. Stormwater drainage all around this city desperately needs to be upgraded. It’s really disappointing to see that the LNP Administration still isn’t getting it. What I understand from the changes to this plan, suburbs like Pallara and Bridgeman Downs are getting prioritised. I believe the language is, a Priority Infrastructure Area. They may not be the only ones but they’re the two that stick out to me.

It’s very interesting, I went and had a look at the population forecast for residential dwellings that’s in the LGIP. Sadly the suburb of Yeerongpilly, which was essentially 800 houses, that over the next few years is going to be something like 3,000 houses, doesn’t even rate a mention. Not even listed. We’re not seeing any infrastructure going in there. There’s a petition later today calling on Council to do a road upgrade that would service that area. But no, there’s no money to do that because it’s not a priority.

It’s not a priority because it’s not even listed in the population forecasts for modelling to deliver the LGIP and the LTIP. That’s how bad this Administration is. So I just want to give people some idea, just some comparisons on the modelling. Because what we’re seeing is this Administration absolutely not getting that right.

Currently, I’m going to give you Bridgeman Downs. So in 2018 there were 3,145 private dwellings. By 2031 that will be up to 4,431 and this new, ultimate figure, sort of over the full year of the life plus, plus, it’s forecast to go up to 6,978. So that’s Bridgeman Downs. Pallara, 2,209 in 2008, 2031, 3,431, and the ultimate figure, the blowout 15-year figure plus 6,025.

So let’s compare that to Yeronga. The suburb of Yeronga, little old suburb of Yeronga. Doesn’t have a neighbourhood plan, doesn’t have any infrastructure listed on the LGIP or the LTIP. Oh no, there’s some on the LTIP. It’s had massive new housing developments go in, 400 people in a retirement village that floods. Another 250 new dwellings on the old parkland site at the RSPCA (Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals). Huge amounts of infill through Yeronga West. There’s a Priority Development Area where we’re going to see around 600 new homes on what was a school site.

What are we seeing in Yeronga? So currently, well 2018, 4,641 private dwellings. By 2031 that’s estimated to rise to 5,278 and the blowout figure of this ultimate figure that’s referred to is 7,132 private dwellings. That’s more than the Priority Infrastructure Area of Bridgeman Downs. That’s more than the Priority Area of Pallara, more by quite a bit. Is there any infrastructure to support the ongoing growth that has happened over the last decade plus in Yeronga and that is clearly continuing to happen both at the State and the—

Councillor interjecting.

Councillor JOHNSTON: —State and the private development? There is literally nothing. Not a thing. What we’re seeing with this LTIP is the Council feathering its own nest. It’s fascinating to me that the report indicates that one of the reasons to update the plan is to put last year’s infrastructure from the budget into the LGIP and the LTIP. So Council’s planning document, the Local Government Infrastructure Plan, which is one of several, is supposed to inform the Annual Operating Plan and the Annual Budget. But it’s the other way around.

That’s because this Administration, not only can they not manage infrastructure projects and service delivery in this city, they are killing communities with bad planning. Bad planning that puts high rise in areas where the roads can’t sustain it. Bad planning that puts high rise on parks. Bad planning that sees high rise going into areas that flood and elderly, vulnerable people in areas that flood. Bad planning that sees units going up with no additional infrastructure like stormwater drainage or additional parkland. Or even fixing up one lane rail bridges that are the only way in and out of a community in times of emergency, like a flood.

There’s not a single cent going to support these communities. The infrastructure that’s been listed for a suburb like Yeronga and Yeerongpilly—which is not even listed—which are experiencing extraordinary growth, is essentially non-existent. Not to mention Oxley, not to mention Sherwood, where we’ve had I think it’s close to 1,000 new dwellings under the neighbourhood plan. Council’s retrospectively put a bit of money in to do some work in the Arboretum and they’re about two years behind. Do you know what they’ve put in? A baby and me swing and it took them a year to do it.

It is extraordinary to watch how badly this Council is managing the planning process. Yet again my community will tell this Council what it needs. This LNP Administration refuses to listen to the community and they will continue to pay the price by failing to do so. Feathering the nests of places like Bracken Ridge ward or out there at Calamvale ward, where there are less predicted homes than in a place like Yeronga, should be a lesson to everybody in this community. That the LNP are only governing for themselves. They are not interested in governing for everybody in this city.

They are not interested in supporting development with good infrastructure and necessary infrastructure like road upgrades, cycling upgrades, stormwater upgrades, pedestrian pathway upgrades. New community facilities and new park and recreational areas. It is appalling to see the impact of the bad planning that this Administration has forced on this Council, pretty much since I’ve been here. This process started back in—well actually one of the very first meetings I went to as a Councillor in June 2008 was the release of the draft Sherwood/Graceville neighbourhood plan.

So I hadn’t been involved in any of it before that. The former Councillor Jane Prentice had ticked off five storeys, she’d just not told anybody else. It’s just wrong. This Administration is letting our city down and it is absolutely contrary to the ethics and the intent of what they should be doing. Which is governing for everyone in the city.

So just to be clear, again, under this LNP Administration, the suburbs that are recognised as Priority Infrastructure houses—sorry, Priority Infrastructure Areas like Bridgeman Downs and Pallara. Are going to have less houses in them than a suburb that has been neglected for decades, continues to experience high growth, continues to flood and is continuing to be ignored by the LNP Administration. That’s a suburb like Yeronga, that’s one of 10 that I represent that this Administration has ignored, forgotten and treated with such disrespect. Such disrespect.

I’ll be making it very clear to my residents at this next election, that the LNP do not deserve their support. Every single resident in my ward speaks to me and says who should I vote for, for LORD MAYOR? I’ve stayed out of it. I’ve let people decide. But I can say very clearly now that there is no way I will be telling them that they should be considering re-electing this LNP Government.

Councillor interjecting.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Because they won’t support our community.

Councillor interjecting.

Chair: Further speakers?

Councillor OWEN.

Councillor OWEN: Thank you, Mr Chair and, Mr Chair, I rise to speak on items B and C and this is a very important component of the E&C today, because out in the suburb of Pallara, in particular, we don’t talk about predicted growth, we actually talk about actual growth. Quite predominantly in one of the small sections of Pallara, which was part of the Paradise Wetlands neighbourhood plan, there are over 700 houses that have been built there recently.

So fast is the growth rate, that on the 10 September, there was a small pocket of an estate, one of the stages that was released to the actual new owners so that they could come out. It was all plan sealed, they got to have their photo on the block, 10 September we were out there doing a welcome to the neighbourhood. Can I say that two months later, on that little component of that stage of that estate, there were 45 houses at frame stage. That is how fast houses are popping up through the suburb of Pallara.

We are not talking about thousands coming years down the track. Since March 2020 when Pallara came back into my ward, I can say that there are so many houses that have been constructed. We are not talking about down the track predictions, forecasts. We are talking about actuals. Actual houses that have been built, actual residents who have moved in. These are our new neighbours and that is why it is important. I know Councillor DAVIS through you, Mr Chair, that we have been working on the proposals for the open space network corridor plan, to build in the bikeways, to build in the drainage to assist all of that new development.

Now, what is extremely important is, as part of that open space network corridor, is that instead of having kids riding from one end of Pallara, from their homes up to where the school is, we will be putting in a pedestrian walkway and a pedestrian bikeway. That will serve to help—and I’ll just note this for Active School Travel purposes—seeing as we had an Active School Travel presentation this morning, that would allow those young children to ride their bikes or walk with family members up to the school in a manner of safety, away from the major corridor road, which is Ritchie Road.

Now it is really interesting that this is a rapidly growing community in our City of Brisbane. I will repeat that. It is a rapidly growing community. Present tense. We’re not talking about the future, we are talking about right now. You only have to compare to the actuals of what’s happening to the predictions. Now when the new Pallara State School was built as part of the Lower Oxley Creek South neighbourhood plan, it was predicted that in the year 2025 there were anticipated to be 725 students attending that school.

Well, the actual figure on day eight this year was 1,038. The expected figure, based on sibling enrolments only for 2023, so in a couple of months’ time, is going to be 1,350. So that’s nearly 50% above what was anticipated to actually occur by the year 2025. So for those of you who can do the maths. When you’re actually getting more students going into a school and the growth is going through the roof, that also means that there are more people living in that school catchment area. Therefore, there is growth in that suburb that is substantiated.

For the officers behind the scenes who work very diligently in comparing the population growths, but also learning about what is actually happening out there to make these decisions to what they propose for moving out of the LTIP into the LGIP to cater of that rapidly growing community. They have done an extremely good job, because the bikeways that we will see coming online as part of bringing it forward into the LGIP are going to benefit so many families.

Councillor DAVIS, I know that you’ve been working with me on the Pallara District Sports Fields and how we take that forward. Now a lot of the land acquisition has been done. On the weekend we had a big community information day. People are very, very proactive about having a say about what they want to see. They are very supportive of sports like volleyball, badminton, futsal, basketball. So they’ are the indoor sports that they want but they also want to see netball and soccer outside, as well as an outdoor volleyball court and some cricket nets. So we have a very long wish list, Councillor DAVIS, through you, Mr Chair.

There is a lot of enthusiasm for the infrastructure that needs to come on board. In particular I will mention the roads. So at the moment we have Stage 1A that has just been completed on the Ritchie Road corridor project. Stage 1B is about to commence and we also did consultation with that on the weekend. Then, as we progress through with the LGIP, we will be able to facilitate the next stages of those projects.

Now, I do acknowledge the Federal Government in supporting us with the funding for Stage 1A and 1B, but there is a lot of work to be done through there and we are working through with the Council officers to make sure all the supplementary roads that feed into those main feeder roads are supported and enhanced. As well as having this major corridor road, as we’ve got all of that growth, because, as many people understand, you don’t lay a driveway and then dig it up to lay your water and dig it up again to lay your sewerage, then dig it up again to put your electricity in. You do the foundations first and then you put your driveway in after, when you’re building a house. A similar proposal or a similar concept is what happens when we’re looking at the wider community.

No I know that in regards to the LGIP, there are quite a number of culverts, natural channels, new pipes and wetlands that are incorporated. Not only into the local streets but importantly into our open space network corridor. So this is where we are synergistically looking at better outcomes for the community. From not only a drainage perspective, not only a pedestrian and cycling perspective. But also an amenity and a lifestyle perspective.

So there’s a lot of benefits that will come out of this transfer. Particularly I know that we are dealing with actual population increases in this rapidly growing community here and now. That is why I wholeheartedly commend items B and C to this Chamber. Because this is needed by the Pallara Community here and now. Thank you.

Chair: Further debate on items B and C?

Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Oh, thanks very much, Chair. I rise to speak on these items. What Councillor OWEN just described there is the reason the community out that way were so disappointed that the local Councillor had to be dragged kicking and screaming to put in six bus stops to extend public transport services.

Councillor interjecting.

Councillor CASSIDY: Very, very basic bus stops. We know it’s a growing community and support the provision of infrastructure. But when they are so poorly represented, it’s no wonder those residents reach out right across the city to get some help.

The two clauses together, LTIP and LGIP. The finish line on this—these documents have been pushed back another 10 years now to 2036. It will be a year ago tomorrow when these same items came to Council. Also pushing back the timeline on a whole range of infrastructure projects right around our city, to cope with increased development and population growth.

If you look at this LNP LORD MAYOR’s track record when it comes to his own signature projects here in the inner city, you see those delays are all too common. They have now been extended into the long-term infrastructure planning process. Which is meant to deliver the infrastructure that our suburban communities right around Brisbane need as our city grows.

We know that alongside this process, a housing strategy should be delivered as well to know how our city is going to grow. What it’s going to look like in the future. How people will live and get around and how they will be connected as a community. A series of suburban communities right around suburban Brisbane but we still haven’t seen any progress on that as well.

So we see that there are, as we’ve heard from Administration Councillors, that neighbourhood plans are being progressed because our city has to grow. But they refuse to do a housing strategy in a holistic way to see how all of those neighbourhoods are going to be connected. Where those growth pressures will be felt right across our city and how we will manage that growth in providing the infrastructure that’s needed.

As we’ve seen over the last 12 months, this LNP Administration has gone through a process here through the LGIP and the LTIP to continue to push projects back. To remove items from the LGIP and to push the horizon for their delivery, the ones that remain in there, further and further down the line. So much of this infrastructure over the next 10 years that is needed, ahead of the Olympic and Paralympic Games, now won’t be delivered. Those Games will have come and gone by half a decade before some of these things are looked at.

Then we just know, on the LNP’s track record, if, if, if they were still in administration in five years’ time, they would continue to push these down the road. But I think people are wising up. People are certainly wising up to this LNP Administration. They’re identifying out in their communities that while they’re paying more in rates than ever before, they’re getting less in return.

The LORD MAYOR talked about this LGIP not being the entire program of infrastructure that this Council will need to provide and that’s true. But it also shows that there’s a $1 billion deficit in funding for the infrastructure that is required as a result of our rapidly growing communities. Now sure, the infrastructure charge caps do prevent that $1 billion in infrastructure funding deficits to be met. So that has to be met through rates’ increases. That’s accepted and that’s the position we are in today. That’s not going to change today, with this.

But what does change, the provision of suburban infrastructure. Things like drainage and park upgrades and footpaths and roads and community facilities. Upgrading sporting facilities and building new sporting facilities ahead of the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games. What stops that from happening are massive blowouts on inner city projects like we’re seeing today, the $400 million blowout.

So there’s $1 billion deficit in the LGIP infrastructure projects. We now see $5+ billion worth of debt for projects that this LORD MAYOR has mismanaged and mishandled in the inner city. But the suburbs continue to miss out. So they’re missing out in the Council budget from this LNP LORD MAYOR. Now they’re missing out in the LGIP and LTIP budgets because of the political decisions this LORD MAYOR has made in terms of his pet projects.

So you know as rates continue to rise well and truly above the level they need to, to cover not only—not only basic infrastructure that’s been left behind and those prices are soaring because of contracting out. We know that private contractors who are delivering road resurfacing projects in Brisbane, costs are increasing by around—well to Council, to ratepayers—those costs are increasing around 25% at the moment. But the in-house, what’s left of the in-house work is going up at a much, much smaller rate.

So because of the political decisions of this LNP Administration in contracting out basic work, we’re seeing rates driven up. Because of the political decisions of this LNP Administration in their mismanaged inner city projects we’re seeing rates driven up and because of their mismanagement of the Long Term Infrastructure Plan and Local Government Infrastructure Plan, that rates are going to be driven up to pay for these infrastructure projects, because they’re delayed and they’re pushed back by 10 years and costs increased and the community continues to see a situation where they pay more and get less out in the suburbs. The people of Brisbane are really not getting very good value for money from this LNP Administration and come March 2024, I think they’re going to take it out on them.

Chair: Further speakers on items B and C? Any further speakers?

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN.

Sorry, I’ll take it from Councillor ALLAN.

Sorry, Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN, he had his hand up first.

Councillor ALLAN: Thank you, Mr Chair. I wish to join the debate on items B and C. The amendment 1B to the Local Government Infrastructure Plan and the Long Term Infrastructure Plan, these plans are set out to help guide Council to direct funds for the delivery of key infrastructure around the city. Not surprisingly, this has to be done on a priority basis and the funding is moved to those projects of greatest need. It includes things such as congestion busting road projects, transport infrastructure that gets residents home quicker and safer and also towards better parks, libraries, stormwater and ultimately, we’re delivering for the long-term vision for the future of our city.

As we know it, Brisbane is growing rapidly. It’s the fastest growing capital city in Australia and so the Schrinner Council is planning for the infrastructure we will need in the future and delivering it right now by increasing capital expenditure by $1.2 billion for the period from 2021 to 2036. Specifically, the LGIP aligns the city’s future development with the infrastructure needed to support this growing population, whilst the LTIP preserves long-term land for open space and infrastructure corridors beyond the LGIP planning horizon. Responding to both State Government and industry feedback, this amendment also seeks to expand the planning horizon to 15 years.

As the LORD MAYOR mentioned, since the LGIP was adopted in 2018, we have delivered over 200 trunk infrastructure items across the city. This includes 85 road network projects, 72 stormwater trunk infrastructure items, new or upgraded parks⎯29 of those⎯six bikeways and three new ferry terminals. This equates to over $200 million per annum of trunk infrastructure investment. Last year the Council’s expenditure on trunk infrastructure was $274 million. Now, I know both the Opposition and Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN have been critical of this Administration for not spending enough on infrastructure. However, I would like to note that The Gabba Ward has the greatest number of LGIP items through this amendment, 152 to be exact, including 73 new items. Additionally, The Gabba Ward has one of the largest total spends for any ward across the city, with a total of $447 million.

Additionally, in the suburb of Moorooka, there has been an increase to $26 million, including projects like the Ipswich Road corridor upgrade and the Ipswich Road and Gainsborough Street intersection upgrade, projects I’m sure Councillor JOHNSTON would be supportive of given her ongoing rhetoric about Ipswich Road. Wynnum West sees a planned expenditure of $89 million and this includes both the Lindum open level crossing and the Kianawah Road corridor upgrade. There is also an increase to $52 million in expenditure in the suburb of Morningside to construct the Morningside Riverwalk, as well as an extension to the Aquatic Centre. Mr Chair, progressing these infrastructure plans will enable the Council to fund and deliver the infrastructure that Brisbane needs to make it a liveable, vibrant and accessible city.

To the points that Councillor JOHNSTON made earlier, it’s worth bearing in mind that a number of the locations she mentioned are actually State PDAs (priority development areas) and it’s the state’s responsibility to deliver infrastructure in those particular locations. I would also note that the LGIP is reviewed by an independent reviewer and obviously that’s a second set of eyes over how the funds are allocated and how we are aligning the LGIP with the ministerial guidelines. So ultimately, the process is a thorough one. Councillor JOHNSTON may not agree with all of the items there, but it is certainly a process that’s based on priority.

To the point Councillor CASSIDY made about infrastructure charges, he acknowledged the shortfall that we get in infrastructure charges. This Administration’s had an ongoing discussion with the State about increasing infrastructure charges. They have a cap on it at the moment, so if Councillor CASSIDY wants to help in this regard can I suggest he pops down the road to 1 William Street and talks to the State about removing the infrastructure cap.

Thank you, Mr Chair.

Chair: Further speakers?

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Thanks, I rise to speak on the LGIP and Long Term Infrastructure Plan. I just thought I’d provide a few quick figures for context, because I think Councillor ALLAN’s right, that there is a lot of projected or anticipated investment in The Gabba Ward. My view is that it’s still nowhere near enough, it’s still nowhere near enough to cater for the rapid growth we’re experiencing. So just for context, the suburb of Woolloongabba in the 2016 census, it had a population of 5,631. So, in 2016, 5,600 people lived in that suburb. That’s jumped up to 8,600 people now, so that one suburb of Woolloongabba has had an increase of over 3,000 people in basically my time in office.

The suburb of West End⎯back in 2016 West End had a population of 9,600. Guess how many West End’s population is now? It’s 14,700. So, we’ve got 3,000 more people in the suburb of Woolloongabba and we’ve got about 5,000 additional people in the suburb of West End. Moving to the suburb of South Brisbane around South Bank, back in the 2016 census we had a population of 7,196. Now, the population of South Brisbane is up to 14,200. So just in those three suburbs we’ve got an extra 3,000 in Woolloongabba, we’ve got about 5,000 extra people in West End and about 7,000 people in South Brisbane.

I won’t go on with examples of the other suburbs like Kangaroo Point, *et cetera*, but the point here is that we’ve experienced a huge amount of growth in population in the last couple of years. I listened with interest to Councillor OWEN because I can see that there’s a lot of growth pressure out at Pallara as well, but it’s just as strong, if not, I would argue, quite a bit stronger in the inner city. So it’s certainly the case that we need more investment in infrastructure, but really it comes down to a question of what kind of infrastructure and the problem I’m continually seeing is that this Council is still spending too much money on road widening projects that represent very poor value for money.

So for example, in the LGIP there’s mention of widening Montague Road in West End and redesigning some of those Montague Road intersections. The cost estimates for those projects in this draft document are far too low. The true cost of delivering those road widenings will be hundreds of millions, if not billions of dollars, because the Montague Road corridor now has eight- to 10-storey high density zoning all the way along it. So if Council wants to be acquiring two kilometres’ worth of land that’s zoned for 10-storey development, their property acquisition bill alone is going to be far more than what has been allocated in this LGIP budget. But my point is that we shouldn’t be spending that money on road widening in the first place and that’s the case whether we’re talking about West End, or Ipswich Road or other suburbs and neighbourhoods further out.

Councillor CASSIDY is right to point out that there’s a shocking lag, or shortfall or deficit in terms of provision of infrastructure and the failure to keep up with population growth. Certainly one piece of the puzzle is the unreasonably low State Government caps on infrastructure charges and I welcome the fact that the LNP have shifted their position over time. I remember when I was first in this Chamber and I talked about removing that cap on infrastructure charges. Mayor Quirk at the time was very resistant to the idea and seemed to be opposing the suggestion that the infrastructure charge caps would have to change or be moved. But since then, we’ve seen even the LNP have had to acknowledge the blunt reality that the infrastructure charge caps mean the money collected isn’t even close to reflecting the true cost of delivering infrastructure for the area.

But beyond that problem with infrastructure charge caps being too low, we are also just spending the money very inefficiently and ineffectively. We’re spending it on projects that don’t represent good value for money and we’re outsourcing to the private sector so much that that too is driving up costs and I think is resulting in situations where projects⎯which would be much cheaper to deliver in-house⎯are continually blowing way out of budget and I think a large part of that is private sector price gouging. But I guess I’ve said all this before, I don’t really think I’m going to change the LNP’s mind here on the floor of Council.

But I did want to open up the conversation and prompt further reflection from anyone who’s listening online, because we’re going to be stuck with this problem for a while yet. Over the next couple of years, I don’t know, presumably at some point Labor and the Greens will end up back in power here in this Chamber and honestly, right now I’m not entirely sure how we are going to be able to find the money to do all the stuff that the LNP has failed to do over the past decade or so. There are so many pedestrian crossings, so many essential bikeway upgrades, new parks that we need, new stormwater infrastructure and drainage infrastructure. The list of stuff that our communities need to cater, not just for the growth that’s yet to come but for the population growth we’ve already experienced in recent years, it’s a phenomenally long list.

What we’re voting on here today is only a small proportion of that and so when I look at these huge costs of hundreds of millions of dollars really in the stuff that the Council does want to do and then there’s probably billions of dollars’ worth more of infrastructure that I think needs to happen for the city, it is going to be really, really difficult to pay for that. One way to help bring down some of those costs is to collapse property values, because if property values fall dramatically then the cost of acquiring land for community facilities or parks, *et cetera*, would diminish a little bit. That’s probably one piece of the puzzle and another element is certainly increasing those infrastructure charges.

But even if we do that, this backlog that the LNP is leaving the city with is so dramatic that it’s going to take years and years to catch up on. I don’t entirely know how we’re going to resolve that. I can foresee that we’re being left with a problem of the LNP’s creation and I feel frustrated about that and disappointed that we haven’t been spending more now to deal with those future challenges. But at the very least, I think we really need to reconsider some of these road widening projects. I’m just looking at the road widenings through Morningside alone along Lytton Road and they’re astronomical costs for that corridor. Like I said, once you factor in the land acquisition costs on top of everything else, you realise that these estimates are still very low.

So there’s a fundamental underlying structural problem here and quibbling about which projects are in or out of this list is sort of just window dressing. Because the deeper underlying issue remains, which is just that we don’t have anywhere near enough revenue coming in to deliver the projects we need to deliver and we are spending way too much of that revenue that is coming in on road widening projects that represent poor value for money. So, I guess I’m preparing myself emotionally and perhaps trying to prepare other Councillors for the fact that even if we do get a change of administration at some point in the future, we’re not going to be able to deliver all this stuff that we want straightaway. The list and the backlog is so long and the deficit is so chronic.

Councillor interjecting.

Councillor SRIRANGANATHAN: Yes, you’re right, Councillor STRUNK, the debt is pretty high. Personally I’m an advocate of debt funded infrastructure. I think it’s better to take out the loan when our credit rating’s good and invest in the infrastructure early on, because the longer you delay it the more the cost—the higher the cost becomes and often failing to deliver some of that essential infrastructure causes more wear and tear on other pieces of infrastructure. So, I don’t know, I would argue that there probably is a case for taking on more debt to deliver some of this stuff faster and I think we have to be open to that conversation as well. But we’re also going to have to look at other revenue streams, because we’re falling so far behind here and I think future administrations and future generations of City Councillors will shake their fists at us for allowing things to get this bad.

As Councillor ALLAN said, like we acknowledge, there’s a lot of investment in The Gabba Ward and even The Gabba Ward which seems to be getting more expenditure in this document than a lot of parts of the city, even that isn’t coming close to what the electorate needs to cater for the extra 30,000 people that have already moved in over the past decade. So there’s a big problem here and I’m very unsatisfied with the way that the current Administration is handling it.

Chair: Thank you. Further debate?

Councillor STRUNK.

Councillor STRUNK: Thank you, Chair. Yes, I rise to speak on both items B and C. Briefly on C, the LTIP, at the last time we were presented with some documents from the plan and on the LTIP, I did mention—and I appreciate that obviously Council officers were listening—I did appreciate that there was an item which was in Inala which I couldn’t really work out where that was supposed to be. It didn’t really tell us, then when we did find out it didn’t make any sense and it was a district integrated facility. So, that’s been actually taken out. I think it was probably an error, it has been taken out and it has not moved on to the LGIP at all. So yes, they obviously listened and I appreciate that.

We do take a lot of time and trouble, my team and myself, going through when we have updates, especially with these maps which are—I’ve said it before, they’re quite challenging, some of these maps that come through in the documents. Because they’re really very hard to read in some cases, but we do our best and we eventually work it out. So in regards to the LGIP, there were two items that have popped up that again I want to mention and maybe again the Council officers will take note.

One was a future community facility that they’ve put on the map right in the middle of an intersection, of course, there in Inala Avenue. I thought well maybe that’s just a slight mistake, where they pop the dot, but if you look right around the actual intersection and probably a few hundred metres from that intersection, again it doesn’t make any sense that it’s there. So, if they could possibly have a look at that one and also there was another one in the middle of a roundabout at Rockfield Street and Crossacres Street at Doolandella. I would appreciate if maybe they have a look at that one, because these both are facilities, community facilities, that they are highlighting in the LGIP.

So those sorts of facilities are always needed, of course, in any community, especially an emerging community, for instance, like Doolandella, which is seeing a lot of growth and where actually the Woolworths is finally going to build that grocery store there on the corner of Blunder and Crossacres Street. We heard recently they’re actually going to go ahead, which everyone’s really looking forward to. So, I just wanted to mention those two, but if we have a look at the—and it’s covered in the LGIP—if we have a look at the suburb of Ellen Grove. I’m just talking the acreage now, because it’s a split suburb with Jamboree Ward, which is the old Carole Park⎯which was renamed Ellen Grove some years back.

But if we have a look at the acreage which is in my ward of Forest Lake, we have a look at what was proposed or has been proposed over the last number of years and some of this keeps getting pushed out. But really there’s been no development—there’s been no recent purchases of any properties for parks and recreational space within the boundaries of the acreage. Some years ago there was some land was purchased, of course, on the corner of Woogaroo and Waterford Road, which remains undeveloped as anything other than a stand of trees, which are very nice. There is some capacity to do some playground areas within those, in between those trees, because it’s not like it’s a planted forest as such.

But the other thing too is that there’s another block of land as well which again sits right behind the school car park in Waterford Road. That goes right through to the Uniting Church, which was purchased again some years ago. The development of that recreational space again has not happened. Now, if we have a look at the actual area, it’s probably about four square kilometres of land I’m talking about now, which has not really seen any investment by this Council over the last probably 10-15 years, at least, maybe 20 years. There’s been a little bit of high-density development, townhouses and things like that at the western end, but there has been no infrastructure for this area from Council.

Now probably the biggest issue, of course, is the sewage, which again is QUU (Queensland Urban Utilities) and water. It certainly has water but it doesn’t have any sewage in this area and the connector to the closest treatment plant has not happened. So the site itself, or this four square kilometres, is basically undeveloped. There’s a few—there’s a number of houses, of course, that are on very large acreages and there’s very few people that actually live in this big area. I think the last time I checked on how many people actually voted, in that acreage area⎯I think it was about 137⎯so as you can imagine, that’s not a lot of homes.

It’s only about 20 kilometres from the CBD (Central Business District), it’s right on a train line and I don’t know why the Council has just not looked at this area and said listen, we need to invest, we need to work with QUU to develop this area, because it’s an area that’s ripe for development, good development, good housing development. It’s got all the services around it, it’s got access to the Logan Motorway, it’s got everything going for it, but this Council in the LTIP and the LGIP just aren’t doing the job. They put things down there but it just keeps getting pushed out further and further and I just am amazed something so close to the CBD of Brisbane, on the Ipswich Motorway with the Logan Motorway just there, on a train line and we haven’t done anything. We really have not done anything.

So we really let the people of Brisbane—I mean honestly, I reckon you could probably in that sort of four-square kilometres, you could probably build probably 1,000 properties. It’s that big, you should really—if you have never seen it or driven through it, just come out and have a look. The planning Chair maybe should come out and have a look at that, because it’s something that really needs to be looked at seriously and needs to have that investment. We need to work with QUU to get those underground services lined up. Thank you, Chair.

Chair: Thank you. Any further speakers? No further speakers.

We move to the vote on items B and C.

**Clauses B and C put**

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

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

The voting was as follows:

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

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

Chair: Councillors, please resume your seats.

Councillors, LORD MAYOR, items G, H, I and K for debate then voting.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair. Item G is an amendment to the Significant Contracting Plans (SCPs) and a sole source submission. As I flagged in the Chamber last week, the global inflation crisis⎯the real challenge that all levels of governments are facing with construction prices, the supply of materials, supply of labour, labour shortages, construction companies falling over and any number of real challenges that are out there⎯have impacted on Council’s record infrastructure spend and are obviously putting upwards pressure on price.

Now we hear the same tired Labor rhetoric of claims that somehow project pressures at a State level are just a fact of life and we should all accept that because of global inflation. But project changes at a Council level, that’s a whole different thing, cannot be justified and this is the kind of rubbish that we expect to hear and we know the lack of imagination that these Labor Councillors have will come to the fore today. They’ll be somehow trying to argue that the project pressures that we’re experiencing are different to the project pressures Labor Governments are experiencing.

Councillors interjecting.

LORD MAYOR: Yes, that’s right, exactly, exactly right. So you’ll see this play out, but the reality is because we have budgeted responsibly, because we deliver surplus budgets every year, we have always done that and we’ve continued to do that, even in the most difficult of circumstances. We can absorb these costs going forward by a reduction in the projected surplus, a reduction in the surplus this year and a reduction in the surplus over the coming two years to help absorb these costs. But most importantly, so that we can continue building the infrastructure that needs to be built.

Now we also hear that Labor Councillors say that this is supposedly for some inner city projects, as though there’s no benefit to anyone else except for the people that live in the city. We know that is also completely false. We know projects like Brisbane Metro, not only in its first stage but in future stages, will transform the entire transport network in Brisbane.

Councillors interjecting.

LORD MAYOR: Again they oppose Brisbane Metro, they oppose Brisbane Metro. It’s funny because I remind you again, Councillor CASSIDY, the State Government is 100% on board with the Brisbane Metro, the Federal Government is 100% on board with the Brisbane Metro and the only people waiting at the station with no friends are the Labor Opposition. They are sitting there sucking on a sour lollipop and the transport system has passed them by, because they have refused to get on board this transformative process.

Councillors interjecting.

LORD MAYOR: The Premier called it essential transport infrastructure, the Premier, so look, we’ll hear the same lines rolled out. They are discredited lines, they are lines which—look, I would simply say the same kind of lines which put them in the same camp as the Victorian Opposition which got pummelled at the election on the weekend, because Dan Andrews builds stuff and he wants to build even more stuff and who whines and carps about it? The Opposition. That’s where you’re headed, that’s where the Labor Party’s headed, into political oblivion. They are going to get rolled by the Greens because at least the Greens stand for something. They stand for a whole lot of crazy stuff but they stand for it.

The Labor Party stands for nothing and they are gone, they are gone. They have made themselves politically irrelevant because they don’t stand for anything. We’re going to hear that today, they’re going to be against building infrastructure, they’re going to be against everything. They’re going to offer no alternative solutions and they are just going to roll out the same speech that they roll out week in, week out on these projects. But we’re not going to be deterred by this negativity, just like we never have been, we’re going to keep building the infrastructure our city needs.

We’re going to keep rolling out Brisbane Metro, we’re going to keep building new green bridges, we’re going to keep rolling out the Moggill Road corridor upgrade. Even though the Greens opposed that upgrade we’re going to build it, because we believe that these projects in the suburbs are important and we believe making it easier for people to catch public transport and to use active travel modes, such as our new green bridges will do, is really important. So yes, we’re facing pressures but this is about getting on with the job, absorbing the impact in the surplus and continuing to build the things that need to be built.

Item H is the amendment for the Significant Contracting Plan for the provision of traffic control management services. Council obviously regularly requires traffic management services as we build infrastructure, maintain infrastructure across the road network. Traffic management control now provides or makes up a significant cost of pretty much everything we do that has any impact when it comes to roads or transport. A significant portion of the budget for any project is traffic management and it’s all about ensuring the safety of our workers, it’s about making sure that the public operates safely through these areas, so this is an essential service.

But having said that, due to changes in the market and increased competitiveness for projects and major infrastructure builds at all levels of government, we’re requiring to be more agile in the way that we meet the demands. As has been the case in this and other submissions, we’re beholden to the turbulent nature of the market with the current environment that we’re in. We’re witnessing increased demands, ongoing change in market conditions and a decreased availability from our primary supplier. Allowing for alternative suppliers would allow relief for Council’s current supplier and enable us to supplement that with different suppliers, so that’s the point here.

Item I is the Stores Board Submission Contracting Plan for the amendment to the kerbside large items collection and recycling service. Obviously, we were able to bring back the kerbside collection one year earlier than anticipated, thanks to responsible financial management. Once again, something—

Councillors interjecting.

LORD MAYOR: Look, Labor made such a big thing about the cancellation of a one-off collection that happens once a year, yet they want to reduce the weekly waste collection services. I mean what hypocrites are they, what hypocrites do we have here when they go off like a pork chop, sizzle like a pork chop against a one-off, once a year service, yet they want to reduce waste collection services for everyone in the city by 50%, a 50% cut to services. So, we will continue to invest in the services that people appreciate and what we’ve seen here is obviously a combination of a couple of factors.

Obviously, there’s been some pent-up demand for kerbside collection in the year that it was paused, you would expect that. People⎯unfortunately, we’re all accumulating things these years that we do need to get rid of in the future or recycle. The process with our kerbside collection program is that we pay by volume and so if there’s more volume, then the costs go up. So, we’ve seen some higher volumes in recent times and if that higher volume continues into the future, we will need to allocate more funding for this program and that is the reality. Having said that, if the volumes peter off and they are lower over time, or if they go back to a more traditional level, then obviously the cost will come down accordingly.

But having said that, we do need to provide for the higher volumes and so that’s exactly what we’re doing here. We’ve been out to make sure that this service can continue to be provided by the community, we know it is appreciated and we also know that it is an important part of the circular economy in our community. So while items that are put out on the kerbside, if it’s still there when our collection team comes around, that material is collected. Anywhere from 40—depending on who you ask, it’s 60% of the material disappears into the community as part of the circular economy. What are they called, Councillor MARX?

Councillor interjecting.

LORD MAYOR: Urban recyclers get on to it. They’ve been known by other names in the past but urban recyclers take that material and repurpose it for other uses. Some of it is used directly as is—

Chair: LORD MAYOR, your time has expired.

**309/2022-23**

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

Chair: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Yes, some of it is reused directly, some of it is, I guess, dismantled and created into other things, but ultimately it’s part of this circular economy that is well and healthy in the city and continuing to grow. But having said that, this includes—this SCP includes the provision for 4,000 extra tonnes of material that residents are putting out on the kerb each year in recent times. As I said, if it continues on at that level more money will need to be allocated, but if it comes down obviously the budget will come down. Is item K the next one?

Chair: Yes.

LORD MAYOR: Yes, okay, so item K is the amendment of a significant contracting plan for the provision of field communications. This is an amendment to a previously approved SCP. Council’s in-field services are central to the operations of our city. Brisbane infrastructure division and most of Transport for Brisbane are based out in the field and they rely heavily on the field communications equipment. These in-field services rely on the presence of a 100% available two-way radio network to ensure safe and efficient services are delivered to Brisbane residents. The SCP was approved by Council four years ago in November 2018. A contractual term of 13 years was approved in the SCP, made up of an 18-month transition period, a 10-year contract term and an 18‑month transition out period.

During contract negotiations it was determined that the best outcome for Council would be to instead enter into a contract made of an 18-month transition period, an initial contract term of seven years with an optional extension period of up to six years and a transition out period of up to 18 months. So, this represents a total contract period of 16 years, three years longer than the originally approved SCP. Since the originally approved SCP and its annual expenditure was estimated, several factors have changed which require an amendment to what’s been put forward together.

These include items which were unable to be costed until detailed design was developed, increased functionality in the equipment which we want to take advantage of the three-year extension of the contract term over and above what was originally proposed, allowing for additional future price escalation and once again price escalation sadly is a factor of life at the moment. Changes to Council services such as the need for bush radios and possible volumetric increases in our services in terms of staff requiring field communications. Collectively, these factors have led to an increase in the estimated potential cost over the extended 16-year term of the contract. Obviously, it goes without saying, but I will say it, it is vital that our staff are safe out in the field and have the equipment necessary to do their job effectively. That’s also part of our Zero Harm commitment, so I commend these items to the Chamber.

Chair: Thank you. Further speakers?

Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks, Chair.

**Seriatim for voting - Clause G**

|  |
| --- |
| Councillor Jared CASSIDY requested that Clause G, STORES BOARD SUBMISSION – AMENDMENT TO SIGNIFICANT CONTRACTING PLANS AND A SOLE SOURCE SUBMISSION, be taken seriatim for voting purposes. |

Chair: Item G seriatim for voting, okay.

Councillor CASSIDY: Yes, thanks very much, Chair. I think there’s some outstanding book, the Brisbane Square Library is chasing down a borrower who’s had it for a while. I think the LORD MAYOR’s had *The Secret* out for a while and he just says these things. He makes them up but then he keeps saying them and he keeps thinking them, sort of the power of positive intentions for him and he thinks they’ll manifest these things if he keeps saying them and they’ll come true. But at the end of the day, they absolutely won’t. I hope he’s keeping—as he goes, I hope he’s doing a tally out the back of what we owe, because we’re clearly all living rent-free in his head and we’re all joining in on that these days, listening to his performances in E&C these days. They’re really quite amusing. They shouldn’t be coming from a LORD MAYOR of Brisbane facing significant challenges, but he obviously thinks this job is a big joke and a big game for him to play.

But he is, this LORD MAYOR, Adrian SCHRINNER, is mortgaging Brisbane’s future on his pet projects in the inner city of Brisbane. He’s locking residents into generational debt and generational rates increases, but what do the suburbs of Brisbane have to show for it? What they will have is record rates increases and they will become the norm under the LNP because of the political decisions that this LNP Mayor, Adrian Schrinner, has made. The residents of Brisbane will have now generational debt which will mean that really tough decisions are going to have to be made by future administrations, because the basics will be struggled to be delivered by a future Council given the high levels of debt that this LNP Administration is getting us into and it’s all because of a couple of pet projects by this LORD MAYOR.

There is no accident and there is no external forces out there in the world, which are to blame for the cuts to suburban services outside of the political decisions that this LORD MAYOR is making. It was by design, the cuts to suburban services and the increase in rates was by design the moment that this LNP Administration announced their overcooked Metro, so-called Metro service and the LORD MAYOR’s inner city bridges. Now Adrian SCHRINNER is asking Council to sign a $400 million cheque to cover the latest cost blowouts, not the first cost blowouts but the latest cost blowouts on his signature projects.

So of course we remember the Metro project when it was announced in January 2016, six years ago, it was going to—well actually then it was an underground, so it wasn’t going to be $944 million then; it was going to be $1.2 billion, they scaled it back then rescaled it. But we remember what we were promised by this LNP Administration back then, an underground subway system to rival Paris or London. They said those vehicles would run on tracks, they would be an underground train essentially, they promised us a subway. You fast-forward now six years and this project has faded away to a 200-metre tunnel under Adelaide Street which is collapsing. It’s doubled in cost and 60 overseas-made buses that won’t arrive in Brisbane until 2034 at the earliest, all of them, that’s right. So there’s a 10-year horizon on the purchase of these Swiss-made buses and the cost of those have also blown out significantly, significantly.

So when this so-called Metro system that the LNP talk about opens, they’ve originally pushed back the soft opening they called it until 2025, I think now, there might be six of these Swiss-made buses on the busway. Then the next year there might be 12 and then there might be 18. We don’t know because that timeframe could blow out as well on this LNP Administration’s watch. So much for the turn up and go services that we were promised. We were promised a subway system, an underground subway system and then when they sort of redesigned it to be a busway, which was hang on, what we’ve already got but with some different vehicles, they said it would be turn up and go every three minutes.

With six buses across the entire South East Busway and the Inner Northern Busway and then the LORD MAYOR says he’ll send it out to Carindale, to the airport and all the way to Chermside, with six buses. They must really think the people of Brisbane are stupid, but they’re not, the people of Brisbane are not stupid. This is the single most overpromised and underdelivered project this city has ever seen. The LORD MAYOR needs to answer a simple question, he can’t simply say in here there’s a surplus that is being eaten up entirely in this year’s budget and therefore that will pay for the $400 million in extra debt he’s taking on to fund the cost blowouts on his significant projects. Rates will have to go up more than they should or services will be cut. He won’t come clean with the people of Brisbane which of those two options he’s going to take, because it has to be paid for—

Councillor interjecting.

Chair: DEPUTY MAYOR, please.

Councillor CASSIDY: It’s going to have to be one of two options. So, he should come clean, he should come clean and tell us which projects he’s slashing. He wouldn’t today come clean on which projects are being cut from the infrastructure projects, from the infrastructure budget and the lifestyle and community services budget this year, but we know next year rates are going to be at an astronomically high level and services in the suburbs of Brisbane are going to miss out once again. So you really have to ask—well it’s not really asking the question anymore, people know it in their minds, they don’t even have to ask whether they think they’re getting good value for money from this LNP Administration. They absolutely know they’re not, they know they’re not.

They know when simple drainage projects can’t be completed, or footpath extensions, or a footpath in a street that’s been crying out for one for the last 100 years, when Council’s response consistently is this will have to be listed for funding in a future budget and priorities will dictate where this funding goes. Well everyone knows where this funding’s going now, it’s to plug the black hole in the Brisbane Metro project and to plug the black hole in the inner city bridges project and this is generational. The Greens Councillor remarked a couple of weeks ago that well, rates have doubled under this LNP Administration, but lots of things have doubled, he said, lots of things have doubled as well.

Well again, the wages of Council’s lowest paid workers haven’t doubled in the last 20 years, drainage funding hasn’t doubled, roads—suburban road projects haven’t doubled and footpaths around Brisbane haven’t doubled, not when you’re building 18 a year across 190 suburbs. But people really aren’t getting good value for money. Something that—well it’s not doubling; it’s tripling, as we see in the answers to QoNs today, Chair, is the advertising budget. It went from $400,000 on the Brisbetter campaign up to $1.2 million this year and on their track record we can—you could run a book on how much it’s going to be next financial year, Chair, in the lead up to the next election. It was, I think, $4.5 million last time in the lead up to the last election.

We know the advertising budget in the Walter Taylor Ward was running at $30,000 last year, which was almost 50% of the budget in that Ward Office, Chair. So, we know we do see increases in this budget and we do see increases under this LNP Administration on inner city projects, increases in blowouts, increases in rates, increases in the advertising budget, but we don’t see increases in suburban infrastructure. The only way, of course, to change all this is to change the LORD MAYOR and from what I’ve read there are certainly people interested in doing that as well, as we get closer to the election. Given the LNP’s behaviour today, yes, it won’t be very hard to do that.

Clause H is the amendment to the contracting plan for traffic control management. We desperately need a root and branch review in this Council, Chair, of the LNP’s contracting out sprees. I have it on good authority from within the organisation that we’re seeing—the cost increases we’re seeing on contracted out services are dwarfing those increases we’re seeing on in-house services. It is—it makes financial and economic sense for the people of Brisbane to have basic services conducted by Council for the residents of Brisbane, rather than contracting those services out. The LNP’s been in power for almost 20 years and over that time they have been hollowing out Council’s own ability to manage both large projects, but also provide basic services like traffic control and road closures.

Now those of us who were on the ground, actually on the ground in the February 2022 flood disaster, saw the direct result of that contracting out. There were no Council crews that could perform road closures and even if there were any Council staff on hand there was no equipment to do so. In some cases, in my ward, it was three days of constant calling, not by me to Council but by Council officers to external contractors to try and get some signs, some witches hats, some bollards, to close roads that were dangerous and they were flooded and were impacting on people’s property as well as people’s safety. If people are continuing to pay the highest rates on record, they deserve better than they’re getting from this LNP.

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY, your time has expired.

**310/2022-23**

At that point, Councillor Jared CASSIDY was granted an extension of time on the motion of Councillor Kara COOK, seconded by Councillor Charles STRUNK.

Chair: Councillor CASSIDY.

Councillor CASSIDY: Thanks, Chair. So these are really basic services, they’re ongoing, they’re day-to-day. As the LORD MAYOR even said, these are for ongoing projects, whether they’re small, medium or large in this Council, it makes economic sense to do these things in-house, provide job security, but also good value for the ratepayers of Brisbane.

Clause I is another contracting plan amendment, this one for kerbside collection. Geez, the LORD MAYOR’s got some gall coming in here and taking credit for the reintroduction of kerbside collection after he cancelled it unceremoniously. He’s a legend in his own lunchbox, that guy. We think that the procedures around contracting out should be root and branch, as I said and should include services like this as well. When you’re seeing these really significant increases in these contracts, you’ve got to ask yourself are these really good value for money anymore? The LORD MAYOR likes to play down kerbside collection and says that it’s just a once a year, once a year, he says, that’s all it happens, as if it might happen on one day a year, maybe one week a year, or one month a year maybe. He just says once a year. It happens every week of the year around Brisbane, kerbside collection is happening. It’s a basic service, it’s waste management.

I think the LORD MAYOR and this LNP Administration realise they really kicked a hornet’s nest when they cancelled it, because he made out as if we were the only ones that raised these issues. But don’t worry, I saw that research, I saw the research and I saw how the people of Brisbane responded to those cuts to basic services. I think if they knew that these basic services were being contracted out and as a result of that political decision that this LNP Administration has made, they’re seeing millions of dollars extra added to all these contracts, millions and millions and millions of dollars extra. If they knew it would be much cheaper to do it in-house, where Council could control those costs, I think they would think that would be much better value for money than they are getting from this LNP Administration.

So they’re paying, residents are paying record high rates and as we look at every single item before us today, we can see why. This is building a very powerful story of the last 20 years of this LNP Administration. They’re lazy, they’re incompetent, they’re politically motivated, they make decisions based on their ideology rather than the best interests of the ratepayers of Brisbane. Talk about some similarities between parties, we see the kinds of people that populate this LNP Administration are the exact same kinds of people we saw running in the Victorian State Election for the Liberal Party and we saw what happened to them. A progressive state booted them right out and a progressive city like Brisbane is going to boot them right out as well in 2024.

The final item, Clause K, talks about poor project management. When we saw those contracts for—come through recently, contracts for tendering, they were contracts to contract out to the contract management of contracting out. When we saw them—we knew this was a problem for a long time, but you saw those ones coming through and you knew it was catastrophic in terms of contract management in this Administration. Here is a perfect example before us today, Clause K, the provision of field communications. The original budget didn’t anticipate—so the original amount that was allocated for this contract didn’t anticipate a contract of 13 years for these radios, which also begs the question how can you predict the rate of CPI (Consumer Price Index) for 13 years?

That’s one of the reasons that’s been given in the item before us today to increase this item before us by so many millions of dollars. So, you have to seriously wonder about the probity of such a long contract when it’s increasing in cost by so much now, let alone what’ll happen in 13 years’ time. What’s before us today in the item in the explanations that’s given is a whole lot of, sort of, MBA (Masters of Business Administration) management talk, which covers up the failure in project management before us today. But the fact is that the Administration is no longer able to manage basic contracts.

They contracted out basic services, they’re contracting out absolutely everything and I suppose they were able to paper over the cracks for so long, but not anymore. When you have a situation where external contracts are increasing by 25% but internally they’re able—our workforce is able to manage those at 15% or 20% lower increases, you’ve got to ask yourself the question why does this LNP Administration continue to contract out basic work? It’s driving up debt, it’s driving up rates and it’s leading to less services in our suburbs. People really are paying more and getting less under the LNP.

Chair: Any further speakers?

Councillor MARX.

Councillor MARX: Yes, thanks, Mr Chair. I rise today to speak on item I, the Significant Contracting Plan amendment for the kerbside large items collection and recycling service. As we all know, the service allows residents to place bulky items on the kerbside and have them collected for free. I just want to clarify the record, yes, it does happen across 41 weeks of the year, servicing the suburbs on a regular basis, but the households have it happen for them individually once per year. That’s what the LORD MAYOR was saying. So if you live in a property you will get access to large kerbside collection once per year, as opposed to the red bin collection which happens on a weekly basis. I just want to make that clear in case anyone is under any misunderstanding about how rubbish bin collection and kerbside collection works.

Well we know that residents do value the scheduled service and it gives them time to plan their clean-ups around the collection date. As we all know, those dates are published on the website a year in advance. There are a number of different pressures facing the Australian economy, but with more people utilising this service and the rising costs of just about everything at the moment, the item before us today seeks to amend the estimated maximum spend within the SCP. As the LORD MAYOR also mentioned, this is what we would call potentially the worst-case scenario. So this is working on extremely high figures of people putting out extremely large amounts of goods to be collected.

Obviously, the more goods they put out, the more the trips the trucks have to make, the longer it takes, the more expensive it is. So, all we can do is ask residents to please consider to continue to recycle as much as they can. All four of our Resource Recovery Centres have the free recycling section. If for some reason you don’t feel that you can go through that section, you want to go straight through to the tipping part of the Resource Recovery Centre, there are officers on hand and they have little what they call dollies that’s a little trolley on wheels, where they can assist you to move potentially your large white goods items into a secondary recycling section. All of that helps for us and our contractors to get less stuff and more recycling.

I actually participated as an urban recycler myself once. I managed to pick up a baby cot which we then took home and we stripped it down, revarnished it, put it all back together and my children lived—lived, they probably—they didn’t quite live in it. Potentially they slept in that baby cot for a number of years and then I was able to pass it on to someone else, so I would suggest urban recycling is fine. All we ask is residents be polite and be mindful of when you’re going through other people’s stuff just to not leave a big mess on the side of the footpath and be respectful, that’s what we ask for. But recycling is good, so the more we do it, the better off we are. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you. Further speakers?

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, thank you, Mr Chair. I rise to speak on items G, H, I and K. If you listen to the LNP, what you would be hearing is that the circumstances of the half a billion dollars in cost blowouts that are attached to these seven projects is completely out of their control. It was the war in Ukraine, it was Putin, yes, it was Putin’s fault. The global pandemic that’s been on, it’s that’s fault. I’m surprised they didn’t blame George Street or even Canberra to say it’s Labor’s fault, that’s the only thing I didn’t hear with the list of and litany of excuses that has come out of the mouths of the LNP Finance Chair, LORD MAYOR and others here today. What we are seeing is the outcome of a bad contracting process.

Now this is what has been going on for the last few years. The LNP brings some sort of plan up here with some very vague statements about what they want to do. It’s a sole sourcing contract, we couldn’t possibly go and ask the market, no, it’s too hard to ask the market. Or no, we’re just going to piggyback on the back of something else. The LNP has been running Council major projects like this for many, many years and they are increasingly turning bad. Yes, external forces are buffeting some of these processes, but the problem is the way in which these contracts have been established by the LNP and their leadership of the major projects that form a significant part of their Administration is fundamentally the problem.

So let’s take the Metro as one example. It was a poorly conceived process, it was a bad concept that got worse. It’s been scrapped multiple times. First it was going to be a bat tunnel and then it was going to be another tunnel under the river. Then it was going to be a subway system with rail and then it’s buses and who knows what it will actually be next week? Who knows? It was poorly conceived as an election stunt by the LORD MAYOR and then over the last term of Council the LNP has managed to run the contracting process, the design, the tendering, all of that’s been run into the ground. I mean this LORD MAYOR went out and spent millions and millions of dollars of ratepayers’ money doing work before they had approval to do that work on State Government land.

They employed the private sector and paid them millions of dollars, millions of dollars and they had to junk it all because they did not have approval to deliver the project. We’re still seeing that happen now. It’s still pretty unclear about whether there’s going to be new bus stations at The Gabba, is that where The Gabba’s going to be upgraded, is that Olympics-related? The project now—and it’s not clear in here because it’s all being kept secret, it’s probably up to about $1.8 billion easily⎯it has more than doubled. So, when your project, your signature project goes that bad, you should not keep throwing good money after bad money.

This Administration has epically botched the Metro, epically botched the Metro. They’ve failed to design it properly, they’ve failed to conceive it properly, they’ve failed to undertake a rigorous and transparent contracting plan and now when things are getting a little bit hard, they’re like oh, we’ll just throw money at it. We’ll just whip out the ATM, the Brisbane ratepayer, and we’ll just go cha-ching out of their back pocket to pay for the botched projects. Now that’s one of only seven major projects that this Administration has stuffed up and is now just going to rip money out of the budget. The little bit of buffer we have for when emergencies happen. The little bit of buffer there is—little bit, which is not much—the little bit of buffer for anything unusual that happens.

They’re cancelling projects left, right and centre by cutting other projects in infrastructure. Remember this budget is one of the worst for rollovers and uncompleted projects from last year to start with. So when the LORD MAYOR says there’s a record infrastructure spend, no, there’s not. It’s because that probably about a quarter of all projects from last year weren’t done and they had to be rolled over to be delivered this year. You watch, exactly the same thing is going to happen again next year. This Administration cannot be trusted to deliver on major projects.

Let’s look at their other signature project, the green bridges. The ratepayers of Brisbane are just going to keep on paying and paying and paying. Both green bridges and the Lores Bonney Riverwalk are going to end up costing way, way more than they did previously. Can I tell you what that will be? No, I can’t, because the LNP are keeping it secret. They don’t want the ratepayers of Brisbane to know the huge stuff up, this is nearly half a billion dollars. I can’t get Oxley Road resurfaced, I can’t get a pedestrian refuge near a school, we can’t get a playground upgrade in Oxley.

We can’t get stormwater upgraded in Yeronga, but meanwhile the LNP are whipping out the ratepayers’ credit card to the tune of half a billion dollars and saying there’s nothing to see here, it’s not our fault; it’s Putin’s fault. When they rip this kind of money out of the budget, it has a massive impact, a massive impact on the delivery of local services in our community. They are propping themselves up and it is—what’s the word I’m looking for? It’s—

Councillors interjecting.

Councillor JOHNSTON: No, that’s not the word. It’s like bloated, it’s like bloated. I missed that, Jared, I’m sorry. Were you having a go at me or them? Good, excellent. It’s bloated, it’s a bloated Administration who can’t recognise that things are spiralling down. They can’t see how badly this has been going for them. We are seeing the Moggill Road upgrade project which—also commercial-in-confidence. I can understand why they don’t want anyone to know how badly that’s going, yes, how much longer it’s going to go. It’s definitely going to be into the election and all those residents, all those residents who have to deal with the chaos that the LNP have unleashed on them over there—and remember what’s there now is what the LNP actually wanted to do, traffic lights. I mean they have absolutely stuffed this one up.

Councillor interjecting.

Councillor JOHNSTON: No, there’s not. When you spend $0.5 billion—so the DEPUTY MAYOR’s just saying is there anything good? No, there’s not. When you understand—

DEPUTY MAYOR: Point of order.

Chair: Point of order to you, DEPUTY MAYOR.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Could you please clarify, that is not what I said. If she’s going to interpret what I say, at least repeat it properly.

Chair: Councillor—DEPUTY MAYOR, you were interjecting across the floor and it may have been misinterpreted. You have the opportunity to respond in General Business, if you would.

Councillor JOHNSTON: So when this Administration overspends by a lazy $0.5 billion, that is not good, there is nothing positive I can say about that. You are delivering projects that you have botched from the very beginning. You are delivering projects that this city can’t afford. You are not delivering that money into projects that are needed in the suburbs, needed for flood recovery, needed for local amenity and safety, needed to support residents in the suburbs. It is appalling and not only—it gets better. I mean this Brisbane International Cycle Park at Murarrie which I think is supposed to be some sort of Olympic training facility, it’s the first Olympic project that Brisbane’s actually attempting to deliver and they’ve botched it, the first one.

I mean we’re not actually in charge of delivering infrastructure for the Olympics and here’s the LORD MAYOR gone out, me too, me too, I want to be out there, I’m Olympics, Olympics and he goes we’ll do the cycling, we’ll do the cycling project. Guess what, botched, rushed, mismanaged, botched, overspent. This is a profligate LNP that’s become bloated, tired and out of touch and they have to go. There is no better reason than $0.5 billion worth of overspend and waste, it’s appalling.

Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, your time has expired. Are there any further speakers? No further speakers?

Yes, Councillor MURPHY.

Councillor MURPHY: Thank you, Mr Chair. I rise to speak on item G, the amendment to the significant contracting plans, particularly as they relate to items within Program 1. Now as noted by the LORD MAYOR, the item before us today is to allow an amendment to the previously approved significant contracting plans for several of Council’s major projects. Chair, we know that Brisbane’s population will continue to boom in the next decade and that means we have to invest in projects and in infrastructure that can cater for future capacity. We’re also, as you know, the host of the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games, which will be the first carbon positive Games, so we’re working very hard to prepare our city with projects that encourage sustainable travel.

This is evident in our record investment in public and active transport projects, which include the Brisbane Metro and the Green Bridges Program to ensure that we can easily commute to and from work, we can access education, we can explore lifestyle and leisure activities and we can visit the people and places that we love. However, as the LORD MAYOR has flagged and flagged last week, we now know that we are building these projects in extremely difficult times. In fact you could say, Chair, these are the worst of times for building projects. Since commencing work, we have been faced with the effects of local disasters like February’s flood, as well as global crises such as the COVID-19 pandemic, the worldwide inflation crisis and Russia’s invasion of Ukraine.

All of these events have contributed to unprecedented cost escalations in the market. The cost of some steel products has increased by 20%, as has asphalt and concrete by more than 12%. Inflationary pressures have caused fuel, timber, sand and labour to skyrocket in price as well. Now despite these price rises, there are global shortages of construction materials, leading to lengthy and costly wait times where projects sit idle and are unable to proceed. At the same time, demand for labour and subcontractors is extremely high, making tendering processes costly and non-competitive due to low market capacity. In fact, Chair, we had a briefing just a few months ago from the independent body, Infrastructure Australia, which advises all Australian governments about how to proceed with major infrastructure projects.

Do you know what they told us? They said you need to stop building stuff now. You need to stop building stuff now because the market is so overheated that infrastructure projects are simply not value for money. In fact, the New South Wales Government has done just that, they have scaled back a number of capital infrastructure projects significantly. But as I mentioned, with the population growth pressures, with the Olympics coming, that is not something that this LORD MAYOR is prepared to do. That is not something that this Administration is prepared to do.

I want to just speak briefly on two particular projects that are impacted and are featured in this submission. Firstly, the award winning Brisbane Metro, the Metro that just keeps getting better, Chair. This project, we know, will provide our city’s transport network with additional capacity and it will revolutionise the way people get around Brisbane. Metro is a project that Brisbane not only wants, but a project that Brisbane needs. It is co-funded by the State and Federal Governments, which proves just how important it is to our future of the city. I note that Cross River Rail is not funded by local government, is not funded by the Federal Government, because it didn’t provide a benefit cost ratio that was supported by Infrastructure Australia, whereas Brisbane Metro did.

Brisbane Metro is the biggest public transport project that this Council has ever undertaken and major infrastructure is now being delivered at 10 sites across the city. Construction’s been underway since 2021 and will continue until 2024, when services commence. Now like many projects these days, Mr Chair, the collaborative partnership agreement that we have for construction between Council and our various delivery partners was formed on what’s called a pain share-gain share basis. Unfortunately at the moment, there is no gain to share; there is only pain. Our contractors have absorbed many price increases, but it is responsible and fair for Council to also contribute to covering additional costs.

The scale of this project is massive and it means that the cost increases to materials like steel, concrete and asphalt have all contributed to additional unexpected costs to the project. In fact construction of Brisbane Metro’s depot administration building alone has used more than 300 cubic metres of concrete and 500 tonnes of steel. While a project of this size, of course, contains contingencies to cover unforeseen circumstances, the magnitude of the challenges that I mentioned earlier, Chair, could not have been predicted. Some subcontractors have withdrawn their bids on parts of the project due to the inability to source suppliers and/or workers. Disruptions in the global supply chain have also put pressure on the availability of supplies in the build of our Metro vehicles, which are being manufactured by Hess.

Of course, we already have our first Metro pilot vehicle here in Brisbane, with the remaining 59 vehicles to come. Now, Chair, we’ve heard a lot from Councillor CASSIDY today, but one of his more interesting and outlandish claims was that we wouldn’t have the 60 Metros in time for the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games and Chair, there’s really nothing else to say than that is a complete and total fabrication. It is a lie. Mr Chair, Councillor CASSIDY needs to learn how to read the documentation that is in front of him. As per the E&C papers before us, our contract with HESS will last for 10 years. Councillors, any guess why we would have a contract that would last for 10 years for supply and maintenance of our 60 Metros?

Councillors interjecting.

Councillor MURPHY: Anyone reckon why we would have a contract that would last for 10 years? Councillor WINES gets a Freddo Frog because he’s just said the answer and I’ll read it into the record, to maintain them. When you buy a vehicle, generally you need parts and maintenance for it and so that is why the contract will last until 2032. It doesn’t mean that it will take until 2032 to deliver the vehicles, so either Councillor CASSIDY has extremely basic comprehension skills when it comes to reading the documents in front of him and he’s not able to perform his job as the Opposition leader, or he’s just lying to people, saying that we won’t be able to deliver these buses in time for the 2032 Games. Which is rubbish, of course, because construction of the vehicles is well underway and we’ll be ready to commence full rate Brisbane Metro services in 2024.

Now, Chair, to the Green Bridges Program, which is all about getting more cars off the road and providing more choice when it comes to travel. We are well into construction when it comes to the first two green bridges, the Kangaroo Point Green Bridge and the Breakfast Creek Green Bridge. These will both provide capacity for active transport between growing residential areas and the CBD, as well as our key Olympic hubs. Both of these bridges represent significant engineering and construction challenges and this is especially true for the Kangaroo Point Green Bridge, which will span 470 metres across the Brisbane River to connect two parts of our city that are extremely close but separated by water, the CBD and the Kangaroo Point Peninsula.

It will significantly reduce the time that it takes for the Kangaroo Point residents and those in Brisbane’s eastern and south-eastern suburbs to travel to and from the CBD. Construction is progressing very well, with piling underway at both bridge locations.

Councillor MURPHY: However, since our construction partners tendered for these projects and commenced construction, a number of external factors have resulted in an increase to estimated construction costs. For example, during the February 2022 floods, works were paused on the bridge. We were closed for about a month by Maritime Safety Queensland, which cost us in time and labour delays.

Councillor JOHNSTON mentioned that she was surprised we didn’t blame the State Labor Government for anything. Well, come in spinner, Chair, because the State Labor Government borrowed our barges to get rid of their drift restaurant that they’d let rot for a decade by the side of the Brisbane River, which we lost additional construction timeframe on top of the month that we lost and all of this has had impacts to our schedule. We’ve had ongoing heavy rainfall and dam releases that have impacted conditions on the river which have furthered works onsite.

In some cases, no tenders were received for subcontracted work such is the shortage of materials and labour availability and we’ve had to self-perform the work. Add to that the cost increases due to rising costs of materials and labour, it’s easy to understand, Chair, why this SCP amendment is necessary. Chair, while the impacts of these cost pressures are very significant to Council, we know that we’re not alone in dealing with these impacts. All three levels of government are experiencing increases in their major infrastructure projects, as are all cities around the world.

Projects under construction like Sydney Metro, like Western Australia’s METRONET rail line and Victoria’s Metro Tunnel have all seen recent massive cost increases. Closer to home, we’ve seen the cost of the Queensland Government’s Coomera Connector and the Gold Coast Light Rail Project increase each by more than $500 million. That is not taking into account the cost growth that is undoubtedly happening on Cross River Rail, but due to the legislation that protects Cross River Rail, we won’t know what that cost increase will ultimately be until well after the project is finished.

But the reality is, Mr Chair, these projects are crucial to the future of our city so we’ll continue to work with our construction partners on the successful delivery of projects to build the infrastructure that our city needs. Thank you very much, Chair.

Chair: Thank you. Any further debate? No further debate?

We now move to the vote on these items. First up, item G. Item G.

**Clause G put**

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

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

The voting was as follows:

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

NOES: 4 - The Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Jared CASSIDY, and Councillors Kara COOK, Charles STRUNK and Nicole JOHNSTON.

Chair: We now move to the vote on items H, I and K. Items H, I and K.

**Clauses H, I and K put**

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

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

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

#### A COUNCIL AND STANDING COMMITTEE MEETING DATES AND RECESS PERIODS FOR 2023

**137/220/14/5**

**311/2022-23**

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

2. Pursuant with sections 4(1) and 56B(1) of the *Meetings Local Law 2001*, Council may set the dates for its ordinary Council and Standing Committee meetings. The meeting dates and recess periods are determined as soon as practicable in order to allow for forward planning by both Councillors and Council officers.

3. The proposed Brisbane City Council and Standing Committee Meeting and Recess Calendar 2023 is set out in Attachment B (submitted on file). The recess periods are in excess of 20 days to allow the Establishment and Coordination Committee and the City Planning and Suburban Renewal Committee to carry out their delegated powers and functions during Council recesses.

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

5. **RECOMMENDATION:**

**THAT COUNCIL RESOLVE THE COUNCIL AND STANDING COMMITTEE MEETING DATES AND RECESS PERIODS FOR 2023, AS SET OUT IN ATTACHMENT A**, hereunder.

**Attachment A  
Draft Resolution**

**DRAFT RESOLUTION TO SET THE COUNCIL AND STANDING COMMITTEE MEETING DATES AND RECESS PERIODS FOR 2023**

As:

1. in accordance with sections 4(1) and 56B(1) of the *Meetings Local Law 2001*, Council may set the dates for its ordinary Council meetings and its Standing Committee meetings
2. by resolution 274/2021-22, Council set the meeting dates for its ordinary Council meetings and its Standing Committee meetings and recess periods for 2022
3. in accordance with section 45(1)(b) of the *Meetings Local Law 2001*, Council may alter a resolution of Council

then Council resolves that:

1. from 6 December 2022, resolution 274/2021-22 is altered to change the resumption date for Council meetings to 14 February 2023
2. from 6 December 2022, resolution 274/2021-22 is altered to change the resumption date for Standing Committee meetings to 14 February 2023
3. its ordinary meeting dates and the meeting dates of the Standing Committees for 2023 are as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **COUNCIL** | **STANDING COMMITTEES** |
| 14 February to 28 March 2023 | 14 February to 21 March 2023 |
| 2 May to 13 June 2023 | 2 May to 6 June 2023 |
| Budget Period: 14 to 23 June 2023 | – |
| 1 August to 12 September 2023 | 1 August to 5 September 2023 |
| 17 October to 28 November 2023 | 17 October to 21 November 2023 |
| Resume on 30 January 2024 | Resume on 30 January 2024 |

(iv) Council meets at 1pm on Tuesdays in the Council Chamber, Level 1, City Hall, Ann Street, Brisbane, unless otherwise advised

(v) the Standing Committees meet at various times on Level 2, City Hall, Ann Street, Brisbane, on Tuesday mornings, unless otherwise advised

(vi) Council meets at 2:30pm on Tuesday 7 November 2023 in the Council Chamber, Level 1, City Hall, Ann Street, Brisbane

(vii) the recess periods for 2023 are as follows:

(i) Autumn Recess: from 29 March 2023, with Council and Standing Committee meetings resuming on 2 May 2023

(ii) Winter Recess: from 24 June 2023, with Council and Standing Committee meetings resuming on 1 August 2023

(iii) Spring Recess: from 13 September 2023, with Council and Standing Committee meetings resuming on 17 October 2023

(iv) Summer Recess: from 29 November 2023, with Council and Standing Committee meetings resuming on 30 January 2024.

**ADOPTED**

#### B AMENDMENT TO *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014* – LOCAL GOVERNMENT INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN – AMENDMENT 1B

**152/160/1218/514-001**

**312/2022-23**

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

7. Part 4 of *Brisbane City Plan 2014* (the planning scheme) contains Council’s Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP). At its meeting on 30 November 2021, Council resolved to prepare a LGIP amendment (LGIP amendment 1B) in accordance with chapter 5, part 3, section 8.1 of the *Minister’s Guidelines and Rules* (the Guideline) made under section 17 of the *Planning Act 2016* (the Act).

8. LGIP amendment 1B is summarised as follows.

* The base date is amended from 2016 to 2021, and the planning horizon from 2026 to 2036.
* The planning assumptions are updated to include the latest population, employment, residential dwellings, and non-residential floorspace projections for the LGIP amendment 1B timeframe.
* The priority infrastructure area has been amended to include growth areas such as Pallara and Bridgeman Downs, and aligns with changes to the local government area to service existing and future urban development within the planning horizon timeframe.
* The desired standards of service for the transport, parks, and land for community facilities networks have been updated as follows:
  + - Transport – replacement of outdated mode share targets with wording relevant to each sub-network (roads, bus stops and ferry terminals)
    - Parks – redefined park classification types, and revised accessibility, provision and size standards for each park type
    - Land for community facilities – refinement of accessibility standards for libraries and aquatic facilities/swimming pools.
* 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, e.g. as outlined in Council’s Annual Plan and Budget 2021-22.
* The SOW models and extrinsic material have been updated to reflect the changes made as part of the LGIP amendment 1B.

9. Council has engaged the appointed reviewer who has completed the compliance check LGIP review checklist and appointed reviewer statement confirming that the LGIP amendment 1B complies with the Guideline, which is provided in Attachment B (submitted on file).

10. LGIP amendment 1B 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).

11. Amendments to other parts of the planning scheme for changes to 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 Act.

12. The amendment of the Infrastructure Design Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) to support park network revisions to their desired standards of service will be progressed separately following the PSP amendment process under the Guideline. These proposed amendments will run parallel to the LGIP and the LTIP.

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

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

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

16. **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 AN AMENDMENT TO *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014*– LGIP AMENDMENT 1B**

As Council:

1. has prepared the proposed Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP) Amendment to *Brisbane City Plan 2014* (the planning scheme), to amend the planning scheme in the manner stated in section 1 of Attachment D (submitted on file) and identified in the Schedules in Attachment C (LGIP amendment 1B, submitted on file), pursuant to chapter 5, part 3, section 8.2 of the *Minister’s Guidelines and Rules* (the Guideline)
2. has consulted with the distributor-retailer (Urban Utilities) and Queensland Government agencies, pursuant to chapter 5, part 3, section 8.3 of the Guideline
3. has completed the LGIP review checklist, pursuant to chapter 5, part 3, section 8.4 of the Guideline
4. has engaged the appointed reviewer who has completed the compliance check LGIP review checklist and appointed reviewer statement (refer Attachment B, submitted on file), pursuant to chapter 5, part 3, section 9 of the Guideline,

then Council:

1. directs, pursuant to chapter 5, part 3, section 9.4 of the Guideline, that a notice be given to the Minister for State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and provide the Minister a copy of the LGIP amendment 1B (refer Attachment D, submitted on file) and compliance check LGIP review checklist and appointed reviewer statement (refer Attachment B, submitted on file) requesting:
   1. a State review of the proposed LGIP amendment 1B
   2. the Minister’s agreement to publicly consult on the proposed LGIP amendment 1B.

**ADOPTED**

#### C TAILORED AMENDMENT TO *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014* – LONG TERM INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN – AMENDMENT 1B

**152/160/1218/515-001**

**313/2022-23**

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

18. *Brisbane City Plan 2014* (the planning scheme) contains Council’s Long term infrastructure plan (LTIP), which contains the longer-term infrastructure planning information and requirements that are beyond the planning horizon of Council’s Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP). At its meeting on 30 November 2021, Council resolved to prepare an amendment (LTIP amendment 1B) and seek approval from the Department of State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning for a tailored amendment process to the planning scheme, in accordance with section 18 of the *Planning Act 2016* (the Act).

19. By letter dated 21 January 2022 (refer Attachment D, submitted on file), the Queensland Government gave Council approval to proceed with a tailored amendment process. The process for amending the planning scheme is set out in Part C of the Chief Executive Notice dated 20 January 2022 (refer Attachment E, submitted on file) and applies instead of the process set out in the *Minister’s Guidelines and Rules*. Council intends to progress LTIP amendment 1B with the proposed LGIP Amendment 1B.

20. LTIP amendment 1B is summarised as follows.

* Schedule 2.4 OM-002.1 Bicycle network overlay maps have been updated to account for new network planning and trunk infrastructure priorities.
* Schedule 2.4 OM-003.4 Community purposes network overlay maps and Part 10 Table 10.3.1.A and Table 10.3.1.B for the parks network and land for community facilities network have been updated to account for new network planning and trunk infrastructure priorities.
* Schedule 2.5 OPM-012.1 LTIP Other plan maps Stormwater Network and Table 10.3.2 have been updated to account for new network planning and trunk infrastructure priorities.

21. LTIP amendment 1B has been prepared in accordance with the Part C of the Chief Executive Notice (refer Attachment E, submitted on file) and is set out in Attachment C (submitted on file). A schedule of proposed amendments is set out in Attachment B (submitted on file).

22. Council has consulted with the relevant distributor-retailer (Urban Utilities) and Queensland Government agencies (Department of State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Department of Transport and Main Roads) while preparing LTIP amendment 1B. Following consultation, there were no material concerns raised by Urban Utilities or Queensland Government agencies.

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

24. **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 TAILORED AMENDMENT TO *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014* – LTIP AMENDMENT 1B**

As Council:

1. has prepared the proposed Long Term Infrastructure Plan (LTIP) 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 identified in the Schedules in Attachment B (LTIP amendment 1B, submitted on file), pursuant to Part C, Step 1 of the Notice (refer Attachment E, submitted on file) given by the Chief Executive under section 18(3) of the *Planning Act 2016* and dated 20 January 2022 (the Chief Executive Notice)
2. has consulted with relevant Queensland Government agencies, pursuant to Part C, Step 2 of the Chief Executive Notice,

then Council:

1. directs, pursuant to Part C, Step 3 of the Chief Executive Notice, that a notice be given to the Minister for State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and provide the Minister a copy of the LTIP amendment 1B (refer Attachment C, submitted on file) requesting:
   1. a State interest review of the proposed LTIP amendment 1B
   2. the Minister’s agreement to publicly consult on the proposed LTIP amendment 1B.

**ADOPTED**

#### D MAJOR AMENDMENT TO *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014* – SANDGATE DISTRICT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

**152/160/1218/396**

**314/2022-23**

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

26. At its meeting of 1 December 2020, Council resolved to amend *Brisbane City Plan 2014* (the planning scheme) to include the Sandgate district neighbourhood plan (the neighbourhood plan), make associated amendments to planning scheme policies and undertake consequential amendments (the proposed amendment). Council also resolved to send the proposed amendment to the Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning (the then Minister), to request a State interest review and approval to publicly consult on the proposed amendment.

27. By letter dated 25 March 2021, the then Minister confirmed that State interests were appropriately integrated in the proposed amendment, and advised that public consultation may proceed, subject to conditions.

28. Public consultation on the proposed amendment was carried out from 10 May 2021 to 21 June 2021 in accordance with the *Minister’s Rules and Guidelines* (the Guideline).

29. At its meeting of 7 June 2022, Council resolved to modify the proposed amendment in response to submissions received, to make associated amendments to planning scheme policies pursuant to the Guideline, and to request the Minister’s approval to adopt the proposed amendment.

30. By letter dated 13 October 2022 (refer Attachment B, submitted on file), the Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister Assisting the Premier on Olympics Infrastructure granted approval for the proposed amendment to be adopted into the planning scheme without any conditions. The proposed amendment to be adopted is set out in Attachment C (submitted on file). The proposed amendment is in a form consistent with the *Planning Act 2016*.

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

32. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A**

**Draft Resolution**

**DRAFT RESOLUTION TO AMEND *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014* TO INCLUDE THE SANDGATE DISTRICT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

As Council:

1. decided, pursuant to section 16.1 of Part 4 of Chapter 2 and section 2.1 of Part 1 of Chapter 3 of the *Minister’s Guidelines and Rules* (the Guideline) to amend *Brisbane City Plan 2014* (the planning scheme) and planning scheme policies to include the Sandgate district neighbourhood plan and make associated consequential amendments (the proposed amendment)
2. sought, pursuant to section 21.1 of Part 4 of Chapter 2 of the Guideline, the Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister Assisting the Premier on Olympics Infrastructure (the Minister) approval to adopt the proposed amendment to the planning scheme
3. was advised by the Minister, by letter dated 13 October 2022 (refer Attachment B, submitted on file), that it could adopt the proposed amendment without conditions,

then Council:

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

**ADOPTED**

#### E 2022-23 BUDGET – SECOND REVIEW

**134/135/1164/851**

**315/2022-23**

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

34. 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.

35. The 2022-23 Budget – Second Review has been prepared and considers:

* emerging issues requiring funding and changes to income and expenditure for 2022‑23 through to 2025-26
* contractual cost escalations and price escalations across a number of key materials and services
* impacts from supply chain disruptions associated with world events, economic conditions and market volatility impacting Council’s cost of operations and capital program delivery
* a tight labour market impacting Council labour and contracted works
* the ongoing financial impacts from the South East Queensland Flooding and Rainfall Event 2022
* the ongoing financial impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Financial impact

36. The anticipated accumulated surplus at 30 June 2023 for the budget approved by Council was $14,024 million.

37. The sum of the proposed adjustments to the budget for 2022-23 will decrease the anticipated accumulated surplus at 30 June 2023 to $13,966 million.

38. Changes to 2022-23 Budget:

|  | **Total change**  **$ million** | **Revised budget**  **$ million** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Income and expenditure** |  |  |
| Income | 0.7 | 3,142.8 |
| Expenses | 58.5 | 2,719.6 |
| Operating capability | (57.7) | 423.2 |
| Capital | 6.3 | 1,418.0 |
|  |  |  |
| **Financial position** |  |  |
| Assets | (49.9) | 34,250.8 |
| Liabilities | 7.8 | 5,871.1 |
| Community equity | (57.8) | 28,379.7 |

39. The net impact of this review on 2023-24 through to 2025-26 is listed in Attachment B (submitted on file), and is summarised below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Year** | **Forward year budget commitments change**  **$ million** |
| 2023-24 | 70.9 |
| 2024-25 | 118.4 |
| 2025-26 | (0.5) |

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 approve tHE 2022-23 Budget** – **second Review**

As:

1. Council proposes to amend the budget to address emerging issues and changes to income and expenditure for 2022-23 through to 2025-26
2. 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:

1. resolves to amend the *Annual Plan and Budget 2022-23* 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**

#### F QUEENSLAND TREASURY CORPORATION’S 2022 BRISBANE CITY COUNCIL CREDIT REVIEW

**134/40/1154/55**

**316/2022-23**

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

43. As a condition of receiving ongoing approval from the Queensland Government to borrow funds, Council is required, and has agreed, to submit to an annual credit review of its financial position by the Queensland Treasury Corporation (QTC). The purpose of the credit review is to assess Council’s credit worthiness and provide a recommendation to the Queensland Government’s Department of State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning for Council’s proposed annual borrowing program.

44. The QTC has rated Council as ‘Strong’ with a ‘Neutral’ outlook since the 2013 financial year.

45. QTC has recently completed its 2022 review and on the basis of this review, has again rated Council as ‘Strong’ with a ‘Neutral’ outlook.

46. Factors contributing to the positive rating included Council’s:

* large and diverse ratepayer base
* demonstrated capacity to deliver and manage large infrastructure projects while servicing forecast debt levels.

47. The ‘Strong’ rating indicates a local government’s strong capacity to meet its financial commitments in the short, medium and long term. QTC has continued to rate Council’s outlook as ‘Neutral’ reflecting that no known foreseeable events are expected to have a direct impact on Council’s rating to meet its financial commitments.

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

49. **RECOMMENDATION:**

**THAT COUNCIL NOTE THE QUEENSLAND TREASURY CORPORATION’S2022 BRISBANE CITY COUNCIL CREDIT REVIEW, AS SET OUT IN ATTACHMENT A** (submitted on file).

**ADOPTED**

#### G STORES BOARD SUBMISSION – AMENDMENT TO SIGNIFICANT CONTRACTING PLANS AND A SOLE SOURCE SUBMISSION

**165/210/179/4749**

**317/2022-23**

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

51. Significant Contracting Plans (SCPs) and a Sole Source submission have been approved for the delivery of the following Council contracts:

* Brisbane Metro Project – Transaction and Contract Management Services
* Brisbane Metro Inner City Infrastructure
* Brisbane Metro Vehicles
* Design and Construction of Upgrades to Buranda and Griffith University Busway Stations (Sole Source submission)
* Design and Construction of the Brisbane Metro Depot
* Project Verification Services for the Brisbane Metro Project
* Design and Construction of the Kangaroo Point Green Bridge
* Construction of the Breakfast Creek Green Bridge and Lores Bonney Riverwalk Extension
* Moggill Road Corridor Upgrade Project
* Brisbane International Cycle Park – Murarrie.

52. All of the SCPs were approved prior to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, global supply chain disruption, conflict in Ukraine and the ongoing *La Niña* event being known, and therefore Council could not consider the significant challenges these events have posed to the procurement and delivery of complex, high-risk, high-value projects. This submission requests a combined increase to estimated contract values of $394.08m, noting that an increase in budget at the Second Budget Review of $217.19m is only required across the current and forward financial years as a large proportion of the increase can be funded from existing project budgets.

53. For the reasons listed below, the SCPs and the Sole Source submission that align with the above contracts have experienced increases in the estimated contract sums, and in some circumstances contract durations, that are predicted to exceed current approved values. Having certainty to finalise negotiations with contractors, preventing further delays and cost, is considered to be most advantageous for Council and in the public interest.

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

Purpose

55. That the Stores Board recommends approval to amend the Significant Contracting Plans (SCPs) and Sole Source submission set out in Appendix A, hereunder, and subsequent variations to the respective post-market approvals.

Background/business case

56. SCPs and a Sole Source submission have been approved for the delivery of the following Council contracts:

- Brisbane Metro Project – Transaction and Contract Management Services

- Brisbane Metro Inner City Infrastructure

- Brisbane Metro Vehicles

- Design and Construction of Upgrades to Buranda and Griffith University Busway Stations (Sole Source submission)

- Design and Construction of the Brisbane Metro Depot

- Project Verification Services for the Brisbane Metro Project

- Design and Construction of the Kangaroo Point Green Bridge

- Construction of the Breakfast Creek Green Bridge and Lores Bonney Riverwalk Extension

- Moggill Road Corridor Upgrade Project

- Brisbane International Cycle Park – Murarrie.

57. These SCPs relate to the delivery of some of Council’s largest and most complex city shaping projects that are significantly contributing to the *Brisbane Vision 2031*. All of the SCPs were approved prior to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, global supply chain disruption, conflict in Ukraine and the ongoing *La Niña* event being known, and therefore Council could not consider the significant challenges that these events have posed to the procurement and delivery of complex, high-risk high-value projects.

Challenges experienced

58. Since the approval of the above SCPs and Sole Source submission, the following challenges have been experienced, which have contributed to the forecast exceedance of contract sums and in some cases contract durations that aligned to the SCPs and Sole Source submission.

* Increased supply chain costs, including for construction materials and manufactured goods for contracts that were at the contractor’s risk and not subject to adjustment. The likelihood of contractor failure and subsequent further costs and delays to Council to re-tender contracts has increased.
* Significant and unexpected increases in price variation indices for contracts with an agreed adjustment mechanism for rise and fall (e.g. Consumer and Producer Price Index, labour and materials indices).
* Market capacity for key sub-contractors has reduced substantially, leading to limited availability for principal contractors with subsequent time, cost and retention pressures.
* Key subcontractors who were committed to bids with principal contractors no longer being able to hold or commit to tendered pricing due to industry pressures and supply chain disruption. In a number of cases, sub-contractors withdrew their involvement.
* Severe weather events, including the February 2022 rainfall and flood event, directly impacting delivery milestones, as well as diverting key resources to flood recovery (e.g. barge and crane resources provided to the Queensland Government from the Kangaroo Point Green Bridge project).
* Government health directions, including in some cases severe lockdowns, that have caused program delays due to supply chain disruptions and inability to access specialist inputs both within Australia and abroad.
* Dependency on Public Utility Providers for service relocations and upgrades, who themselves have experienced the same risks and pressures, resulting in increased costs and delays to Council contracts.

59. Significant in principle negotiations are ongoing with contractors to ensure that commercial outcomes can be reached, which provide best value for money to Brisbane and limit financial stress for contractors. To enable commercial-in-confidence negotiations to be finalised, that may commit Council to contract sums beyond current limits, approval of contract sum increases is required. The proposed increases are based on an assessment of the current volatile market conditions.

Local supply and public interest considerations

60. Maintaining rigid contract positions on price and approved sub-contractors for all aspects of contracts may contribute to contractor failure or sub-optimal outcomes, resulting in the need to re‑tender partially completed projects. It is considered more cost effective for Council to provide a reasonable level of relief, having regard to prevailing market conditions, rather than facing the risk of re‑tendering in a volatile market with reduced competition.

61. Council’s preference is to negotiate mutually acceptable outcomes with its existing contractors. This approach provides the following benefits for Council.

* Continues Council’s commitment to supporting local suppliers and employment within Brisbane.
* Continues Council’s constructive relationships with these suppliers to ensure achievement of intended outcomes.
* Contractors are more likely to retain interest in tendering for future Council projects, therefore maintaining or enhancing Council’s position as a client of choice.
* Council’s reputation with the broader local supply would be enhanced in the current heated market environment characterised by severe resource constraints.
* Reduces the likelihood that Council would become involved in protracted contract disputes, with significant cost, time and reputational consequences.

62. Negotiating mutually positive outcomes with contractors is considered to represent the most advantageous outcome for Council and be in the public interest.

Other considerations

63. The contracts that are aligned to the above SCPs and the Sole Source submission are for relatively long durations, meaning that the contractors were or are:

* less able to fix input costs
* required to re-negotiate with key contractors and sub-contractors no longer able to maintain pricing
* delayed in completing designs and statutory approvals due to COVID-19 pandemic restrictions, with consequent delays in placing orders for key materials (e.g. concrete and structural steel)
* experiencing program impacts affecting achievement of key milestones, necessitating re-staging of works.

64. While contractors have absorbed some price increases, due to the value of these significant Council contracts, it is prudent for Council to contribute to covering the cost of these increases.

65. Council continues to conduct regular quantitative risk assessments (QRAs) to assess the risks associated with these contracts and their related projects.

Amendments to each SCP and a sole source submission

66. Appendix A, hereunder, details the changes required to align contracts with SCP and sole source submission approvals.

67. Revised contract durations are based on a review of known contract risks. Aspects such as severe or prolonged adverse weather conditions may further impact timeframes. Increases in time beyond those listed in Appendix A, hereunder, will be managed through existing contract management processes.

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

69. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A  
Draft Resolution**

**DRAFT RESOLUTION TO AMEND SIGNIFICANT CONTRACTING PLANS AND A SOLE SOURCE SUBMISSION**

As:

1. Council approved Significant Contracting Plans and a Sole Source submission for:

* Brisbane Metro Project – Transaction and Contract Management Services on 5 February 2018
* Brisbane Metro Early Works, Inner City Infrastructure, Metro Vehicles on 22 June 2018, with an amendment on 9 June 2020
* Council Sole Source Decision – Design and Construction of Upgrades to Buranda and Griffith University Busway Stations on 17 November 2020
* Design and Construction of the Brisbane Metro Depot on 12 March 2019
* Project Verification Services for the Brisbane Metro Project on 4 June 2019
* Design and Construction of the Kangaroo Point Green Bridge on 18 August 2020, with an amendment on 8 June 2021
* Construction of the Breakfast Creek Green Bridge and Lores Bonney Riverwalk Extension on 18 August 2020, with an amendment on 7 February 2022
* Moggill Road Corridor Upgrade Project on 4 August 2020, with an amendment on 24 August 2021
* Brisbane International Cycle Park – Murarrie on 23 June 2022

1. significant challenges have been experienced, including an increase in market price for key cost inputs that have put pressure on cost and time for the delivery of some of Council’s largest projects
2. it is considered most advantageous for Council to agree mutually acceptable outcomes with contractors, having regard to prevailing market conditions, rather than facing the risk of re‑tendering in a volatile market with reduced competition and associated delays
3. section 211(5) of the *City of Brisbane Regulation 2012* provides that Council may, by resolution, amend a Significant Contracting Plan at any time before the end of the financial year to which the plan relates,

then:

1. Council resolves to amend the:
   1. Significant Contracting Plans for: Brisbane Metro Project – Transaction and Contract Management Services; Brisbane Metro Early Works, Inner City Infrastructure, Metro Vehicles; Design and Construction of the Brisbane Metro Depot; Project Verification Services for the Brisbane Metro Project; Design and Construction of the Kangaroo Point Green Bridge; Construction of the Breakfast Creek Green Bridge and Lores Bonney Riverwalk Extension; Moggill Road Corridor Upgrade Project; and Brisbane International Cycle Park – Murarrie, as set out in Attachment B (submitted on file)
   2. Sole Source submission for the Design and Construction of Upgrades to Buranda and Griffith University Busway Stations, as set out in Attachment B (submitted on file).

**Appendix A**

**Appendix A – Summary of contract amendments aligned to Significant Contracting Plans and a Sole Source Submission**

| **Contract name and number** | **Contractor** | **Significant Contracting Plan (SCP) or Sole Source submission**  **(Council approval date)** | **Current approved contract sum including contingency**  **($ million)** | **Revised contract sum including contingency**  **($ million)**  *(relevant section of SCP or sole source submission)* | **Increase required**  **($ million)** | **SCP or Sole Source anticipated duration #** | **Revised contract duration #**  *(relevant section of SCP or sole source submission)* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Brisbane Metro Program** | | | | | | | |
| 1. Transaction and Contract Management Services (Contract No. 531437) | E3 Advisory Pty Ltd | SCP – Brisbane Metro Project – Transaction and Contract Management Services (5 February 2018) | [Commercial-in-Confidence] | [Commercial-in-Confidence]  *(section 8.1)* | [Commercial-in-Confidence] | 4 years  (Part C delivery phase) | Approximately [Commercial-in-Confidence]  *(section 5.12)* |
| 1. Brisbane Metro Collaborative Partnership – Separable Portion 1 – Inner City Infrastructure and Associated Works (Contract No. 570200) | Brisbane Move (Acciona Construction Australia Pty Ltd and Arup Australia Projects Pty Ltd) | SCP – Early works, Inner City Infrastructure, Metro vehicles (22 June 2018) and SCP Amendment (9 June 2020) | [Commercial-in-Confidence] | [Commercial-in-Confidence]  *(section 9.1)* | [Commercial-in-Confidence] | In the order of 3.5 years | Of the order of[Commercial-in-Confidence]  *(section 6.12)* |
| 1. Design and Construction of Upgrades to Buranda and Griffith University Busway Stations (Contract No. 570200) | Brisbane Move (Acciona Construction Australia Pty Ltd and Arup Australia Projects Pty Ltd) | Sole Source – Design and Construction of Upgrades to Buranda and Griffith University Busway Stations (17 November 2020) | [Commercial-in-Confidence] | [Commercial-in-Confidence]  (*sections* *6.0* *and 7.0)* | [Commercial-in-Confidence] | 36 months | Approximately[Commercial-in-Confidence]  *(section 4.10)* |
| 1. Depot Design and Construction (Contract No. 570210) | ADCO Constructions Pty Ltd | SCP – Design and Construction of the Metro Depot (12 March 2019) | [Commercial-in-Confidence] | [Commercial-in-Confidence]  *(section 8.1)* | [Commercial-in-Confidence] | Approximately 28 months | Approximately[Commercial-in-Confidence]  *(section 5.12)* |
| 1. Design and Build of Metro Vehicles (Contract No. 570202) | Carrosserie Hess AG | SCP – Early works, Inner City Infrastructure, Metro vehicles (22 June 2018) and SCP Amendment (9 June 2020) | [Commercial-in-Confidence]**^^** | [Commercial-in-Confidence]**^^**  *(section 9.1)* | [Commercial-in-Confidence] | 10 years | No change |
| 1. Project Verification Services for Brisbane Metro – Category 1 – Infrastructure (Contract No. 570230) | SMEC Australia Pty Ltd | SCP – Project Verification Services (4 June 2019) | [Commercial-in-Confidence] | [Commercial-in-Confidence]  *(section 8.1)* | [Commercial-in-Confidence] | Up to 5 years | No change |
| **Green Bridges Program** | | | | | | | |
| 1. Design and Construction of the Kangaroo Point Green Bridge (Contract No. 520682) **^** | Watpac Construction Pty Ltd | SCP ­– Design and Construction of the Kangaroo Point Green Bridge (18 August 2020) and SCP Amendment (8 June 2021) | [Commercial-in-Confidence] | [Commercial-in-Confidence]  *(section 8.1)* | [Commercial-in-Confidence] | Approximately 2.5 years | Approximately **\*\***[Commercial-in-Confidence]  *(section 5.12)* |
| 1. Construction of the Breakfast Creek Green Bridge and Lores Bonney Riverwalk Extension (Contract No. 520683) | Georgiou Brady Joint Venture | SCP – Construction of the Breakfast Creek Green Bridge and Lores Bonney Riverwalk Extension (18 August 2020) and SCP Amendment (7 February 2022) | [Commercial-in-Confidence] | [Commercial-in-Confidence]  *(section 8.1)* | [Commercial-in-Confidence] | Approximately 2 years | Approximately[Commercial-in-Confidence]  *(section 5.12)* |
| **Project Management** | | | | | | | |
| 1. Moggill Road Corridor Upgrade Project (Contract No. 532491) | Georgiou Group Pty Ltd | SCP – Moggill Road Corridor Upgrade Project (4 August 2020) and SCP Amendment (24 August 2021) | [Commercial-in-Confidence] | [Commercial-in-Confidence]  *(section 8.1)* | [Commercial-in-Confidence] | Approximately 104 weeks | Approximately[Commercial-in-Confidence]  *(section 5.12)* |
| 1. Brisbane International Cycle Park – Murarrie (Contract No. 520931) | To be decided | SCP – Brisbane International Cycle Park Murarrie (23 June 2022) | [Commercial-in-Confidence] | [Commercial-in-Confidence]  *(section 8.1)* | [Commercial-in-Confidence] | 47 weeks | Approximately[Commercial-in-Confidence] |
| **TOTALS** | | | **1,352.30** | **1,746.38** | **394.08** |  | |

^ Section 5.15 (price adjustment) for SCP item 7 to be amended to read “price adjustment may be subject to negotiation”

^^ The current approved value for item 5 is calculated based on the hedged exchange rates secured following contract commencement in early 2020 and escalation realised to date. The revised contract sum is based on exchange rates associated with forward contracts aligned to milestone payments, as well as forecast escalation based on contracted price indices.

# Excludes defects liability periods, which are typically one to two years.

**ADOPTED**

#### H STORES BOARD SUBMISSION – AMENDMENT OF SIGNIFICANT CONTRACTING PLAN FOR THE PROVISION OF TRAFFIC CONTROL MANAGEMENT SERVICES

**165/830/179/543**

**318/2022-23**

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

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

72. The Establishment and Coordination Committee approved the establishment of a Corporate Procurement Arrangement for the provision of Traffic Control Management Services on 17 July 2018. The tender was advertised publicly and 16 suppliers provided a submission. A post-market submission was approved by Stores Board on 6 November 2018 recommending Verifact Traffic Pty Ltd (Verifact) as the preferred supplier. The contract with Verifact was executed on 9 November 2018 with a contract commencement date of 23 January 2019 for an initial term of four years, with options to extend for additional periods of one year each, for a maximum term of six years.

73. Due to increase in business needs and decrease in availability from the primary supplier, additional suppliers would allow relief to the current supplier and assist with Council delivery. Engagement of additional suppliers will assist to reduce the risk to Council of traffic control unavailability.

74. An increase in estimated expenditure from [Commercial-in-Confidence] to [Commercial-in-Confidence] over the potential six-year term and additional suppliers added to the arrangement will allow for the delivery of an increase in traffic control requirements for Council works.

Purpose

75. That the Stores Board recommends approval to amend the Significant Contracting Plan (SCP) for Traffic Control Management Services, from an estimated expenditure of [Commercial-in-Confidence] to [Commercial-in-Confidence], over the potential six-year term and add additional supplier/s to the current Corporate Procurement Arrangement (CPA).

Background/business case

76. Council has an ongoing need for suitably qualified traffic control personnel, vehicles with flashing signage, traffic cones and other equipment to ensure safety of the public on roads, pathways, at roadworks, major traffic disruptions, community events and natural disasters throughout Brisbane. Historical volumes indicate a need of 100 traffic controllers (TCs) and 50 vehicles per standard working day as outlined in the tender.

77. The Establishment and Coordination Committee approved the SCP to establish a CPA for the provision of Traffic Control Management Services on 17 July 2018. The tender was advertised publicly, and 16 suppliers provided a submission. A post-market submission was approved by Stores Board on 6 November 2018 recommending Verifact Traffic Pty Ltd (Verifact) as the preferred supplier. The contract with Verifact was executed on 9 November 2018 with a contract commencement date of 23 January 2019, for an initial term of four years with options to extend for additional periods of one year each, for a maximum term of six years.

Rationale for amending the estimated expenditure total and adding additional suppliers

78. Council established a CPA with Verifact who are unable to meet Council’s increased requirements due to attraction and retention challenges and a limited market for suitable traffic control vehicles.

79. Due to increase in Council’s requirements including increasing demand, change in market conditions and decrease in availability from the primary supplier, additional suppliers would allow relief to the current supplier, encourage a more competitive arrangement and assist with Council delivery. Engagement of additional suppliers will assist to reduce the risk to Council of traffic control unavailability.

80. An increase in estimated expenditure from an annual [Commercial-in-Confidence] per year to [Commercial-in-Confidence] per year for the remaining two years will allow for additional suppliers to be added to the arrangement and allow for the delivery of an increase in traffic control requirements for Council works.

Contract expenditure and budget availability

81. Estimated increase in expenditure (including contingency):

The increase is from an estimated expenditure of [Commercial-in-Confidence] to [Commercial-in-Confidence], over the potential six-year term of the CPA.

82. Sufficient approved budget to meet the additional expenditure under this contract/CPA?

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

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

84. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A**

**Draft Resolution**

**DRAFT RESOLUTION TO AMEND SIGNIFICANT CONTRACTING PLAN**

As:

1. Council approved a Significant Contracting Plan for Traffic Control Management Services on 17 July 2018
2. it is in Council’s interests to increase the estimated contract expenditure and add additional suppliers to the current arrangement to meet Council’s business needs for traffic control management services
3. section 211(5) of the *City of Brisbane Regulation 2012* provides that Council may, by resolution, amend a Significant Contracting Plan at any time before the end of the financial year to which the plan relates

then:

1. Council resolves to amend the Significant Contracting Plan for Traffic Control Management Services, as set out in Attachment B (submitted on file).

**ADOPTED**

#### I STORES BOARD SUBMISSION – SIGNIFICANT CONTRACTING PLAN AMENDMENT FOR KERBSIDE LARGE ITEMS COLLECTION AND RECYCLING SERVICE

**165/830/179/863**

**319/2022-23**

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

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

87. On 2 November 2021, Council approved a Significant Contracting Plan (SCP) for Kerbside Large Items Collection and Recycling Service to establish a Corporate Procurement Arrangement (CPA) in the form of a Preferred Supplier Arrangement. A public tender was subsequently released to the market on 5 November 2021 and closed on 4 February 2022 with two submissions received. An evaluation process was then undertaken, including a clarification and negotiation process.

88. As part of the tender evaluation, analysis was undertaken to determine comparative pricing for both tender submissions. This analysis has identified that the estimated approval in the SCP of [Commercial-in-Confidence] million over the potential eight-year term, is inadequate to deliver the scope of services.

89. Subsequent analysis has been undertaken which considered the incumbent provider’s current rates (escalated in line with the contracted rise-and-fall formula), historical invoicing, supplier provided summaries (outlining date service completed, number of households in the scheduled area, total collections made, tonnes collected and invoice value), and anticipated costs associated with fleet upgrades (the service is currently undertaken by a fleet of fully depreciated, aged vehicles, it is anticipated new vehicles will be purchased, inclusive of technology enabling real-time data to be provided on the service). This analysis aligns with the requirement to increase estimated expenditure to [Commercial-in-Confidence] million, an increase of [Commercial-in-Confidence] million, over the potential eight-year term. The pricing analysis conducted is in line with Council’s revised internal cost modelling for these services.

90. The Chief Executive Officer and the Stores Board considered the submission, as set out in Attachment B (submitted on file), on 7 November 2022.

Purpose

91. That the Stores Board recommends approval to amend the Significant Contracting Plan (SCP) for Kerbside Large Items Collection and Recycling Service, from an estimated expenditure of [Commercial-in-Confidence] million to [Commercial-in-Confidence] million, an increase of [Commercial-in-Confidence] million, over the potential eight-year term.

Background/business case

92. Council currently provides a kerbside large items collection service via a Corporate Procurement Arrangement (CPA) in the form of a Preferred Supplier Arrangement with Curbside Services Pty Ltd (Curbside).

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

94. The Kerbside Large Items Collection Service was originally scheduled to end on 30 June 2022. On 2 November 2021, Council approved an SCP to establish a new CPA in the form of a Preferred Supplier Arrangement for Kerbside Large Items Collection and Recycling Service. The SCP also approved an extension of the existing CPA for an initial term of six months with options to extend for two additional periods of three months each, for a maximum term of 12 months from 1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023.

95. A public tender was subsequently released to the market on 5 November 2021, and closed on 4 February 2022, with two tenders received. The evaluation process was then undertaken, including a clarification and negotiation process.

Rationale for amending the estimated expenditure total

96. As part of the tender evaluation, analysis was undertaken to determine comparative pricing for both tender submissions. This analysis has identified that the original approved SCP’s annual expenditure estimated at [Commercial-in-Confidence] million per annum or [Commercial-in-Confidence] million over the potential eight-year term, is inadequate to deliver the scope of services.

97. The estimated expenditure in the approved SCP was developed from two inputs:

* the profile of the vehicle fleet used to provide the service
* the number of vehicles to inform the necessary workforce.

98. This service was suspended in 2020 therefore data from 2019 was used. The data showed that the kerbside collection service consistently operated each week with eight waste compactors. In addition, some collection weeks only required the collection vehicles to be in operation for part of the week, as collection volumes were low, enabling collections to be completed in less than the suggested five business days.

99. Operating costs were estimated using 2021 vehicle and labour rates (further escalated using assumed rise-and-fall factors). This estimate was validated against historical expenditure records which supported the estimate.

100. Since the original approved SCP annual expenditure was prepared, material factors have changed.

* The amount of kerbside large items requiring collection has increased.
* In the 2021-22 financial year, the number of waste compactors operating to complete the service each week has expanded, with between eight and up to 14 waste compactors now available.

101. A key driver of this change has been the evolving habits of residents during the COVID-19 pandemic.

* Residents are purchasing more household goods and/or undertaking home improvements, that in turn, leads to greater volumes of large item waste.
* Residents are spending more time at home, which leads to more frequent reviewing of household goods.
* Historically, items were typically added to the kerbside on the weekend. Working from home arrangements are now common with residents progressively adding items throughout the week.

102. Collectively, these factors have led to the amount of kerbside collection material increasing from the 12,500 tonnes per annum anticipated in the original approved SCP to 16,800 tonnes during the most recent collection period.

103. Underlying supply market volatility has increased the kerbside collection services operating costs. High employment rates have complicated the recruitment of kerbside collection workers and salaries have increased. The cost of critical commodities, such as diesel and diesel exhaust fluid (AdBlue) have also seen significant increases. To ensure Council meets its safety and information management obligations, the service requires a modern vehicle fleet. The cost of acquiring new vehicles and associated technologies, including finance costs, have all risen. Collectively, these factors have increased the cost of operating the kerbside large items collection service.

104. Although several of the highlighted cost influencing factors may moderate over time, it is anticipated most represent long-term trends. This, coupled with Brisbane’s steady population growth forecasts, suggest that the volume of large item kerbside collection seen in the past 12 months will remain representative of future demand. Council stakeholders have projected that the number of waste compactors required to be operational each week to facilitate completion of the service, will increase to 10 waste compactors. This projected increase in the number of compactors has been taken into consideration when determining the revised estimate.

105. The revised estimate, based upon the incumbent providers present rates (escalated in line with the contracted rise-and-fall formula), historical invoicing, supplier provided summaries, as well as anticipated costs associated with fleet upgrades and predicted increase in the number of waste compactors, provides an updated estimate of [Commercial-in-Confidence] million per annum or [Commercial-in-Confidence] million over the potential eight-year term. The pricing analysis conducted is in line with Council’s internal cost modelling for these services. The adjusted estimates are to the satisfaction of Council stakeholders.

Contract expenditure and budget availability

106. Estimated increase in expenditure (including contingency):

The increase is from an estimated expenditure of [Commercial-in-Confidence] million to [Commercial-in-Confidence] million, an increase of [Commercial-in-Confidence] million, over the potential maximum eight-year term.

107. Sufficient approved budget to meet the additional expenditure under this contract/CPA?

Budget is confirmed for the financial years from 2023 through to 2027. Future years will be added during future budget cycles each year.

108. Indicative program and supporting information:

Program: Program 6 – City Standards, Community Health and Safety

Outcome: 6.3 Managing and Reducing Brisbane’s Waste and Litter

Strategy: 6.3.1 Effective Waste Stream Management and Reduction

Service: 6.3.1.1 Waste Stream Management and Reduction

Operating/projects: Annual Kerbside Large Item Collection

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

110. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A  
Draft Resolution**

**DRAFT RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE SIGNIFICANT CONTRACTING PLAN FOR KERBSIDE LARGE ITEMS COLLECTION AND RECYCLING SERVICE**

As:

(i) Council approved a Significant Contracting Plan for Kerbside Large Items Collection and Recycling Service on 2 November 2021

(ii) the estimated expenditure for the delivery of Kerbside Large Items Collection and Recycling Service has increased

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

then:

(i) Council resolves to amend the Significant Contracting Plan for Kerbside Large Items Collection and Recycling Service, as set out in Attachment B (submitted on file).

**ADOPTED**

#### J LEASE OF LAND AT 34B AMESBURY STREET, KANGAROO POINT

**112/445/444/1389**

**320/2022-23**

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

112. Council has leased the land at 34B Amesbury Street, Kangaroo Point (Lot 1 on SP 142506), since 2002 (refer Attachment C, submitted on file). The land accommodates wharf structures over the Brisbane River adjacent to the shared pathway to Kangaroo Point Cliffs Park and the Council owned Naval Stores building. As the wharf is located over the Brisbane River, it is in the ownership of the Queensland Government. The wharf and Naval Stores building are integral to each other and are listed on the State Heritage Register. The current lease over the land expires on 13 March 2023.

113. The lessor, the Queensland Government Department of Resources, has offered terms for a new 21-year lease. The proposed commencing net rental is $3,087.52 (excluding GST) per annum or $21.30  (excluding GST) per square metre (subject to survey). This is an increase of five per cent on the rent payable under the current lease. The annual rental will be increased subject to annual reassessment in accordance with the *Land Valuation Act 2010*.

114. The lessor’s offered rental is calculated by multiplying the valuation of the land for rental purposes ($45,000) by the percentage rate (six per cent) for the category of the lease, in accordance with the *Land Regulation 2020.* The prescribed minimum rent for tenures of this type and rental category is $3,087.52. Where the calculated rent is less than the prescribed minimum rent, the minimum rent is payable.

115. The lease over this land is required to maintain the existing use of the wharf structures. The lessor conditions that the leased land forming the wharf area must only be used in conjunction with the adjoining land occupied by the Naval Stores. The cost to make-good the land and remove the wharf structure is estimated at $120,000 and if removed there would be a loss of use of this area to both the public and the adjoining lessee of the Naval Stores.

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

117. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A**

**Draft Resolution**

**DRAFT RESOLUTION TO ENTER INTO A NEW LEASE OVER EXISTING LAND AT 34B AMESBURY STREET, KANGAROO POINT**

As:

(i) Council’s lease of the land located at 34B Amesbury Street, Kangaroo Point, (Lot 1 on SP 142506) expires on 13 March 2023

(ii) the lessor has provided an offer for a new 21-year lease of the existing land

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

then Council:

(i) resolves to enter into a new lease over existing land at 34B Amesbury Street, Kangaroo Point, in accordance with the lease terms, as set out in Attachment B (submitted on file) and otherwise on terms and conditions satisfactory to the Property Portfolio Manager, Asset Management, Brisbane Infrastructure, and the Chief Legal Counsel, City Legal, City Administration and Governance.

**ADOPTED**

#### K STORES BOARD SUBMISSION – AMENDMENT OF SIGNIFICANT CONTRACTING PLAN FOR THE PROVISION OF FIELD COMMUNICATIONS

**165/210/179/3702**

**321/2022-23**

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

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

120. In-field services are a key part of Council’s operations, as significant portions of Brisbane Infrastructure’s and most of Transport for Brisbane’s operations are field based. These in-field services play an important role in ensuring efficient and effective delivery of Council’s core services. These in-field services rely on a 100% available two-way radio network to ensure safe and efficient services are delivered to Brisbane residents. Compliance and Regulatory Services field staff and a range of disaster operations also rely on these radios to deliver operations. These two-way radios are also an integral part of Council’s *Zero Harm* policy regarding employee safety.

121. On 6 November 2018, Council approved a Significant Contracting Plan (SCP) for Field Communications to establish a Corporate Procurement Arrangement (CPA). A public tender was subsequently released to the market on 9 November 2018 and closed on 18 January 2019 with five submissions received. An evaluation process was then undertaken, including a clarification and negotiation process.

122. An evaluation of the Government Wireless Network (GWN) was also undertaken during this time. The GWN is a private two-way radio network funded by the Queensland Government which is used by all state operated emergency services. Some other Government agencies have also committed to this network.

123. On 15 May 2019 the tenderers to the Request for Proposal (RFP) were advised of the suspension of the evaluation process while consideration of the GWN could be completed. After comprehensive evaluation and consultation, it was determined that GWN’s offering was not acceptable to Council and that the RFP evaluation should recommence.

124. A post-market submission was approved by the Stores Board on 26 June 2020 recommending approval to establish a CPA in the form of a Preferred Supplier Arrangement (PSA) with Tait Electronics (Aust) Pty. Ltd. (Tait) as the preferred supplier. The contract with Tait was executed on 7 July 2020 with a contract commencement date of 13 July 2020, for an initial term of seven years with options to extend for additional periods of up to six years for a maximum term of 13 years inclusive of transition-in and transition-out activities.

125. A contractual term of 13 years was approved in the SCP comprising of an 18-month transition-in period, a 10‑year contract term and an 18-month transition-out period. It was identified during contract negotiations that the best commercial outcome for Council would be to enter into a contract comprising of a projected 18-month transition-in period followed by an initial contract term of seven years with options to extend for additional periods of up to six years, followed by a transition-out period of up to 18 months for a total contract period of 16 years.

126. As part of the tender evaluation, analysis was undertaken to determine comparative pricing for all five tender submissions. This analysis has identified that the estimated approval in the SCP of [Commercial-in-Confidence] million over the potential 13-year term, as inadequate to deliver the scope of services. To deliver the scope of services, an increase in estimated expenditure from [Commercial-in-Confidence] million to [Commercial-in-Confidence] million, an increase of [Commercial-in-Confidence] million, is required over the potential 16-year term.

127. The A/Chief Executive Officer and the Stores Board considered the submission, as set out in Attachment B (submitted on file), on 14 November 2022.

Purpose

128. That the Stores Board recommends approval to amend the Significant Contracting Plan (SCP) for provision of Field Communications, from an estimated expenditure of [Commercial-in-Confidence] million to [Commercial-in-Confidence] million, an increase of [Commercial-in-Confidence] million, and increase the potential maximum contract term from 13 years to 16 years.

Background/business case

129. In-field services are a key part of Council’s operations, as significant portions of Brisbane Infrastructure’s and most of Transport for Brisbane’s operations are field based. These in-field services play an important role in ensuring efficient and effective delivery of Council’s core services. These in-field services rely on a 100% available two-way radio network to ensure safe and efficient services are delivered to Brisbane residents. These two-way radios are also an integral part of Council’s *Zero Harm* policy regarding employee safety.

130. On 6 November 2018, Council approved an SCP for the provision of Field Communications to establish a Corporate Procurement Arrangement (CPA). A public tender was subsequently released to the market on 9 November 2018 and closed on 18 January 2019, with five submissions received. An evaluation process was then undertaken, which included a clarification and negotiation process.

131. An evaluation of the Government Wireless Network (GWN) was also undertaken during this time. The GWN is a private two-way radio network funded by the Queensland Government which is used by all state operated emergency services. Some other Government agencies have also committed to this network.

132. On 15 May 2019, the tenderers to the Request for Proposal (RFP) were advised of the suspension of the evaluation process while consideration of the GWN could be completed. After comprehensive evaluation and consultation, it was determined that GWN’s offering was not acceptable to Council and that the RFP evaluation should recommence.

133. As part of the tender evaluation, analysis was undertaken to determine comparative pricing for all five tender submissions. The evaluation process was then undertaken, which included a clarification and negotiation process.

134. A post-market submission was approved by Stores Board on 26 June 2020 recommending approval to establish a CPA in the form of a Preferred Supplier Arrangement (PSA) with Tait Electronics (Aust) Pty. Ltd. (Tait) as the preferred supplier. The contract with Tait was executed on 7 July 2020 with a contract commencement date of 13 July 2020, for an initial term of seven years with options to extend for additional periods of up to six years for a maximum term of 13 years inclusive of transition-in and transition-out activities.

135. Council and Tait have worked together to deliver the transition-in services with all Council vehicles now operating on the new Tait solution.

Rationale for amending the estimated expenditure total and extending the maximum contractual term

136. A contractual term of 13 years was approved in the SCP comprising of an 18-month transition-in period, a 10‑year contract term and an 18-month transition-out period. It was identified during contract negotiations that the best commercial outcome for Council would be to enter into a contract comprising of a projected 18-month transition-in period followed by an initial contract term of seven years with options to extend for additional periods of up to six years, followed by a transition-out period of up to 18 months for a total contract period of 16 years.

137. As part of the tender evaluation, analysis was undertaken to determine comparative pricing for all five tender submissions. This analysis has identified that the estimated approval in the SCP of [Commercial-in-Confidence] million over the potential 13-year term, is inadequate to deliver the scope of services.

138. Since the original approved SCP estimated annual expenditure was prepared, several material factors have changed including:

* allocation of costs to items identified during evaluation but unable to be costed until detail design developed
* increased functionality required to provide a safe working environment for Council’s in-field personnel
* projected contract term
* change in projected Consumer Price Index
* possible future volumetric changes to Council services.

139. Collectively, these factors have led to the increase in estimated cost over the extended 16-year term of the contract.

Budget availability

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

Program: 8 – City Governance

Outcome: 8.3 – Enabling and Enhancing Council

Strategy: 8.3.1 – Talented, Capable and Efficient Council

Service: 8.3.1.3 – Digital and Information Technology

Operating/Projects: Projects

Program: B – External

Outcome: B.1 – Transport for Brisbane

Strategy: B.1.1 – Transport for Brisbane

Service: B.1.1.1 – Bus Operations

Operating/Projects: Business Activity

Program: B – External

Outcome: B.2 – City Standards

Strategy: B.2.2 – City Standards

Service: B.2.2.1 – Operational Services

Operating/Projects: Business Activity

Program: 5 – Lifestyle and Community Services

Outcome: 5.6 – City Icons and Standards

Strategy: 5.6.1 – Preserve and Maintain City Hall and King George Square Precinct

Service: 5.6.1.1 – The People’s Place Precinct

Operating/Projects: Operating

Program: 6 – City Standards, Community Health and Safety

Outcome: 6.6 – Public Safety

Strategy: 6.6.1 – Public Safety

Service: 6.6.1.1 – Public Safety

Operating/Projects: Operating

Program: 2 – Infrastructure for Brisbane

Outcome: 2.1 – Roads and Transport Network Management

Strategy: 2.1.4 – Manage the Transport Network

Service: 2.1.4.1 – Manage the Network

Operating/Projects: Operating

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

142. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A  
Draft Resolution**

**DRAFT RESOLUTION TO AMEND SIGNIFICANT CONTRACTING PLAN**

As:

1. Council approved Significant Contracting Plan for Field Communications on 6 November 2018
2. the estimated expenditure for the provision of Field Communications has increased and the combined contractual term is to be extended
3. section 211(5) of the *City of Brisbane Regulation 2012* provides that Council may, by resolution, amend a Significant Contracting Plan at any time before the end of the financial year to which the plan relates

then:

1. Council resolves to amend the Significant Contracting Plan for Field Communications, as set out in Attachment B (submitted on file).

**ADOPTED**

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

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

The DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Krista ADAMS, Civic Cabinet Chair of the Economic Development and the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Sarah HUTTON that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on Tuesday 22 November 2022, be adopted.

Chair: DEPUTY MAYOR.

*At that time, 5.07pm, the Deputy Chair, Councillor Peter MATIC, assumed the Chair.*

DEPUTY MAYOR: Thank you, Mr Chair. First of all, the Business Hub coming up next week or this week leading into next week, Taking Strategy From Paper To Execution, an interactive workshop teaching attendees how to turn their strategy around in seven steps. Then on 6 December, Surprise and Delight: Enhance Your Customer Experience, an interactive workshop to create a customer journey map unique to your business. Thank you to our business experts, Impact Healthcare Consulting and Nucleus Digital, that are providing those. Again, plenty of high calibre mentors are happening as well, 51 over the last month have now joined us, so please, if you’ve got businesses that need support, send them through to the Business Hub.

Last week we did the LORD MAYOR’s Multicultural Awards for Business. It was a fantastic event that was held on 11 November after a slight delay from the Queen’s passing. It was launched in 2009 and it celebrates everything about our multicultural community that is creative, innovative and resilient. Can I congratulate Mr Johnny Shin from the Solomons Group, the Nick Xynias Multicultural Young Businessperson of the Year Award, Miss Nina Nguyen from Pakko, the Multicultural Entrepreneur of the Year and Mr George Sha from Balanz, the Multicultural Businessperson of the Year Award. Thank you, Mr Deputy Chair.

Deputy Chair: Thank you, DEPUTY MAYOR.

Further speakers? No further speakers? I’ll put the motion.

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

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

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

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – LORD MAYOR’S MULTICULTURAL AWARDS FOR BUSINESS

**322/2022-23**

1. The Manager, International Relations and Multicultural Affairs, City Planning and Sustainability, attended the meeting to provide an update on the Lord Mayor’s Multicultural Awards for Business. She provided the information below.

2. The Lord Mayor’s Multicultural Awards for Business (the Awards) was launched in 2009 to provide an opportunity for the multicultural business community to showcase their achievements and acknowledge the contribution their businesses make to Brisbane. Supported by ongoing partnerships and sponsors, the Awards celebrate the multicultural business community’s creativity, innovation and resilience.

3. The Awards were held on 11 November 2022 with more than 490 attendees, in the Main Auditorium of Brisbane City Hall. The winners were:

- Mr Johnny Shin, Solomons Group Australia – Nick Xynias Multicultural Young Business Person of the Year Award

- Ms Nina Nguyen, Pakko – Multicultural Entrepreneur of the Year Award

- Mr George Sha, Balanz – Multicultural Business Person of the Year Award.

4. The Lord Mayor’s Multicultural Business Scholarship Program (the Program) was launched in 2008 as an initiative of the Lord Mayor’s Multicultural Round Table to provide business training opportunities to Brisbane residents from multicultural backgrounds. The Program has provided more than 600 scholarships since its commencement, with a further 42 recipients in 2022 who will develop their knowledge and skills to grow a business.

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

6. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

Deputy Chair: Councillor MURPHY, Transport Committee.

### TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

Councillor Ryan MURPHY, Civic Cabinet Chair of the Transport Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Angela OWEN, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 22 November 2022, be adopted.

Deputy Chair: Councillor MURPHY.

Councillor MURPHY: Thanks very much, Deputy Chair. Just briefly, last week the Committee had a presentation on one of the major pieces of infrastructure which is under construction as part of the Brisbane Metro Project, which is the new depot at Rochedale. We heard from the project team about how construction is progressing on what will become Australia’s largest electric bus depot. To date, most of the works onsite have been earthworks, which have been a big task, given it’s a massive 10 hectare site and some of the weather conditions that we’ve been dealing with out there throughout this year.

Over 100,000 cubic metres of material has been moved to level out the site. The concrete slab for the main administration building has also now been poured, more than 300 cubic metres of concrete, which shows the scale of this facility. We recently hit another milestone with the buildings now starting to take shape out of the ground, thanks to the commencement of structural steel works. Five hundred tonnes of steel, as I mentioned in the previous report, will be used to construct the depot’s facilities, all of which will be provided by Brown Steel, which is located right here in Queensland.

As I mentioned, the facility we are constructing at Rochedale will be Australia’s largest electric bus depot and it is a very impressive sight to behold when you’re out there, Mr Deputy Chair. Cities like Sydney and Melbourne are still trying to work out how they will have the space and capacity to support the transition to an electric fleet and it’s good to know that Brisbane is once again leading the way with transition and decarbonisation of the transport task in the economy. There were also a number of other reports around the Breakfast Creek Green Bridge, the Toowong to West End Green Bridge and public transport services out in Pallara and I’ll leave further debate to the Chamber.

Deputy Chair: Thank you, Councillor MURPHY. Is there any debate?

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes. Just very briefly with respect to the Brisbane Metro Committee update. I just want to put on the record my extreme concern about the responses residents are starting to get about the bus review which indicates that Council’s not prepared to make any changes. I’m incredibly disappointed by the language I’m seeing in the response to residents. It looks like the fix is in and it’s not surprising me that Council’s not prepared to listen to residents. We heard Councillor MURPHY just a few weeks ago deliberately say he would not listen to me at all but he would listen to my constituents.

Well, they’re speaking up in droves and Council is ignoring them, telling them they will have to transfer. So, what is this sham consultation that Council is doing as part of the Brisbane Metro? I will be calling it out publicly because what I am seeing now is not genuine engagement with the community and it’s certainly very clear that Council does not want to change from the draft bus network review that they put out, despite the high level of community feedback that’s occurring. That reflects very poorly on Council.

Consultation—I know this Council has a problem with understanding what consultation means but generally, if you ask people their opinions and their views and you want to get a better outcome, you listen to them and you work with what they’re suggesting, to make something better. This LNP Administration has spent decades now doing the opposite of that and it’s very disappointing.

Deputy Chair: Further speakers?

Councillor OWEN.

Councillor OWEN: Thank you, Mr Chair. I just rise briefly to speak in regards to the petition about the Pallara bus. This is something that I would like to express gratitude for the Council officers who since March 2020 have been working extensively with me to ensure that this service can be delivered for the local residents. It will be starting in upcoming weeks and through putting together multiple business cases and supporting me with the evidence needed to convince Translink that this was a vital service, it is now going ahead. I just would like to place on the record my thanks to the Council officers who are extremely hardworking behind the scenes and this will be a great outcome for the local community.

Deputy Chair: Further speakers?

Councillor MCLACHLAN.

Councillor MCLACHLAN: Thank you, Deputy Chair. I rise to speak briefly on item B, the petition that I presented that came forward in regards to the naming of the new bridge between Albion and Newstead and the naming of the Bretts Wharf Terminal location Pensacola Convoy Place. This was a petition in two parts, which has been separated and we’ll see the results of the second part coming through this Council next week. That’s the naming of a location down at Bretts Wharf or the Pensacola Convoy Place. It was in the Environment, Parks and Sustainability Committee today and this is a good outcome.

In regard to the naming of the future bridge under construction between Newstead and Albion or Albion and Newstead, the green bridge, which will be a fantastic asset to continue the great opportunity for people to travel by active transport along the Lores Bonney Riverwalk into Newstead, I think there are opportunities to think about what that name should be that will come forward. I think the petition response indicated that it’s not appropriate to name an asset before it’s actually been constructed and the naming of that asset will be left to a future time and with further consultation. Thank you, Deputy Chair.

Deputy Chair: Thank you, Councillor.

Any further debate? No further debate?

Councillor MURPHY. No?

I’ll now put the motion.

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

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

Councillor Ryan Murphy (Civic Cabinet Chair), Councillor Angela Owen (Deputy Chair), and Councillors Jared Cassidy, Steven Huang and David McLachlan.

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE:**

Councillor Jonathan Sriranganathan.

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – BRISBANE METRO DEPOT UPDATE

**323/2022-23**

1. The Deputy Project Director, Major Projects, City Projects Office, Brisbane Infrastructure, attended the meeting to provide an update on the Brisbane Metro depot (the depot). He provided the information below.

2. The Committee was shown an aerial image of the depot site. Key features of the depot include:

- stabling and maintenance facilities for the new fleet of 60 electric metros

- five end-of-route flash chargers, which can recharge a metro in under six minutes

- six slow chargers and supporting charging infrastructure

- extensive workshop facilities to accommodate both routine maintenance and body repairs

- driver amenities and administration offices to support day-to-day running of the depot and metro fleet operations

- on-site parking for staff, visitors and people with disability.

3. Planning and land acquisition of the depot commenced in 2017, with design and construction being awarded to ADCO Constructions (ADCO) in early 2021. Between mid to late 2021, the site was prepared and early investigation works commenced. The main construction works then commenced in late 2021, which included significant earthworks, in-ground service works and building construction. The installation of charging infrastructure is expected to be completed by mid-2023, with pilot metro vehicle testing anticipated to be conducted by late 2023. The site is anticipated to be operational by late 2023.

4. To date:

- more than 100,000 cubic metres of material has been moved to ensure suitable levels across the 10-hectare site

- approximately 500 tonnes of structural steel was required for building works

- approximately 300 cubic metres of concrete was poured for the foundations of the administration building

- 80% of ADCO’s construction contract spend has occurred with local industries and businesses within Brisbane and South East Queensland.

5. Works already completed on the depot include the western busway access road and foundation works for the administration building. Works currently in progress include critical in-ground service works, such as the electrical connections to support vehicle charging; bulk excavation, foundation and pavement works; and installation of retaining walls around the site perimeter.

6. The depot design incorporates the installation of Council’s largest solar-capture facility, which will offset some of the operational demands of the Brisbane Metro. A megawatt generated from the installed solar panels will:

- provide Council clean and green energy equivalent to the power consumed by 280 Brisbane homes

- avoid carbon emissions and is equivalent to taking more than 500 cars off the road.

7. Other sustainable features of the depot include the use of harvested rainwater across the site, use of recycled water in the vehicle wash facility and a building design that will achieve a ‘5 Star’ Green Star rating through its sustainable-design solutions. The Green Building Council of Australia’s Green Star rating system is Australia’s largest voluntary and holistic sustainability rating system for buildings, fit‑outs and communities.

8. In early to mid-2023, a section of School Road, Rochdale, between Priestdale Road and the intersection with the South East Busway, will permanently close to general vehicle traffic to support the delivery of both the depot and the future South East Busway extension. Council will provide information and advance notice regarding depot works and the permanent closure of School Road, including detailed timings and expected impacts of the road closure.

9. Following a question from the Committee, the Civic Cabinet Chair thanked the Program Director for his informative presentation.

10. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

#### B PETITION – REQUESTING COUNCIL NAME THE NEW BREAKFAST CREEK GREEN BRIDGE, ‘THE BATTLE OF CORAL SEA MEMORIAL BRIDGE’, AND THE NAME OF THE POCKET PARK AT THE BRETTS WHARF FERRY TERMINAL, ‘PENSACOLA CONVOY PLACE’

**CA21/989084**

**324/2022-23**

11. A petition requesting Council name the new Breakfast Creek Green Bridge, ‘The Battle of Coral Sea Memorial Bridge’, and the name of the pocket park at the Bretts Wharf Ferry Terminal, ‘Pensacola Convoy Place’, was presented to the meeting of Council held on 24 August 2021, by Councillor David McLachlan, and received.

12. The Executive Manager, City Projects Office, Brisbane Infrastructure, provided the following information.

13. The petition contained 210 signatures. Of the petitioners, 106 live in various suburbs in the City of Brisbane, 83 live outside the City of Brisbane and 21 provided P.O. Box addresses.

**The Green Bridges Program**

14. Council is providing more transport options and responding to its growing population, making it easier for residents and visitors to travel around the city now and into the future.

15. Building and investing in Brisbane’s roads, bridges, footpaths, bike paths and e-mobility options is creating world-class public and active transport that will help residents navigate the city easily and will leave a lasting legacy as we set our sights on the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games.

16. Council’s Green Bridges Program is a vital part of this plan making it even easier for our residents and visitors to get around our city on foot, by bike or scooter, or by connecting with public transport.

17. The Green Bridges Program will deliver a new connection between Kangaroo Point and the Brisbane Central Business District (CBD), a new crossing at Breakfast Creek, and new links from Toowong to West End and St Lucia to West End.

18. Attachment B (submitted on file) shows a locality map.

19. In June 2022, the Green Bridges Program was included in Infrastructure Australia’s Infrastructure Priority List as an early-stage proposal, confirming the program is economically significant to the nation and recognising the role it will play in in shaping our city for generations to come.

**Breakfast Creek Green Bridge**

20. The Breakfast Creek Green Bridge and Lores Bonney Riverwalk extension will provide an enhanced active transport link, making it safer and more convenient to walk or ride along the river from the inner city to the northern suburbs.

21. It will ensure Brisbane continues to be a great place to live, work and relax, and will provide the perfect way for residents to explore our River City during the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games, leaving a lasting legacy for generations to come.

22. While Council appreciates suggestions from the community to name the Breakfast Creek Green Bridge, given Council is still in the early stages of delivering the project, any decision around naming of the bridge is still to be determined, with Council’s immediate priority focused on continuing with construction.

23. In March 2022, Georgiou Brady Joint Venture was announced as the successful contractor to construct the Breakfast Creek Green Bridge, following an extensive procurement process. Construction started in mid-2022, with the bridge expected to open in early 2024.

24. Council will continue to keep local residents, businesses and other stakeholders informed about the Breakfast Creek Green Bridge construction activities and milestones.

**Bretts Wharf Plaza and Parkland**

25.Delivered as part of Council’s Kingsford Smith Drive upgrade, the Bretts Wharf Plaza is a multifunctional plaza and parkland area which has been designed for residents and visitors to entertain, relax, and enjoy the stunning river views. With over 7,000m2 of revitalised outdoor space, the area includes subtropical landscaping, BBQ and picnic facilities, seating, rest nodes, a bike repair station, stepped terraces to the river’s edge, facilities for hosting events, catenary lighting, and public art.

26. The Bretts Wharf Plaza and parkland was completed in late 2019 and is easily accessible via public transport with the Bretts Wharf CityCat terminal and bus stop located adjacent to the Plaza. Following the completion of the Kingsford Smith Drive upgrade, Council is working to resolve the land tenure for this site, which is anticipated to be dedicated as parkland in the future. However, the stepped terrace at Bretts Wharf Plaza is located on Council land. Council will consider renaming parks in accordance with Council’s Naming Parks, Facilities or Tracks Procedure. Consultation on the naming of a part of Brett’s Wharf Plaza as Pensacola Convoy Place has been undertaken by the ward Councillor and a submission is being prepared for the Environment, Parks and Sustainability Committee’s consideration.

Funding

27. The Green Bridges Program is funded under the Providing Active Transport Infrastructure service.

Consultation

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

Customer impact

29. The submission responds to the petitioners’ concerns.

30. The Executive Manager recommended as follows and the Committee agreed.

31. **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:** CA21/989084

Thank you for your petition requesting Council name the new Breakfast Creek Green Bridge ‘The Battle of Coral Sea Memorial Bridge’ and name the pocket park at the Bretts Wharf Ferry Terminal ‘Pensacola Convoy Place’.

As you are aware, Council is building new green bridges across Brisbane to make it even easier to get around our city. The Breakfast Creek Green Bridge and Lores Bonney Riverwalk extension will provide an enhanced active transport link, making it safer and more convenient to walk or ride along the river from the inner city to the northern suburbs.

The new green bridge will ensure Brisbane continues to be a great place to live, work and relax, and will provide the perfect way for residents to explore our river city during the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games, leaving a lasting legacy for generations to come.

Construction for the new green bridge started in mid-2022 and is expected to open in early 2024.

While your suggestion for the Breakfast Creek Green Bridge to be named in remembrance of Brisbane’s role in World War II is appreciated, given Council is still in the early stages of delivering the project, any final naming of the bridge is still to be determined, with Council’s immediate priority focused on continuing with construction.

While Council is not currently seeking suggestions for bridge names, please be assured your suggestion has been recorded and will be considered as part of future project planning.

Council will continue to keep local residents, businesses and other stakeholders informed about the Breakfast Creek Green Bridge and will provide further information as the project progresses.

Council delivered the Bretts Wharf Plaza and parkland as part of the Kingsford Smith Drive upgrade. The land for the Plaza and parkland area was acquired for the Kingsford Smith Drive upgrade and Council is working to resolve the land tenure for this site, which is anticipated to be dedicated as parkland in the future. However, the stepped terrace at Bretts Wharf Plaza is located on Council land. Council will consider renaming parks in accordance with Council’s Naming Parks, Facilities or Tracks Procedure. Consultation on the naming of a part of Brett’s Wharf Plaza as Pensacola Convoy Place has been undertaken by the ward Councillor and a submission is being prepared for the Environment, Parks and Sustainability Committee’s consideration.

Council appreciates the importance of commemorating the history and dedication of servicemen and women during World War I and II, and notes there are several memorials located in the Hamilton and Newstead area. As you may be aware, the Bretts Wharf Plaza and parkland area features a ‘Gateway to Victory’ memorial plaque commemorating the arrival of the 27th Bomb Group and 24th Pursuit Group during World War II, which was a joint operation of the Royal Australian Air Force, QANTAS Empire Airways and the United States (US) Air Force. An interpretive sign is also featured in Bretts Wharf parkland acknowledging the use of Bretts Wharf as the main port for US transport fleets, as well as where the US Naval convoy berthed, and the US Air Force aircraft were unloaded before being assembled at Eagle Farm.

A World War I memorial dedicated to the men of Hamilton who enlisted is featured in Cameron Rocks Reserve. Several memorials are also located in Newstead Park, including a Royal Australian Navy Corvette Memorial commemorating those who served in the Bathurst Class Corvettes, the Australian American Memorial recognising the contribution from the United States of America to the defence of Australia during World War II, and a Vietnam War Memorial commemorating those who passed through the Port of Brisbane and Brisbane Airport for service in the Vietnam War.

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

If you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact the Green Bridges project team on 1800 318 166 during business hours or by email at greenbridges@brisbane.qld.gov.au.

Thank you for raising this matter.

**ADOPTED**

#### C PETITION – REQUESTING COUNCIL NAME THE TOOWONG TO WEST END GREEN BRIDGE ‘NOWRUZ BRIDGE’ AND TO CONSIDER USING PERSIAN ENGINEERING AND DESIGN METHODS WHEN CONSTRUCTING THE BRIDGE

**CA21/1152346**

**325/2022-23**

32. A petition requesting Council name the Toowong to West End Green Bridge ‘Nowruz Bridge’ and to consider using Persian engineering and design methods when constructing the bridge, was received during the Spring Recess 2021.

33. The Executive Manager, City Projects Office, Brisbane Infrastructure, provided the following information.

34. The petition contains 340 signatures. Of the petitioners, 227 live in various suburbs in the City of Brisbane and 113 live outside the City of Brisbane.

**The Green Bridges Program**

35. Council is providing more transport options and responding to its growing population, making it easier for residents and visitors to travel around the city now and into the future.

36. Building and investing in Brisbane’s roads, bridges, footpaths, bike paths and e-mobility options is creating world-class public and active transport that will help residents navigate the city easily and will leave a lasting legacy as we set our sights on the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games.

37. Council’s Green Bridges Program is a vital part of this plan making it even easier for residents and visitors to get around our city on foot, by bike or scooter or by connecting with public transport.

38. The Green Bridges Program will deliver a new connection between Kangaroo Point and the Brisbane Central Business District (CBD), a new crossing at Breakfast Creek, and new links from Toowong to West End and St Lucia to West End.

39. In June 2022, the Green Bridges Program was included in Infrastructure Australia’s Infrastructure Priority List as an early-stage proposal, confirming the program is economically significant to the nation and recognising the role it will play in shaping our city for generations to come.

**Toowong to West End Green Bridge**

40. The Toowong to West End Green Bridge will:

* offer Toowong residents direct access to markets, restaurants, art and music venues and green space in West End
* link West End residents to shopping, business and health facilities in Toowong
* enable commuters to interchange at Toowong railway station and Regatta ferry terminal, and access high-frequency bus services in West End and South Brisbane.

41. In preparing the concept design and preliminary business case, Council investigated the benefits, impacts and cost of the green bridge, and considered the potential bridge form and structure, transport and economic benefits, property impacts, constructability, and how the bridge will integrate with the surrounding environment.

42. Stone arch bridges like the Si-o-se-pol and Khaju bridges are not considered a suitable bridge form for active transport bridges across the Brisbane River. The Brisbane River is a fast‑flowing river in major events and to ensure that bridge foundations are resilient to major floods, typically the number of piers in the river are kept to a minimum.

43. The limited number of piers in the river also reduces flooding impacts to properties upstream of the bridge and minimises impacts to river users that frequently pass through the Toowong Reach of the Brisbane River. The Regional Harbourmaster also requires a 70-metre-wide navigation channel in the middle of the river at the Toowong Reach, which is difficult to achieve using a multi-arch bridge design similar to Persian-style bridges.

44. Council undertook community consultation on the concept design for the Toowong to West End Green Bridge from 15 November 2021 to 28 February 2022. At this time, Council also released the key findings of the preliminary business case for this project. The consultation period followed an initial consultation phase in late 2019, and further consultation on bridge alignment options in late 2020 and early 2021. The consultation outcomes for the concept design were released in September 2022.

45. Feedback on the concept design will play a critical role in the future development of this project, including final design treatments, ongoing connections to the citywide walking and riding network, and management of impacts during construction.

46. Following the February 2022 floods, planning for the Toowong to West End Green Bridge was paused to prioritise flood recovery activities across Brisbane. Given planning for the project has been paused, Council is not looking to name the bridge at the present time.

47. Council will seek additional contributions from the Queensland and Australian Governments to help Council deliver this critical project. If funding is secured during the flood recovery effort, Council will consider progressing the detailed design and procurement process for the Toowong to West End Green Bridge to ensure it can be delivered sooner than anticipated.

48. To ensure the necessary land is preserved for the future construction of the Toowong to West End Green Bridge, Council has been in ongoing discussions with the owners and developers of the proposed landing site for the Toowong to West End Green Bridge at 600 Coronation Drive, Toowong. Funding has been set aside this financial year to progress land acquisition at this site, confirming Council’s commitment to deliver the Toowong to West End Green Bridge, once funding is secured to deliver the project.

49. Council will continue to keep the community informed and will provide further opportunity for feedback on the Toowong to West End Green Bridge during future project planning.

Funding

50. The Green Bridges Program is funded in the 2022-23 budget for Providing Active Transport Infrastructure.

Consultation

51. Councillor James Mackay, Councillor for Walter Taylor Ward, and Councillor Jonathan Sriranganathan, Councillor for The Gabba Ward, have been consulted and support the recommendation.

Customer impact

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

53. The Executive Manager recommended as follows and the Committee agreed.

54. **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:** CA21/1152346

Thank you for your petition requesting Council name the Toowong to West End Green Bridge ‘Nowruz Bridge’ and consider using Persian engineering and design methods when constructing the bridge.

Council is building new green bridges across Brisbane to make it even easier to get around our city on foot, by bike or scooter, or by connecting with public transport. The Green Bridges Program will deliver a new connection between Kangaroo Point and the Brisbane Central Business District (CBD), a new crossing at Breakfast Creek, and new links from Toowong to West End and St Lucia to West End.

In June 2022, Infrastructure Australia identified the green bridges as nationally significant infrastructure, recognising the critical role the city-shaping program will play in shaping our city’s future.

Council recognises the positive level of support for the Toowong to West End Green Bridge as a vital cross-river link that will make it easier for residents and visitors to travel around our city into the future.

While planning for the Toowong to West End was paused in 2022 to prioritise flood recovery activities across Brisbane, Council will seek additional contributions from the Queensland and Australian Governments to help Council deliver this critical project. If funding is secured during the flood recovery effort, Council will consider progressing the bridge sooner than anticipated.

Your suggestion for the Toowong to West End Green Bridge to be named in honour of the Persian New Year is appreciated, however given planning for the project has been paused, Council is not looking to name the bridge at the present time. Please be assured your suggestion has been recorded and will be considered as part of future project planning.

In preparing the concept design and preliminary business case for this project, Council investigated the benefits, impacts and cost of the green bridge, and considered the potential bridge form and structure, transport and economic benefits, property impacts, constructability, and how the bridge will integrate with the surrounding environment.

While your suggestion to consider Persian engineering and design methods when constructing the Toowong to West End Green Bridge is also appreciated, stone arch bridges like the Si‑o‑se‑pol and Khaju bridges are not considered a suitable bridge form for active transport bridges across the Brisbane River. The Brisbane River is a fast-flowing river in major events and to ensure that bridge foundations are resilient to major floods, typically the number of piers in the river are kept to a minimum.

The limited number of piers in the river also reduces flooding impacts to properties upstream of the bridge and minimises impacts to river users that frequently pass through the Toowong Reach of the Brisbane River. The Regional Harbourmaster also requires a 70-metre-wide navigation channel in the middle of the river at the Toowong Reach which is difficult to achieve using a multi-arch bridge design similar to Persian-style bridges.

Council undertook community consultation on the concept design for the Toowong to West End Green Bridge from 15 November 2021 to 28 February 2022. At this time, Council also released the key findings of the preliminary business case for this project. The consultation period followed an initial consultation phase in late 2019, and further consultation on bridge alignment options in late 2020 and early 2021. The consultation outcomes for the concept design were released in September 2022 and are available on Council’s website.

Feedback on the concept design will play a critical role in future stages of planning, including the final bridge design, ongoing connections to the citywide walking and riding network, and management of impacts during construction, once funding for the project is secured.

Council will continue to keep the community informed and will provide further opportunity for feedback on the Toowong to West End Green Bridge during future project planning.

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

If you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact the Green Bridges project team on 1800 318 166 during business hours or by email at greenbridges@brisbane.qld.gov.au.

Thank you for raising this matter.

**ADOPTED**

#### D PETITION – REQUESTING PUBLIC TRANSPORT SERVICES FOR THE RESIDENTS OF PALLARA

**137/220/594/64**

**326/2022-23**

55. A petition requesting public transport services for the residents of Pallara, was presented to the meeting of Council held on 1 February 2022, by Councillor Angela Owen, and received.

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

57. The petition contains five signatures, with only one petitioner residing in Pallara.

58. Council operates its bus services under a contract with Translink, a division of the Queensland Government’s Department of Transport and Main Roads. Translink is responsible for the delivery of public transport services and infrastructure for South East Queensland.

59. Council received a petition in 2018, requesting Translink bus services be provided to the Pallara Estate, Pallara. The petitioners were advised that from the start of the 2019 school year, the district route 803 service to Pallara State School would be extended to include the bus bay stop on Gooderham Road, Pallara (in front of the Pallara Estate). In addition, a referral to Translink was made by Council requesting consideration be given for bus services in Pallara.

60. Translink has the overall responsibility for approving and funding any new bus services or changes to services. In determining any bus network expansion, Council works with Translink to ensure that services will be well utilised and meet customer demand. Since 2019, Council, along with the Civic Cabinet Chair for the Transport Committee and the local Councillor, has corresponded with the Queensland Government and Translink to advocate for increased public transport services in Pallara. In advocating for bus services for the residents of Pallara an on‑site meeting was held on 5 October 2021, between Councillor Angela Owen, Translink and Council officers.

61. Council recognises the rapid growth and new developments in the suburb of Pallara and with these new developments, the suburb’s growth and population has risen, particularly around Pallara State School. Council recognises the importance that public and active transport initiatives will play in moving people around Pallara safely and efficiently. In light of this, Council has submitted a number of proposals and formal business cases (since May 2020) to Translink for bus services to be provided. A business case has now been accepted by Translink.

62. Council allocated funds to design and construct new bus stops in Pallara in preparation for funding and approval of new bus services for Pallara by Translink.

63. All bus stops are now complete with Translink approving and funding an extension and realignment of the route 126 bus service to Pallara and Heathwood.

64. The route 126 extension will commence on 12 December 2022 and will operate from Sunnybank Plaza to Pallara (Stockland Estate and Ritchie Road) and Heathwood. This will create high-level connections with high-frequency bus services to the city and the wider network, with rail connections at Altandi station, including express connections on the Beenleigh and Gold Coast lines.

Consultation

65. Councillor Angela Owen, Councillor for Calamvale Ward, has been consulted and supports the recommendation.

Customer impact

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

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

68. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A**

**Draft Response**

**Petition Reference:** 137/220/594/64

Thank you for your petition requesting public transport services for Pallara.

Council operates its bus services under a contract with Translink, a division of the Queensland Government’s Department of Transport and Main Roads. Translink is responsible for the delivery of public transport services and infrastructure for South East Queensland.

Council received a petition in 2018, requesting Translink bus services be provided to the Pallara Estate, Pallara. The petitioners were advised that from the start of the 2019 school year, the district route 803 service to Pallara State School would be extended to include the bus bay stop on Gooderham Road, Pallara (in front of the Pallara Estate). In addition, a referral to Translink was made by Council requesting consideration be given for bus services in Pallara.

Translink has the overall responsibility for approving and funding any new bus services or changes to services. In determining any bus network expansion, Council works with Translink to ensure that services will be well utilised and meet customer demand. Since 2019, Council, along with the Civic Cabinet Chair for the Transport Committee and the local Councillor, has corresponded with the Queensland Government and Translink to advocate for increased public transport services in Pallara. In advocating for bus services for the residents of Pallara an on‑site meeting was held on 5 October 2021, between Councillor Angela Owen, Translink and Council officers.

Council recognises the rapid growth and new developments in the suburb of Pallara and with these new developments, the suburb’s growth and population has risen, particularly around Pallara State School. Council recognises the importance that public and active transport initiatives will play in moving people around Pallara safely and efficiently. In light of this, Council has submitted a number of proposals and formal business cases (since May 2020) to Translink for bus services to be provided. A business case has now been accepted by Translink.

Council allocated funds to design and construct new bus stops in Pallara in preparation for funding and approval of new bus services for Pallara by Translink.

All bus stops are now complete with Translink approving and funding an extension and realignment of the route 126 bus service to Pallara and Heathwood.

The route 126 extension will commence on 12 December 2022 and will operate from Sunnybank Plaza to Pallara (Stockland Estate and Ritchie Road) and Heathwood. This will create high-level connections with high-frequency bus services to the city and the wider network, with rail connections at Altandi station, including express connections on the Beenleigh and Gold Coast lines.

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

Should you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact Selena Beaverson, Executive Assistant, Transport for Brisbane on (07) 340 72216.

Thank you for raising this matter.

**ADOPTED**

Deputy Chair: Councillor WINES, the Infrastructure Committee.

### INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE

Councillor Andrew WINES, Civic Cabinet Chair of the Infrastructure Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Sarah HUTTON, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on Tuesday 22 November 2022, be adopted.

Deputy Chair: Councillor WINES.

Councillor WINES: Thank you, Mr Chair. Very briefly, the presentation to Committee last week was the ordinary quarterly major projects planning presentation that we receive to make sure that all Committee members are across major inner city projects that are occurring. Once again, I will pre-empt criticism: this is always an inner city presentation. We have many projects across the city from Indooroopilly to Bracken Ridge to Rochedale—the very southeast corner, so I just want to pre-empt that early. We had two petitions there which I suspect the local Councillors will respond to.

Deputy Chair: Thank you, Councillor. Further debate?

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, I rise to speak briefly on items A and B. Just very briefly on item A. I’m sure that the LNP thought it was a great idea to bring forward these inner city projects to talk about in the Chamber. The Brisbane Metro is going so badly and so are the two green bridges that are on here, so I just don’t understand what they think this is doing. When you blow out the cost of these major projects by hundreds of millions of dollars, you delay them, it causes impacts on the delivery of other projects, it causes the Council’s budget to be impacted adversely, it’s not a good thing. It’s not a good thing.

I can see why you have to talk about everybody else’s projects, State Government and private sector projects, but the really interesting part is the damage, the absolute destruction and damage that Council has done to the unnecessary battery charging station under the Eleanor Schonell Bridge. It is just—to destroy parkland like that, to destroy vegetation like that, all because this Council could not put its charging and battery station on the UQ side, is just shocking. The actual destruction of parkland is bigger than a house block. The batteries themselves are bigger than a house block.

Council’s knocking down trees to deliver it. They then have to string power cables up under the bridge and carry them all the way across the river to the other side on UQ where the Metro station end charging facility is going to be. The loss of power through transmission in that way is going to have an adverse impact. The loss of greenspace and parkland on the southern side of the river is just appalling. This is one of the aspects of the proposal that has gone so badly, so not only are these buses not going to benefit most of my ward, we’re losing trees and greenspaces, which is just really sad.

I don’t know why the Administration thinks it needs to keep talking about these projects because they’re not going well. They are not going well and if you think they are, then you must be that out of touch, that bloated and haggard that you really have no idea, no idea, that these things are not going well. Well, I don’t know how else to describe it. There doesn’t seem to be any oversight of what’s going on here, there doesn’t seem to be any kind of accountability or responsibility for a $0.5 billion cost blowout.

That’s fine. According to the LNP, if you want to overspend by $0.5 billion, there’s nothing to see here. If you can’t recognise that that is a problem, then there’s something wrong with you.

Now, item B. I don’t support this do-nothing response. Now, this is a great example of where Brisbane City Council is absolutely failing Yeronga residents. So, remember earlier today I talked about the very significant growth that’s happening in the suburb of Yeerongpilly and Yeronga. Based on Council’s current and future population projections under the LGIP, there’s going to be more houses in Yeronga than there will be in Pallara and Bridgeman Downs.

Now, I found it interesting listening to the Councillor for Calamvale when she talked about how big one of the stages of development in her area was and there were 45 new houses that had gone in. Forty-five new houses, woohoo. We’ve got 250 units going in on a park at the moment. We’ve had 400 go in in a retirement village. We’ve got another 600 coming on a TAFE site and we’re losing all these community facilities to development. There’ll be more people living in Yeronga than there will be in Pallara and they’re not going to see a cent.

Councillor MURPHY: Point of order, Chair.

Deputy Chair: Point of order, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor MURPHY: I just don’t know what’s relevant to the report in this. It’s become a bit of a spray.

Deputy Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, could you please bring your comments back to the actual petition in regards to the relevant—

Councillor JOHNSTON: I understand. Yes, I understand that they don’t want me to point out the hypocrisy of what they’re doing but let me read a line from here. The design, planning and construction of large traffic bridges is a very expensive undertaking. Where’s another good line? At this time, there’s no funding or timeframe to widen the Cardross Street overpass for general traffic and/or pedestrian movements. There’s a high demand for road network improvements throughout Brisbane and consideration of funding for specific proposals are subject to an assessment of their priority relevant to other similar citywide projects. So, let’s talk about other similar citywide projects.

Deputy Chair: No, no, Councillor JOHNSTON, no.

Councillor JOHNSTON: No, no, in terms of they’re comparing—

Deputy Chair: No.

Councillor JOHNSTON: They’re comparing the—

Deputy Chair: No, Councillor JOHNSTON. Councillor JOHNSTON, if I could just take you back for a moment. I’m not trying to curb your debate; you have the right to speak.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, you are.

Deputy Chair: No.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, you are.

Deputy Chair: What I’m saying to you is that you need to speak to the report and—

Councillor JOHNSTON: I am talking about this.

Deputy Chair: No, no, what’s in the report, not outside of the report.

Councillor JOHNSTON: That is what is in the report. I just quoted from the report.

Deputy Chair: No.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Paragraph 15, paragraph 16.

Deputy Chair: Yes.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Brisbane City Council is saying no to a pedestrian and road bridge in Yeronga but they’re saying yes to areas in Pallara and Bridgeman Downs where there is less development, less houses, less people—

Deputy Chair: No, Councillor, that’s not—

Councillor JOHNSTON: —and less infrastructure need.

Deputy Chair: No, Councillor JOHNSTON, they’re not in the—

Councillor JOHNSTON: The priorities of Brisbane City Council in delivering this response to the petition demonstrates that Council is funding its own areas.

Councillor MURPHY: Point of order, Chair.

Deputy Chair: No, Councillor JOHNSTON, you need to stop. Just a moment, Councillor MURPHY.

Councillor JOHNSTON: I’m talking about this.

Deputy Chair: Councillor, that is not in the report.

Councillor JOHNSTON: It is in the report.

Deputy Chair: No, no, it simply talks about citywide priorities. You’ve made the conclusion yourself.

Councillor JOHNSTON: I am allowed to debate.

Deputy Chair: I’d like to bring you back to what’s actually in the report.

Councillor JOHNSTON: So, you’re saying I can’t debate what’s in the report?

Deputy Chair: No, I’m saying that you should debate what’s in the report and you’re not.

Councillor JOHNSTON: I am debating what’s in the report.

Deputy Chair: So, I’m taking you back and I’m saying either please debate what’s in the report or sit down.

Councillor JOHNSTON: I am. I am.

Deputy Chair: Please proceed.

Councillor JOHNSTON: I am saying—

Deputy Chair: No, no, please proceed.

Councillor JOHNSTON: —that Brisbane City Council is saying no to funding a bridge and pedestrian upgrades in Yeronga because it’s not a priority. Where are they—

Deputy Chair: No, it’s not saying that.

Councillor JOHNSTON: That’s what it says.

Deputy Chair: No. Councillor JOHNSTON, I’m taking you back to what’s in here. Like you said, you have some leniency to make some conclusions but you’re going way off the report. Please come back to the report or sit down.

Councillor JOHNSTON: It’s exactly what it says in paragraph 16.

Deputy Chair: No.

Councillor JOHNSTON: A high demand for the road network, funding of other specific proposals, assessment of their priority relative to other citywide projects. There’s no funding for Cardross Street. Council has decided that there are other projects more important than this suburb that has more development happening in it than areas that have been prioritised in this city. That is fundamentally the problem with this petition response. It does not reflect what is happening on the ground in Yeronga with respect to the amount of development. It does not reflect the importance of this road bridge over the rail line for emergency flood access.

When the roads are cut, it is the only east-west connection between Annerley-Yeronga and it does not reflect the fact that there are massive developments happening all around this area. It does not reflect the significant traffic and accident history. There is a footpath less than a metre wide and it is absolutely appalling that this Council is refusing—refusing—to upgrade this road and pedestrian bridge to make it safe, to make it functional and to make it suitable for the huge volume of traffic that uses Cardross Street and Fairfield Road every day. Lives are being put at risk by Council’s inaction and why? Because they want to prioritise suburbs like Pallara and Bridgeman Downs where there’s not as much growth happening because they’re LNP wards. That’s appalling.

Deputy Chair: Further debate? No further debate?

Councillor WINES.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order.

Deputy Chair: Point of order, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, I’d just ask that item B and C be taken seriatim for voting purposes.

Deputy Chair: Sorry, Councillor JOHNSTON, the advice is you needed to do that at the beginning before you debate.

Councillor WINES: Point of order.

Deputy Chair: Oh—

Councillor WINES: No, look, point of order.

**Seriatim for voting - Clauses B and C**

|  |
| --- |
| Councillor Andrew WINES requested that Clauses B, PETITIONS – REQUESTING COUNCIL WORK WITH THE QUEENSLAND GOVERNMENT TO WIDEN THE RAIL OVERPASS AT CARDROSS STREET, YEERONGPILLY; and Clause C, PETITION – REQUESTING COUNCIL INSTALL TRAFFIC CALMING ON PATEN ROAD, THE GAP, be taken seriatim for voting purposes. |

Deputy Chair: Okay. We’ll take—

Councillor WINES: Really, it does not matter. It’s the start of my speech. It’s immaterial whether we vote them all at once or separate. I’m happy to propose it.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order. Could you just point me to the rule that says that, though? If you want to debate it separately.

Councillor WINES: Mr Chair, while the clerks are attending to that, can I just carry on?

Deputy Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, the advice is section 44(2) for the debate of the motion and section 44(3) for the putting of the motion.

Councillor JOHNSTON: For the what?

Deputy Chair: Putting the motion.

Councillor JOHNSTON: And it says it has to be done—

Deputy Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON, it’s prior to my exercising the right of reply. I had already called on Councillor WINES and then you made the call.

Councillor JOHNSTON: So, it’s not before I speak, the ruling is that it has to come before—

Deputy Chair: I’m happy to be clarified. Happy to be clarified, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Thank you. I just wanted—thank you.

Deputy Chair: Yes. Councillor WINES.

Councillor WINES: No, thanks, Mr Chair. I always appreciate an opportunity to speak to these matters. Can I just once again remind Councillors that we bring this to every quarter? It’s something we discuss. The report’s something we do every quarter. It’s part of our ordinary management, part of the fundamental and sensible and rational things we do here to make sure that everybody in this place is informed. There’s been some really quite bizarre accusations that everything we do and say is political but largely, those accusations have been made by individuals who are deeply political in all that they say and do, so I suspect they are projecting their motives onto us, rather than us conducting ourselves in the manner that they would suggest.

Also, as you know, Mr Chair, I always love an autobiographical moment. I myself from grade 1 through 5 was an attendee of a wonderful educational institution called Yeronga State School and as a person who is very familiar with Yeronga, I well know Cardross Street. The benefit of my education at Yeronga State School allowed me to read and allowed me to understand the delineation between Council and State. Now, there was quite an aggressive series of assertions made that Council was not living up to its responsibilities because of political reasons and then much quoting from the report but this was never read out, but I think it should be.

The Cardross Street Rail Overpass, which is owned by Queensland Rail—owned by Queensland Rail and so all of those accusations levelled at us only moments ago, can I encourage the Councillor to aim them where they belong, at the State Government, at the owner of the bridge, Queensland Rail. Now, I’m not going to sit here and defend Queensland Rail. They are notoriously limited in what they maintain.

Deputy Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor WINES: But I can tell you that the passion with which Councillor JOHNSTON entered that debate should be aimed where it belongs, not at her Council colleagues, but at Queensland Rail. Can I encourage her to rather than blame us, blame the people who own the bridge?

Deputy Chair: Sorry, I’ve got to do in seriatim for voting for items B and C. I’m sorry. I’ll start with item A.

Councillor JOHNSTON: No, I thought you said—

*Councillors interjecting.*

Deputy Chair: Oh, sorry. Sorry, sorry. Sorry, I’m having my own moment. I’m sorry, I’m having my own moment.

Deputy Chair: I will put the motion. Councillor JOHNSTON is correct, we are not—Councillor JOHNSTON is correct in saying that we are not going seriatim, we are simply voting on the item.

Councillor WINES: Point of order, Mr Chair. I proposed they be separate.

Deputy Chair: Do you—

Councillor WINES: I did. I proposed in my speech that they be separate.

Deputy Chair: Okay. Okay. All right, since Councillor WINES proposed in his speech that items B and C be seriatim for the purposes of voting, we will do them all separately. So—

Councillor JOHNSTON: He can’t.

*Councillors interjecting.*

Deputy Chair: He can.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Once you call him to reply—the ruling was, once you called upon him to reply, he can’t do—

Deputy Chair: No, you can’t.

Councillor JOHNSTON: No, he can’t.

Deputy Chair: No, but it’s his speech.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Does it say he—

Deputy Chair: Yes. So, let’s vote.

**Clause A put**

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

Deputy Chair: Item B.

**Clause B put**

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

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

The voting was as follows:

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

NOES: 4 - The Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Jared CASSIDY, and Councillors Kara COOK, Charles STRUNK and Nicole JOHNSTON.

Deputy Chair: We will quickly vote on item C. Okay.

**Clause C put**

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

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

The voting was as follows:

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

NOES: 4 - The Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Jared CASSIDY, and Councillors Kara COOK, Charles STRUNK and Nicole JOHNSTON.

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

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

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE:**

Councillor Steve Griffiths.

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – INNER CITY PROJECTS CONSTRUCTION UPDATE – NOVEMBER 2022

**327/2022-23**

1. The Major Projects Planning Manager, Transport Planning and Operations, Brisbane Infrastructure, attended the meeting to provide a construction update of Council’s inner city projects. She provided the information below.

2. There are currently four major projects underway in Brisbane:

- Cross River Rail (CRR)

- Brisbane Metro

- Queen’s Wharf Brisbane (QWB)

- Breakfast Creek and Kangaroo Point Green Bridges.

3. CRR construction activities currently planned or in progress include:

- internal access roads and a rail bridge over Breakfast Creek

- Inner Northern Busway platform 2 construction works at Roma Street station

- tunnel fit out and rail construction works at Albert Street, Brisbane and Woolloongabba stations

- southern tunnel portal and new shared pedestrian and cycle path construction at Kent Street and Boggo Road, Dutton Park

- demolition of the existing Exhibition station at Bowen Hills

- earthworks and drainage at Fairfield station and Clapham Yard, Yeerongpilly

- station entry, construction of platforms 2 and 3 and a new pedestrian overpass at Yeronga Station

- site upgrades at Rocklea station.

4. Brisbane Metro construction activities currently planned or in progress include:

- works to Metro fast-charging sites located at UQ Lakes station, Countess Street, Brisbane and Ernie’s Roundabout, Bowen Hills

- tunnel connection works at King George Square

- tunnel portal works and road resurfacing of Adelaide Street, Brisbane

- strengthening works and lane reconfigurations of Victoria Bridge

- temporary outbound platforms at the Cultural Centre station and traffic changes at Grey and Melbourne Streets, South Brisbane

- service relocation works at Buranda busway station and partial road closure of O’Keefe Street, Woolloongabba

- significant site works for the Metro depot and closure of School Road, Rochedale scheduled for early to mid-2023.

5. QWB construction activities currently planned or in progress include:

- precinct piling, heritage base, basement excavation and structural support works within QWB Precinct 3 (residential tower precinct)

- construction works of the integrated resort development

- mast installation works at the Neville Bonner Bridge.

6. Construction works continue on both the Breakfast Creek and Kangaroo Point green bridges:

- Breakfast Creek Green Bridge:

- the centre median lanes of Breakfast Creek Road have been removed and a lateral shift of traffic to the western side completed

- closure of the eastern footpath of the Breakfast Creek Road bridge

- continuation of bridge enabling works and piling operations.

- Kangaroo Point Green Bridge:

- recommencement of piling works and return of all marine plant and equipment to site following the February 2022 flood event

- land piling works of piers 6 and 7 at C.T. White Park, Bright Street, Kangaroo Point

- lighting upgrades and retaining wall construction at the Main and Deakin Streets, Kangaroo Point connection.

7. The Committee was shown a map and report of the Inner City Network, a network of 16 road corridors located within a five-kilometre radius of the CBD. The report provided traffic data within the inner city, such as average traffic volumes, travel time and average network speed. Traffic indicators noted that traffic volumes along the suburban network have returned to pre‑2020 levels.

8. Following a number of questions from the Committee, the Civic Cabinet Chair thanked the Major Projects Planning Manager for her informative presentation.

9. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

#### B PETITIONS – REQUESTING COUNCIL WORK WITH THE QUEENSLAND GOVERNMENT TO WIDEN THE RAIL OVERPASS AT CARDROSS STREET, YEERONGPILLY

**137/220/594/50 and 137/220/594/54**

**328/2022-23**

10. Two petitions from residents, requesting Council work with the Queensland Government to widen the rail overpass at Cardross Street, Yeerongpilly, were presented to the meeting of Council held on 7 December 2021, by Councillor Nicole Johnston, and received.

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

12. The petitions contain 670 signatures. The majority of petitioners live in the Moorooka and Tennyson Wards, and eight live outside the City of Brisbane.

13. The Cardross Street rail overpass, which is owned by Queensland Rail (QR), connects the eastern side of Cardross Street with the western side, which intersects with Fairfield Road. Cardross Street connects to School Road, Annerley, both of which are classified as District roads in Council’s *Brisbane City Plan 2014* road hierarchy and provide a connection between Ipswich Road and Fairfield Road for local residential areas. District roads facilitate the movement of people and goods to and through suburbs, including buses and heavy vehicles.

14. Council has a long-term plan to improve the Cardross Street connection over the railway line to Fairfield Road. However, any road widening project on Cardross Street would require significant modification or replacement of the existing QR bridge structure. Consultation with QR, as the manager of the rail corridor land, would be required to ensure that any future works are consistent with new standards and/or planned upgrades to the rail corridor. This may include, for example, increasing the clearance between the bridge and railway (electrical) catenary infrastructure or the need to accommodate larger rollingstock.

15. The planning, design and construction of large traffic bridges is a very expensive undertaking and, in this case, would require substantial financial support from the Queensland Government. It is noted that if QR requires increased clearances, that this would incur significant financial costs, engineering constraints, as well as potentially significant impacts to adjoining properties.

16. At this time, there is no funding and/or timeframe to widen the Cardross Street overpass for general traffic and/or pedestrian movements. There is a high demand for road network improvements throughout Brisbane and consideration for funding of specific proposals are subject to an assessment of their priority relative to other similar citywide projects. This budgetary requirement ensures that Council’s resources are directed to the streets and areas most in need of such traffic management works, including those that offer the greatest benefit in terms of safety and amenity to the wider community.

17. Council endeavours to optimise the available signal phases to suit the traffic demand on each approach at intersections. Council will continue to monitor the signal timings at the intersection of Fairfield Road and Cardross Street to maintain a suitable balance between road safety, minimising general delay and restricting queues on critical approaches.

18. It is recommended that the information in this submission be noted and the draft response, as set out in Attachment A, be sent to the head petitioner.

Consultation

19. Councillor Nicole Johnston, Councillor for Tennyson Ward, has been consulted and does not support the recommendation.

Customer impact

20. The submission responds to the petitioners’ concerns.

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

22. **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 References:** 137/220/594/50 and 137/220/594/54

Thank you for your petitions requesting Council work with the Queensland Government to widen the rail overpass at Cardross Street, Yeerongpilly.

Council has a long-term plan to improve the Cardross Street connection over the railway line to Fairfield Road. However, any road widening project on Cardross Street would require significant modification or replacement of the existing Queensland Rail (QR) owned bridge structure. Consultation with QR, as the manager of the rail corridor land, would be required to ensure that any future works are consistent with new standards and/or planned upgrades to the rail corridor. This may include, for example, increasing the clearance between the bridge and railway (electrical) catenary infrastructure or the need to accommodate larger rollingstock.

The planning, design and construction of large traffic bridges is a very expensive undertaking and, in this case, would require substantial financial support from the Queensland Government. It is noted that if QR requires increased clearances, that this would incur significant financial costs, engineering constraints, as well as potentially significant impacts to adjoining properties.

At this time, there is no funding and/or timeframe to widen the Cardross Street overpass for general traffic and/or pedestrian movements. There is a high demand for road network improvements throughout Brisbane and consideration for funding of specific proposals are subject to an assessment of their priority relative to other similar citywide projects. This budgetary requirement ensures that Council’s resources are directed to the streets and areas most in need of such traffic management works, including those that offer the greatest benefit in terms of safety and amenity to the wider community.

Council endeavours to optimise the available signal phases to suit the traffic demand on each approach at intersections. Council will continue to monitor the signal timings at the intersection of Fairfield Road and Cardross Street to maintain a suitable balance between road safety, minimising general delay and restricting queues on critical approaches.

Should you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact Mr Damian Burke, Senior Strategic Transport Planner, Policy, Strategy and Planning, Transport Planning and Operations, Brisbane Infrastructure, on (07) 3403 7676.

Thank you for raising this matter.

**ADOPTED**

#### C PETITION – REQUESTING COUNCIL INSTALL TRAFFIC CALMING ON PATEN ROAD, THE GAP

**137/220/594/117**

**329/2022-23**

23. A petition requesting Council install traffic calming on Paten Road, The Gap, was received during the Winter Recess 2022.

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

25. The petition contains four signatures. All petitioners live on Paten Road.

26. Paten Road has a speed limit of 50 km/h and is classified as neighbourhood road in Council’s *Brisbane City Plan 2014* road hierarchy, providing access to local residential properties. One section of Paten Road provides access to Grenoble Street, and the other section turns into a no through road.

27. The petitioners’ request for Council to install traffic calming on Paten Road has been noted. The installation of traffic calming devices, such as speed platforms, chicanes and traffic islands, which may be landscaped in some cases, may be used to discourage use from non-local traffic and to moderate vehicle speeds, improving safety for all road users. Traffic calming devices are generally applied to local and neighbourhood access roads, which primarily provide access to dwellings, residential buildings and other local streets, with limited traffic movements.

28. Council considers the installation of traffic calming devices only where there is a combination of both a demonstrated widespread issue of non-local traffic utilising the street and where there is a demonstrated speeding issue. Speeding issues alone are not sufficient to consider the use of traffic calming devices as speeding in isolation is considered a driver behaviour issue.

29. A review of the road network surrounding Paten Road has been completed. The review has confirmed that Paten Road and the connecting neighbourhood streets do not offer any travel time or distance savings for motorists attempting to avoid congestion from the nearby major road network, such as Payne Road and Waterworks Road. Paten Road is not subjected to significant non-local traffic use, with most road users residing in or visiting the local precinct. As such, the installation of traffic calming devices in Paten Road cannot be considered.

30. In 2016, Council installed a speed limit sign on Paten Road, to remind drivers of the 50 km/h speed limit in built up areas. With clear delineation of the speed limit in place, drivers speeding along Paten Road are doing so knowingly. Speeding is primarily a behavioural issue best managed through enforcement of the road rules by the Queensland Police Service (QPS). As such, the petitioners are encouraged to raise any concerns with speeding motorists directly with the QPS via the Hoon Hotline on 13 HOON (13 46 66).

31. It is recommended that the information in this submission be noted and the draft response, as set out in Attachment A, be sent to the head petitioner.

Consultation

32. Councillor Steve Toomey, Councillor for The Gap Ward, has been consulted and supports the recommendation.

Customer impact

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

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

35. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A**

**Draft Response**

**Petition Reference:** 137/220/594/117

Thank you for your petition requesting Council install a traffic calming on Paten Road, The Gap.

Your request for Council to install traffic calming on Paten Road has been noted. The installation of traffic calming devices, such as speed platforms, chicanes and traffic islands, which may be landscaped in some cases, may be used to discourage use from non-local traffic and to moderate vehicle speeds, improving safety for all road users. Traffic calming devices are generally applied to local and neighbourhood access roads, which primarily provide access to dwellings, residential buildings and other local streets, with limited traffic movements.

Council considers the installation of traffic calming devices only where there is a combination of both a demonstrated widespread issue of non-local traffic utilising the street and where there is a demonstrated speeding issue. Speeding issues alone are not sufficient to consider the use of traffic calming devices as speeding in isolation is considered a driver behaviour issue.

A review of the road network surrounding Paten Road has been completed. The review has confirmed that Paten Road and the connecting neighbourhood streets do not offer any travel time or distance savings for motorists attempting to avoid congestion from the nearby major road network, such as Payne Road and Waterworks Road. Paten Road is not subjected to significant non-local traffic use, with most road users residing in or visiting the local precinct. As such, the installation of traffic calming devices in Paten Road cannot be considered.

In 2016, Council installed a speed limit sign on Paten Road, to remind drivers of the 50km/h speed limit in built up areas. With clear delineation of the speed limit in place, drivers speeding along Paten Road are doing so knowingly. Speeding is primarily a behavioural issue best managed through enforcement of the road rules by the Queensland Police Service (QPS). As such, you are encouraged to raise any concerns with speeding motorists directly with the QPS via the Hoon Hotline on 13 HOON (13 46 66).

Should you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact Mr Kevin Chen, Transport Network Engineer, Transport Network Operations, Transport Planning and Operations, Brisbane Infrastructure, on (07) 3178 2019.

Thank you for raising this matter.

**ADOPTED**

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

### CITY PLANNING AND SUBURBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE

Councillor Adam ALLAN, Civic Cabinet Chair of the City Planning and Suburban Renewal Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Fiona HAMMOND that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on Tuesday 22 November 2022, be adopted.

Deputy Chair: Councillor ALLAN, any debate?

Councillor ALLAN: Thank you, Mr Chair. item A was a Committee presentation—the development at 8 Foxton Street, Indooroopilly. The approved development will see the construction of a six-storey mixed use development incorporating ground level commercial tenancies, two levels of office space and 15 dwelling units. It also includes three levels of basement car parking. Importantly, the dwellings are concentrated around existing and future public transport nodes which will encourage greater use of public transport services in the area.

This development is of a height and scale and form that achieves the intended outcome for the precinct, improves the amenity of the neighbourhood plan area and contributes to a cohesive streetscape and a built-form character. The development application was subject to impact assessment and as such public notification was undertaken. No submissions or public comments were received for the development.

Item B was a petition requesting that Council make property developers keep safety fences within boundaries and off public footpaths. The petition had 66 signatures. The response to the head petitioner will outline that temporary construction fences are assessed as part of the planning for the development. Council is conscious that it needs to put up fencing to make sure that pedestrians are safe. These particular fences are of a type that ensures that residents can move safely past construction sites but obviously, construction sites can inherently be challenging, particularly when materials and things are being delivered.

So, while we do attempt to maintain a 1.2 to 1.5 metre-wide footpath, additionally these footpath permits are for a three-month period only and Council reviews these periodically to make sure community expectations are being met. I’ll leave further debate to the Chamber.

Deputy Chair: Thank you, Councillor ALLAN.

Further debate?

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, thank you.

**Seriatim for voting - Clause B**

|  |
| --- |
| Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON requested that Clause B, PETITION – REQUESTING COUNCIL MAKE PROPERTY DEVELOPERS KEEP SAFETY FENCING WITHIN BOUNDARIES AND OFF PUBLIC FOOTPATHS, be taken seriatim for voting purposes. |

Councillor JOHNSTON: The 66 residents who have spoken up about this problem with safety fencing around construction sites in Brisbane are doing so for good reason. We know that people with prams, the elderly and people with disabilities struggle to negotiate Brisbane’s bad footpath network now but when development is happening, there are massive, massive problems with the way in which developers take up the whole footpath, poorly maintain the footpath, don’t provide appropriate diversions, don’t provide ramps, don’t provide them in safe ways and in many cases don’t even have approval to do this.

The information that Councillor ALLAN just provided then is—honestly, it’s like it’s some sort of fantasy land idea of how this works out in the suburbs. Wherever possible in high pedestrian traffic areas Council does not support the full closures of footpaths. Well, in my ward, if it leads to a shop, it’s fully closed. If it leads to a district centre, it’s fully closed. If it leads to parks, it gets fully closed. I’m not sure where else you would consider to be a high traffic area but that’s what’s been happening out in my ward for years and years and years.

Yes, we do complain constantly about the state of full footpath closures and also partial footpath closures. This goes on to say that Council normally requires the provision of a pedestrian path on the roadway with pedestrians protected by approved water-filled barriers. I mean, that doesn’t happen. There’s one right now at about 584 Sherwood Road. You can’t walk on the footpath; it’s all gravel. There’s another one around the corner in Primrose Street where the safety fencing’s been up over the whole footpath and you’ve just got to walk out onto the road and take your chances. There’s no way to get round it.

It goes on to say that Council limits footpath permits to three-month periods. I mean, that’s hilarious. Whoever’s got the job of renewing those every three months must be the busiest Council officer in Brisbane because most of these permits are in place for years and years. It is appalling for Council to say that these are limited mainly to three-month periods and prior to extension being granted, Council looks at community feedback. I’d like to ask Councillor ALLAN how many permit extensions have been refused, through you, Mr Chairman.

How many have been refused? That’s what I’d like to know. Councillor ALLAN seems to think that this is something that’s happening to protect pedestrians but I know the ones that ring me, cyclists, pedestrians, mums with prams, these things are getting approved for years at a time, not months at a time. I just think Council has been unrealistic about the adverse impacts this causes for the safety and amenity of pedestrians when footpaths are fully closed, particularly for mums with prams and people in wheelchairs and the elderly.

It’s hard enough negotiating Council’s dodgy footpaths now but when these developments are happening, it is extremely difficult to safely move around them. It is just astonishing for me that Council—if I said this to some of the residents that raise it with me, they would just laugh at Council. Three months? You must be dreaming.

Deputy Chair: Further debate? No further debate?

Councillor ALLAN? Nothing?

I’ll now put the motion.

Councillor JOHNSON: Seriatim? I asked for seriatim.

Deputy Chair: On item A, so this is 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 Planning and Suburban Renewal Committee was declared **carried** on the voices.

Deputy Chair: We’ll now move to item B.

**Clause B put**

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

Councillor JOHNSTON: Division.

*The division lapsed for want of a seconder.*

Deputy Chair: We’ll now move on to our next item.

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

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

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – 8 FOXTON STREET, INDOOROOPILLY (A005967313)

**330/2022-23**

1. The Planning Services Manager, Development Services, City Planning and Sustainability, attended the meeting to provide an update on 8 Foxton Street, Indooroopilly (the subject site) (A005967313). He provided the information below.

2. An aerial view and context map displayed the proximity of the subject site to surrounding locations, including Indooroopilly Shopping Centre, Indooroopilly train station and the Walter Taylor Bridge. In accordance with *Brisbane City Plan 2014* (City Plan), the zoning map demonstrated that the subject site is designated as Mixed use zone.

3. The subject site has an area of 1,179m2 with use identified as Multiple dwelling, food and drink outlet, office and shop. The proposed development is suitable for downsizing or small families, with 15 three‑bedroom dwellings ranging in size from 129m2 to 188m2. The development is eight storeys including five storeys of residential dwellings, two storeys of commercial tenancy, three podium levels containing centre activities, and three basement levels.

4. Parking will be provided within the basement levels with 30 car spaces available for residents and four car spaces for visitors. In addition, there will be provisions for 15 resident spaces and six visitor spaces for bicycles. Commercial parking will also be available, with 40 car spaces and seven bicycle spaces. The subject site is within close proximity to cycle routes and promotes an accessible, connected city. High frequency public transport is available within walking distance.

5. The subject site provides private, open space areas for each dwelling ranging between 23m2 and 91m2. Upper units will have private roof top areas as well as a communal, open space on the roof top of 93m2. Pedestrian awning and lighting will be provided along the entire site frontage. Commercial tenancies will also provide an increase in casual surveillance.

6. The development was approved for the following reasons.

* The development creates a diverse, integrated, mixed use centre hosting retail and commercial office uses, higher density dwellings that are concentrated around existing and future public transport nodes to encourage greater use of public transport services and attract further investment in new public transport facilities in and serving Indooroopilly centre.
* The development is of a height, scale and design that is consistent with the intended height, bulk and character of the relevant precinct and does not result in a density that would place disproportionate pressure on transport infrastructure, public space or community facilities.
* The development provides a range of public, communal and private open spaces on site to support both public usage and building occupant needs which are distinct and afforded the appropriate level of access and privacy.
* The development provides safe, convenient and accessible on-site vehicle parking that does not adversely impact on the quality and amenity of an adjoining streetscape, public space or residents.
* The development provides an active frontage and integrated streetscape interface that creates a pedestrian-scaled, comfortable, attractive, sheltered and safe public realm, and supports pedestrian activity on Brisbane’s subtropical streets.
* The development contributes towards Council’s vision as a smart, prosperous city.

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

8. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

#### B PETITION – REQUESTING COUNCIL MAKE PROPERTY DEVELOPERS KEEP SAFETY FENCING WITHIN BOUNDARIES AND OFF PUBLIC FOOTPATHS

**137/220/594/152**

**331/2022-23**

9. A petition from residents, requesting Council make property developers keep safety fencing within boundaries and off public footpaths, was received during the Spring Recess 2022.

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

11. The petition contains 66 signatures, and all of the petitioners live in the City of Brisbane.

12. The petitioners’ concerns include the following.

• Safety fences should stay inside the property boundaries and not on public footpaths.

• For a small fee, developers can erect fences on public footpaths and block public access without any consideration for public safety.

• Erecting fences on footpaths puts children walking to school, parents with prams, people walking dogs, families walking and people exercising in danger due to blocking the footpath.

13. Temporary construction fencing is assessed prior to issuing any temporary closure permit by Council engineers. Council only considers requests for fencing to be located on the footpath to eliminate safety issues associated with the construction of the development or to upgrade the footpath and associated underground services conditioned as part of the associated development approval. Council assesses the length of the closure and seeks to minimise this as much as practicable.

14. While it may appear that the closures are solely to facilitate the development, they are also required to allow upgrades to the footpath and utility assets at no cost to Council and rate payers.

15. Permits are generally identified in two categories, full or partial closure. Wherever possible, in high pedestrian traffic areas, Council does not support full closures and sets conditions to maintain a 1.2 to 1.5 metre-wide path on the verge. They are assessed against the *Queensland Guide to Temporary Traffic Management* (QGTTM).

16. Council normally requires the provision of a pedestrian path on the roadway with pedestrians protected by approved water filled barriers if a full closure is required for safety reasons associated with construction. Additionally, depending on the location of intersections, Council requires well signed footpath detours to direct pedestrians to navigate safely around the development frontage. In some situations, Council will condition the developer to employ traffic controllers to manage safe pedestrian movements.

17. Council limits footway permits to three monthly periods so that development progress and conditions can be reviewed, including community feedback, prior to any extension approval. Should Council receive negative feedback from the community Council officer would inspect the issue(s) and if the site contractor cannot address the problems to Council’s satisfaction, the permit may either have more stringent conditions applied or the permit may be cancelled immediately if necessary. Council works proactively with development sites to minimise temporary impacts on local communities such as temporary footpath closures.

18. Council encourages residents to provide feedback from specific footpath closures and can be registered via Council’s 24-hour Contact Centre on (07) 3403 8888 and an officer will inspect the site to ensure the contractors are complying with all permit conditions.

Customer impact

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

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

21. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**Attachment A**

**Draft Response**

**Petition Reference:** 137/220/594/152

Thank you for your petition requesting Council make property developers keep safety fencing within property boundaries and off public footpaths.

Temporary construction fencing is assessed prior to issuing any temporary closure permit by Council engineers. Council only considers requests for fencing to be located on the footpath to eliminate safety issues associated with the construction of the development or to upgrade the footpath and associated underground services conditioned as part of the associated development approval. Council assesses the length of the closure and seeks to minimise this as much as practicable.

While it may appear that the closures are solely to facilitate the development, they are required to allow upgrades to the footpath and utility assets at no cost to Council and rate payers.

Permits are generally identified in two categories, full or partial closure. Wherever possible, in high pedestrian traffic areas, Council does not support full closures and sets conditions to maintain a 1.2 to 1.5 metre-wide path on the verge. Footway permits are assessed against the *Queensland Guide to Temporary Traffic Management* (QGTTM)

Council normally requires the provision of a pedestrian path on the roadway with pedestrians protected by approved water filled barriers if a full closure is required for safety reasons associated with construction. Additionally, depending on the location of intersections, Council requires well signed footpath detours to direct pedestrians to navigate safely around the development frontage. In some cases, Council will condition the developer to employ traffic controllers to manage safe pedestrian movements.

Council limits footway permits to three monthly periods so that development progress and conditions can be reviewed, including community feedback, prior to any extension approval. Should Council receive negative feedback from the community Council officer would inspect the issue(s) and if the site contractor cannot address the problems to Council’s satisfaction, the permit may have more stringent conditions applied or the permit may be pulled immediately if necessary. Council works proactively with development sites to minimise temporary impacts on local communities such as temporary footpath closures.

Council encourages residents to provide feedback about specific footpath closures and these can be registered via Council’s 24-hour Contact Centre on (07) 3403 8888 and an officer will inspect the site to ensure the contractors are complying with all permit conditions.

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

Should you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact Mr James Mokrzecki, Engineering Compliance Manager, Development Services, City Planning and Sustainability, on (07) 3178 7690.

Thank you for raising this matter.

**ADOPTED**

Deputy Chair: Councillor DAVIS, Environment, Parks and Sustainability Committee.

### ENVIRONMENT, PARKS AND SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE

Councillor Tracy DAVIS, Civic Cabinet Chair of the Environment, Parks and Sustainability Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor James MACKAY, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on 22 November 2022, be adopted.

Deputy Chair: Councillor DAVIS.

Councillor DAVIS: Thank you, Deputy Chair. The Committee presentation last week was on Council’s investment in solar and renewable energy. Council achieved carbon neutrality in 2017 and Council has been powered by renewable energy for almost 20 years. Since 2003, we have purchased more than one million megawatt hours of renewable energy. As the largest carbon neutral government organisation in the country, we’re always looking for new and innovative ways to reduce our carbon footprint. Mr Deputy Chair, we are doing more than just purchasing renewables.

We are harnessing the Council’s resources along with the latest technology to generate our own renewable energy, including solar power. There have been fantastic advances in solar technology. The capacity of the solar panels we’re installing now is 25% greater than those we were using just five years ago. We now have more than 9,000 solar panels installed across 97 sites, including 14 libraries, four works depots, two entertainment venues and even a bridge. This saves 4,500 tonnes of carbon emissions every year, equivalent to taking 1,400 cars off the road.

Our bus depots, environment centres and waste facilities are now all 100% solar powered and that’s without mentioning the new Brisbane Metro depot at Rochedale, which I know Councillor MURPHY is working hard to deliver, which will be the biggest ever solar plant in Council’s history. Once complete, the new Brisbane Metro depot will reduce our carbon footprint by more than 1,600 tonnes per year. That’s the equivalent of taking more than 550 cars off the road every year.

Deputy Chair, this Administration is delivering solar in a way that not only provides benefit to the planet but also to the community. Through the Resilient Club Program, we have delivered more than 2,100 rooftop panels to community facilities around Brisbane, generating 900 kilowatts of renewable power. That’s about the same as taking 400 cars off the road. We heard about the real positive benefits for the community like at the Bulimba Bowls Club where Council installed a new solar system, an energy monitoring system and developed an energy and water action plan that led to a 63% reduction in energy consumption for the club with an annual cost saving of nearly $9,000. I’ll leave further debate to the Chamber. Thank you.

Deputy Chair: Thank you, Councillor.

Is there any debate? No debate?

I’ll put the motion.

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

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

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

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE:**

Councillors Steve Griffiths and David McLachlan.

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – SOLAR-POWERED COUNCIL

**332/2022-23**

1. The Water, Energy and Environmental Systems Manager, Natural Environment, Water and Sustainability, City Planning and Sustainability, attended the meeting to provide an update on Council’s solar-powered achievements. She provided the information below.

2. Council’s carbon footprint is the second largest of any organisation certified under Climate Active, a partnership program between the Australian Government and Australian businesses to encourage voluntary climate action. Certified as a carbon-neutral organisation since 2016‑17, Council has purchased more than one million megawatt-hours (MWh) of renewable energy since 2003. Council generates 8.4 megawatts (MW) of renewable energy from landfill gas captures at the Willawong Resource Recovery Centre and Brisbane Landfill, Rochedale.

3. Council has 3.27 MW of rooftop solar panels installed across 97 sites, producing more than five gigawatt‑hours (GWh) per year. This saves approximately 4,500 tonnes of carbon emissions per year and is equivalent to taking more than 1,400 cars off the road. Council’s bus depots, environment centres and waste facilities are all 100% solar-powered.

4. The Resilient Clubs Support Program (the program) delivered 914 kilowatts (kW) of rooftop solar to community-leased sites in the last two years, saving approximately 1,250 tonnes of carbon emissions which is equivalent to taking approximately 400 cars off the road. The program supports a variety of community clubs, such as Bulimba Bowls Club by:

- conducting energy and water efficiency audits

- developing an energy and water action plan

- installing a 15 kW solar system

- installing energy monitoring systems to track real-time usage

- providing advice on timers, fridge stocking and sprinkler head settings.

5. Council supports global climate outcomes and aims to reduce emissions by at least 30% by 2032, and achieving net zero emissions by 2050. The Brisbane Metro depot will be Council’s largest solar project with more than a megawatt of solar panels, and the Brisbane Metro service will be powered using 100% renewable energy.

6. Advances in solar panel technology allow for greater capacity and efficiency, which means more electricity can be generated from the same area of solar panel. Utilising the roof space on Council assets for solar continues to be an opportunity for new and existing locations. Solar battery technology is also advancing with potential to store excess solar energy on-site, rather than sell it back to the grid.

7. Following a question from the Committee, the Civic Cabinet Chair thanked the Water, Energy and Environmental Systems Manager for her informative presentation.

8. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

Deputy Chair: Councillor MARX, City Standards Committee.

### CITY STANDARDS COMMITTEE

Councillor Kim MARX, Civic Cabinet Chair of the City Standards Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Steven TOOMEY, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on Tuesday 22 November 2022, be adopted.

Deputy Chair: Councillor MARX.

Councillor MARX: Yes, thank you, Mr Deputy Chair. I’d just like to close the loop on a couple of questions that were taken this morning on notice and Committee before I get to my report. Councillor CUMMING asked the question, is there any treated water on the island? We had a report on the Moreton Island. I did mention that he was quite keen to have that particular part of Brisbane in his ward. He says he can see it from his window and I said, well, he’d have to probably talk to Councillor CASSIDY about that. Anyway, I also said potentially he could ask Councillor CASSIDY this question, but anyway, he seemed quite reluctant.

So, the answer is yes, the Tangalooma Resort has a water treatment facility to provide resort guests and the residential houses above the resort with clean and safe water. Councillor JOHNSTON had two questions: will the shade sails be delivered this financial year or over the length of the problem? Councillor DAVIS and her team very kindly provided us with the answer. This program is being delivered over the next three financial years. The other question from Councillor JOHNSTON: which branch is responsible for designing playgrounds?

So, a playground design may be led by City Standards PPI (Program Planning and Integration) branch, NEWS (Natural Environment, Water and Sustainability) or CPO depending on the scale and scope of individual projects. Again, there was three chairs involved in that. So, Mr Deputy Chair, talking about last week’s presentation. It was Council’s Compliance and Regulatory Services proactive community engagements at events. So, the manager attended our meeting last week to provide an update on the proactive community engagement being done at events across Brisbane.

By attending large public events such as the Brisbane Home Show and the Ekka, residents can connect with officers to discuss queries they may have on topics relating to compliance and regulation matters. The reality is, Mr Deputy Chair, CaRS (Compliance and Regulatory Services) play a pivotal role in the amenity of the city and perform various duties when they are out and about across Brisbane. As Chair, I always try to get out at these events when I can, meet with the officers and it’s always a highlight in my diary. I want to thank the officers who are involved with this program. They’re incredibly patient and I’d like to thank them for all their work.

Deputy Chair: Thank you, Councillor.

Is there any debate? No debate?

I’ll put the motion.

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

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

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

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE:**

Councillor Nicole Johnston.

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – COMPLIANCE AND REGULATORY SERVICES: COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

**333/2022-23**

1. The Manager, Compliance and Regulatory Services, Lifestyle and Community Services, attended the meeting to provide an update on Council’s Compliance and Regulatory Services’ (CaRS) proactive community engagement at events. She provided the information below.

2. Community engagement provides Council the opportunity to proactively engage with residents and discuss queries relating to compliance and regulation matters. Each year, CaRS officers attend events to engage with the community and perform various duties to help protect the health, safety and wellbeing of attendees. CaRS officers also play a pivotal role in the amenity of the city and quality of infrastructure.

3. CaRS officers have attended a number of events including:

- The Brisbane Home Show – providing seminars and professional advice on building and renovations

- Queensland Pool and Spa Lifestyle Expo – providing community education on Council’s role in pool safety in Brisbane

- Ekka – undertaking educational and compliance activities, such as pre-event planning, food business audits, pollution management activities and building compliance inspections

- Emergency Services Expo – providing information on how to prepare for natural disasters and plan for emergency situations

- Lanham Park May Fair – providing community education on graffiti management and prevention

- Pet Fairs – promoting responsible pet ownership.

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

5. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

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

### COMMUNITY, ARTS AND NIGHTTIME ECONOMY COMMITTEE

Councillor Vicki HOWARD, Civic Cabinet Chair of the Community, Arts and Nighttime Economy Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Sandy LANDERS, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on Tuesday 22 November 2022, be adopted.

Deputy Chair: Councillor HOWARD.

Councillor HOWARD: So Mr Deputy Chair, I’ve already told you all about the wonderful things that happened over the weekend, particularly with our wonderful Valley Fiesta and of course, the Wynnum Fringe. We’ve got one more weekend to go along and enjoy that. Our Committee presentation was of course about the wonderful Brisbane Festival. I urge everyone to look at the presentation and I will leave debate to the Chamber.

Deputy Chair: Thank you, Councillor. Any debate? No debate?

I’ll put the motion.

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

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

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

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE:**

Councillor Steve Griffiths.

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – BRISBANE FESTIVAL 2022

**334/2022-23**

1. The Chief Executive Officer and Artistic Director, Brisbane Festival, attended the meeting to provide an overview of Brisbane Festival 2022. They provided the information below.

2. Brisbane Festival (the Festival) ran from 2-24 September 2022, with 718 performances and seven mini-festivals, reaching an audience of 156.5 million. Of the 1,751 artists and art workers, 160 were First Nations artists and 1,466 were local artists from Queensland. The Festival opened with the annual Riverfire celebration, showcasing music and entertainment in the afternoon, followed by Australian Defence Force flyovers, a fireworks display and a performance by Aboriginal artist, Jessica Mauboy, in the evening.

3. Brisbane Serenades 2022 was a program of seven mini-festivals with performances celebrating community, music, connection and fun. The program featured performances by:

- Opera Queensland

- Camerata - Queensland’s Chamber Orchestra

- L-FRESH The LION

- Bustamento

- Emma Pask

- Queensland Youth Orchestra

- The Little Red Company

- Shaun Parker & Company.

4. The Festival updated its brand in 2022, broadening the colour palette whilst retaining the traditional pink. The Festival website received 2,272,401 views, and the number of followers across social media channels were:

- Facebook - 113,210

- Instagram - 47,226

- Twitter - 177,000

- LinkedIn -11,000.

There were also 54,269 email subscribers. The Festival received national coverage with an estimated media reach of 146.5 million. It featured in 7,655 editorial clips and 5,790 broadcast clips.

5. Following a number of questions from the Committee, the Civic Cabinet Chair thanked the Chief Executive Officer and Artistic Director for their informative presentation.

6. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

Deputy Chair: Councillor CUNNINGHAM, Finance and City Governance Committee.

### FINANCE AND CITY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

Councillor Fiona CUNNINGHAM, Civic Cabinet Chair of the Finance and City Governance Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Angela OWEN, that the report of the meeting of that Committee held on Tuesday 22 November 2022, be adopted.

Deputy Chair: Councillor CUNNINGHAM.

Councillor CUNNINGHAM: Mr Deputy Chair, item A was the Committee presentation, which was from our acting Chief Financial Officer, giving the Committee an update on Council’s financial recovery from the floods and our interactions with the QRA. Item B was our regular quarterly financial reports and I’ll leave the rest to the Chamber.

Deputy Chair: Thank you. Any debate? No debate?

I’ll put the motion.

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

The report read as follows⎯

**ATTENDANCE:**

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

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE:**

Councillor Jonathan Sriranganathan.

#### A COMMITTEE PRESENTATION – QUEENSLAND RECONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY CLAIMS (POST FLOOD) UPDATE

**335/2022-23**

1. The A/Chief Financial Officer, Corporate Finance, Organisational Services, attended the meeting to provide an update on Queensland Reconstruction Authority (QRA) claims (post flood). He provided the information below.

2. Council recently reached a major milestone for QRA claims arising from the February 2022 flood event, with Counter Disaster Operations (CDO) claims lodged to the value of $28.9 million, and Immediate Reconstruction Works (IRW) lodged to the value of $600,000. Council received a $50 million advance for the Voluntary Home Buy-Back Program in August 2022, with a further $50 million received from the Queensland Government in November 2022.

3. Other claims and grant applications lodged include the Department of Tourism, Innovation and Sport’s Community and Recreational Assets Recovery and Resilience Program of $22.7 million, to be supplemented by a $10.5 million contribution from Council, and the QRA Community and recreational assets program of $16.5 million. Council also applied to the QRA’s Flood Risk Management Program in 2021-22 for $4.3 million.

4. The purpose of CDO funding is to provide direct assistance to individuals (Category A) or to protect the general public (Category B). Examples of this assistance include evacuation centres, extraordinary operational responses and clean-up, and debris removal in residential buildings and essential public assets. All submissions for this type of assistance have now been finalised. Supporting evidence for the claims comprised of more than 30,000 records including photos, timesheets and invoices. To date, $700,000 worth of claims have been approved, and Council has received a $10 million cash advance from the QRA.

5. The QRA is currently assessing Council’s remaining lodged submissions and executing the funding agreements for approved submissions. Council is not anticipating any further lodgement of applications to the QRA.

6. The purpose of IRW funding is to provide reimbursement of eligible costs incurred for immediate reconstruction of essential public assets where no further works are required. All submissions for this funding have now been finalised. Funding relating to traffic signals totalled $600,000. Council’s IRW claims are currently being assessed, and no further claim lodgement is anticipated.

7. The purpose of Clean-up grants (Category D) is to provide financial assistance with the clean‑up, removal and disposal of otherwise ineligible flood-related debris. A total of $30 million in funding is available to State agencies and local councils. Examples of areas requiring clean up include:

- business, commercial, agricultural, industrial and residential areas

- natural assets, such as waterways, creeks, rivers, streams and mangroves

- community, cultural, sporting and recreational areas and facilities, such as boardwalks, walkways, parks and playgrounds.

Council is currently drafting and reviewing submissions for this funding. Supporting evidence comprises of more than 800 records including photos, timesheets and invoices. Council is required to lodge claims for this funding with the QRA by 30 December 2022.

8. Reconstruction of Essential Public Assets (REPA) funding is for the permanent reconstruction of an essential public asset that has been directly damaged by an eligible disaster. REPA funding may be eligible for up to $5 million per project from the Betterment Program to restore the asset to a more resilient standard. A total of $170 million has been allocated to Queensland local government areas for damage sustained during the 2021-22 disaster season. The deadline for submission applications is 31 March 2023, and reconstruction works are to be completed by 30 June 2024. Documentation is being collated to meet stringent evidence requirements, including photographs with GPS metadata, detailed itemised timesheets and invoices. The QRA are involved in damage inspections of initial REPA submissions, which include bus stops, roads and landslips.

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

10. **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**ADOPTED**

#### B COMMITTEE REPORT – FINANCIAL REPORTS (RECEIVABLE, RATES, INVENTORY, PAYABLE, PROVISIONS AND MALLS) FOR THE PERIOD ENDED SEPTEMBER 2022

**134/695/317/1329**

**336/2022-23**

11. The A/Chief Financial Officer, Corporate Finance, Organisational Services, provided a detailed report, submitted on file, on Council’s position relating to accounts receivable, rates, inventory, accounts payable, provisions and malls for the period ended September 2022.

12. The Civic Cabinet Chair and the Committee noted the report. The financial report on Council’s position relating to accounts receivable, rates, inventory, accounts payable, provisions and malls for the period ended September 2022 is now presented for noting by Council.

13. **RECOMMENDATION:**

**THAT THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THE REPORT** (submitted on file) **BE NOTED.**

**ADOPTED**

## PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS:

Deputy Chair: Councillors, are there any petitions?

Councillor HOWARD.

Councillor HOWARD: I have a petition requesting Council investigate local area traffic management measures at the intersection of Barker Street and Bowen Terrace, New Farm.

Deputy Chair: Councillor JOHNSTON?

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, thank you. I have three petitions. Firstly, residents in Yeronga calling on Brisbane City Council to re-establish the Yeronga West Loop for the 105 bus service. Secondly, a petition calling on Council to install a yellow line on the blind corner of Menin Road and Walker Street, Corinda. Council won’t put the yellow line in. Thirdly, a petition from residents in Yeerongpilly calling on Brisbane City Council to urgently facilitate a stormwater drainage upgrade for localised flooring.

Deputy Chair: Councillor HAMMOND.

Councillor HAMMOND: I have a petition with 120 signatures on it.

Deputy Chair: Thank you. Councillor LANDERS, may I have a motion for the receipt of the petitions?

Sorry, Councillor HUTTON⎯sorry.

My apologies, Councillor LANDERS.

**337/2022-23**

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

The petitions were summarised as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **File No.** | **Councillor** | **Topic** |
| 137/220/594/169 | Vicki Howard | Requesting Council investigate and install Local Area Traffic Management measures at the intersection of Barker Street and Bowen Terrace, New Farm to reduce the volume of traffic on Barker Street and mitigate the risk of collisions. |
| 137/220/594/172 | Nicole Johnston | Requesting Council re-establish the Yeronga West bus loop on the 105 bus route, to connect residents with their closest principal activity centre for essential services, and extend 192 bus route services to run on Saturdays, and weeknights until 9pm. |
| 137/220/594/171 | Nicole Johnston | Requesting Council install a yellow line on the corner of Menin Road and Walker Streets, Corinda to prevent car parking and improve safety for road users and local residents. |
| 137/220/594/168 | Nicole Johnston | Requesting Council prioritise funding to upgrade the stormwater drainage pipe system and associated infrastructure, between Yeronga Memorial Park, Ipswich Road, Yeronga, and Moolabin Creek, Yeerongpilly, to prevent localised flooding. |
| 137/220/594/170 | Fiona Hammond | Requesting Council install separate lanes for cyclists and pedestrians in the shared section of the Kedron Brook pathway between Lutwyche Road Park and Norman Avenue Park, Kedron. |

## GENERAL BUSINESS:

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

Are there any matters of General Business?

There being no General Business, I declare the meeting closed.

## QUESTIONS OF WHICH DUE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

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

**Submitted by Councillor Steve Griffiths (received on 24 November 2022)**

**Q1.** Please provide the number of mosquito management staff employed by Council and the full-time equivalent figure.

**Q2.** How much has been budgeted in the 2022/2023 financial year for mosquito spraying?

**Q3.** How much of the 2022/2023 financial year mosquito spraying budget has already been spent?

**Q4.** Please provide a breakdown of how many auction bids were received for each of the recently sold cross‑river ferries?

**Q5.** How many properties fell under each of the following rating categories in each of the following financial years?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2018/2019** | **2017/2018** | **2016/2017** | **2015/2016** |
| Residential – Owner Occupied *(including when known as a previous category name)* |  |  |  |  |
| Residential – Non-owner Occupied or Mixed Use *(including when known as a previous category name)* |  |  |  |  |
| CTS – Residential – Owner Occupied *(including when known as a previous category name)* |  |  |  |  |
| CTS – Residential – Non-owner Occupied or Mixed Use *(including when known as a previous category name)* |  |  |  |  |
| Transitory Accommodation *(including when known as a previous category name)* |  |  |  |  |
| CTS – transitory Accommodation *(including when known as a previous category name)* |  |  |  |  |

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

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

**Submitted by Councillor Steve Griffiths (from meeting of 22 November 2022)**

**Q1.** Provide a breakdown of how much money has been budgeted and how much has been spent on the Brisbetter campaign in the 2022/2023 financial year.

***A1.*** *$449,059 has been spent out of a budget of $1,250,000.*

**Q2.** Provide a breakdown of how much money was budgeted and how much was spent on the Brisbetter campaign in the 2021/2022 financial year.

***A2.*** *$397,643 was spent out of a budget of $400,000.*

**Q3.** How many properties fell under each of the following rating categories in each of the following financial years?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2022/2023** | **2021/2022** | **2020/2021** | **2019/2020** |
| Residential – Owner Occupied *(including when known as a previous category name)* |  |  |  |  |
| Residential – Non-owner Occupied or Mixed Use *(including when known as a previous category name)* |  |  |  |  |
| CTS – Residential – Owner Occupied *(including when known as a previous category name)* |  |  |  |  |
| CTS – Residential – Non-owner Occupied or Mixed Use *(including when known as a previous category name)* |  |  |  |  |
| Transitory Accommodation *(including when known as a previous category name)* |  |  |  |  |
| CTS – transitory Accommodation *(including when known as a previous category name)* |  |  |  |  |

***A3.***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | ***2022/2023*** | ***2021/2022*** | ***2020/2021*** | ***2019/2020*** |
| *Residential – Owner Occupied (including when known as a previous category name)* | *235,816* | *234,409* | *230,994* | *229,176* |
| *Residential – Non-owner Occupied or Mixed Use (including when known as a previous category name)* | *77,787* | *78,376* | *79,861* | *79,976* |
| *CTS – Residential – Owner Occupied (including when known as a previous category name)* | *68,456* | *61,935* | *57,562* | *54,232* |
| *CTS – Residential – Non-owner Occupied or Mixed Use (including when known as a previous category name)* | *106,861* | *111,366* | *112,663* | *109,341* |
|  | ***2022/2023*** | ***2021/2022*** | ***2020/2021*** | ***2019/2020*** |
| *Transitory Accommodation* |  |  |  |  |
| *Transitory Accommodation (CTS)* |  |  |  |  |

*Note: The figures provided represent the number of properties at the beginning of the respective financial year. Transitory accommodation rating categories were introduced for the 2022/23 financial year and therefore zero properties were in the category at the start of the financial year.*

**Submitted by Councillor Jonathan Sriranganathan (from meeting of 22 November 2022)**

**Q1.** Was an Options Analysis undertaken for proposals for a green bridge or car bridge between Bellbowrie/Moggill and the southern side of the river? If so, what is the name of this document and when was it produced?

***A1.*** *No.*

**Q2.** Was a Pre-feasibility or Feasibility Study undertaken for proposals for a green bridge or car bridge between Bellbowrie/Moggill and the southern side of the river? If so, what is the name of this document and when was it produced?

***A2.*** *Yes. “New Green Bridges for Brisbane: Bellbowrie Bridge – Pre-feasibility assessment”. Produced in 2019.*

**Q3.** Was a Business Case undertaken for proposals for a green bridge or car bridge between Bellbowrie/Moggill and the southern side of the river? If so, what is the name of this document and when was it produced?

***A3.*** *No.*

**Q4.** What is the estimated cost or cost range of a bus, pedestrian and bicycle bridge between Bellbowrie/Moggill and Riverhills/Wacol/Redbank?

***A4.*** *There is no current cost estimate.*

**Q5.** What is the estimated cost or cost range of a general traffic, bus, pedestrian and bicycle bridge between Bellbowrie/Moggill and Riverhills/Wacol/Redbank?

***A5.*** *There are no current costs for bridges within the areas specified, noting that all roads leading into and out of Bellbowrie/ Moggill are State-controlled.*

**Q6.** What is the estimated cost or cost range of a pedestrian and bicycle bridge between Bellbowrie/Moggill and Riverhills/Wacol/Redbank?

***A6.*** *See answer 4.*

**Q7.** What is the name of the most recent study undertaken by BCC pertaining to transport in and out of the Bellbowrie/Moggill area, and when was it produced?

***A7.*** *See answer 2.*

**RISING OF COUNCIL: 5.48pm.**

**PRESENTED: and CONFIRMED**

**CHAIR**

**Council officers in attendance:**

Dorian Maruda (A/Senior Council and Committee Officer)

Courtney Randall (A/Council and Committee Officer)

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