

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

**The 4449 meeting of the Brisbane City Council,
held at City Hall, Brisbane
on Tuesday 21 October 2014
at 2pm**

**Prepared by:
Council and Committee Liaison Office
Chief Executive's Office
Office of the Lord Mayor and the Chief Executive Officer**





Dedicated to a better Brisbane

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

THE 4449 MEETING OF THE BRISBANE CITY COUNCIL, HELD AT CITY HALL, BRISBANE, ON TUESDAY 21 OCTOBER 2014 AT 2PM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PRESENT:	1
OPENING OF MEETING:	1
APOLOGY:	1
MOTION OF CONDOLENCE – Terry Hampson	1
MINUTES:	6
QUESTION TIME:	6
CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ESTABLISHMENT AND COORDINATION COMMITTEE:	20
ESTABLISHMENT AND COORDINATION COMMITTEE (Report of 8 September 2014)	20
A CONTRACTS AND TENDERING – REPORT TO COUNCIL OF CONTRACTS ACCEPTED BY DELEGATES FOR JULY 2014	24
CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ESTABLISHMENT AND COORDINATION COMMITTEE DURING RECESS:	30
ESTABLISHMENT AND COORDINATION COMMITTEE (Adoption report)	30
A ANNUAL OPERATIONAL PLAN PROGRESS AND QUARTERLY FINANCIAL REPORT FOR THE PERIOD ENDED JUNE 2014	66
B REPORT OF THE AUDIT COMMITTEE MEETING ON 4 SEPTEMBER 2014	67
C CONTRACTS AND TENDERING – REPORT TO COUNCIL OF CONTRACTS ACCEPTED BY DELEGATES FOR AUGUST 2014	67
D LEASE TO QUEENSLAND AFRICAN COMMUNITIES COUNCIL INCORPORATED	74
E PEST SURVEY PROGRAMS UNDER THE LAND PROTECTION (PEST AND STOCK ROUTE MANAGEMENT) ACT 2002	75
F STORES BOARD SUBMISSION – HOWARD SMITH WHARVES REVITALISATION PROJECT	80
G APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE BCC COUNCILLOR CONDUCT REVIEW PANEL MEMBERSHIP POOL	92
NOTATION OF DECISIONS OF THE ESTABLISHMENT AND COORDINATION COMMITTEE AS DELEGATE OF THE COUNCIL:	94
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE	94
A PETITION – REQUESTING THAT COUNCIL REFUSE THE APPLICATION FOR A MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT AT 2 LATROBE TERRACE, PADDINGTON	105
B PETITION – REQUESTING THE IDENTIFICATION AND PROTECTION OF TRADITIONAL HOUSING CHARACTER AND HERITAGE IN THE GAYTHORNE AREA AND SURROUNDS	106
C PETITION - REQUESTING THAT ROBERTSON STREET, FORTITUDE VALLEY, BE REMOVED FROM THE SPECIAL ENTERTAINMENT PRECINCT BUFFER AREA, AND FOR ANY LICENSED PREMISES TO BE REQUIRED TO FINISH THEIR ACTIVITIES AT A REASONABLE HOUR IN ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE EXTENT OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT IN ROBERTSON STREET AND SURROUNDS	108
D PETITION – REQUESTING THE PREPARATION OF A NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN TO PROTECT THE ONGOING OPERATIONS OF THE BELMONT SHOOTING COMPLEX	110
E PETITION – REQUESTING THAT COUNCIL OPPOSE A DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION FOR RESIDENTIAL USE AT 48 GOVERNMENT ROAD, RICHLANDS	111
F PETITION – REQUESTING THAT COUNCIL OPPOSE A DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AT 242 ENGLEFIELD ROAD, OXLEY	113



Dedicated to a better Brisbane

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

THE 4449 MEETING OF THE BRISBANE CITY COUNCIL, HELD AT CITY HALL, BRISBANE, ON TUESDAY 21 OCTOBER 2014 AT 2PM

<i>G</i>	<i>PETITION – REQUESTING THAT COUNCIL REFUSE A DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION FOR THE RECONFIGURATION OF LAND AT 67 CHAPMAN PLACE, OXLEY</i>	<i>114</i>
<i>H</i>	<i>PETITION – REQUEST TO AMEND THE GRANGE DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN IN THE BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2000</i>	<i>116</i>
	BRISBANE LIFESTYLE COMMITTEE	117
<i>A</i>	<i>PETITION – REQUESTING THAT COUNCIL IMPROVE PUBLIC SAFETY OF FLEET LANE AND JOLLY PLACE PARK, SOUTH BRISBANE</i>	<i>120</i>
<i>B</i>	<i>PETITIONS – REQUESTING THAT COUNCIL ALLOW THE WYNNUM MANLY AND DISTRICT MEN’S SHED INCORPORATED TO REMAIN LOCATED AT THE FORMER WYNNUM CENTRAL STATE SCHOOL SITE</i>	<i>123</i>
	CONSIDERATION OF NOTIFIED MOTION – Infrastructure Agreements:	125
	PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS:	139
	GENERAL BUSINESS:	140
	QUESTIONS OF WHICH DUE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:	142
	ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS OF WHICH DUE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:	144



Dedicated to a better Brisbane

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

THE 4449 MEETING OF THE BRISBANE CITY COUNCIL, HELD AT CITY HALL, BRISBANE, ON TUESDAY 21 OCTOBER 2014 AT 2PM

PRESENT:

The Right Honourable the LORD MAYOR (Councillor Graham QUIRK) – LNP
The Chairman of Council, Margaret de WIT (Pullenvale Ward) – LNP

LNP Councillors (and Wards)

Krista ADAMS (Wishart)
Matthew BOURKE (Jamboree)
Amanda COOPER (Bracken Ridge)
Vicki HOWARD (Central)
Steven HUANG (Macgregor)
Fiona KING (Marchant)
Geraldine KNAPP (The Gap)
Kim MARX (Karawatha)
Peter MATIC (Toowong)
Ian McKENZIE (Holland Park)
David McLACHLAN (Hamilton)
Ryan MURPHY (Doboy)
Angela OWEN-TAYLOR (Parkinson) (Deputy
Chairman of Council)
Adrian SCHRINNER (Chandler) (Deputy Mayor)
Julian SIMMONDS (Walter Taylor)
Andrew WINES (Enoggera)

ALP Councillors (and Wards)

Milton DICK (Richlands) (The Leader of the
Opposition)
Helen ABRAHAMS (The Gabba) (Deputy Leader of
the Opposition)
Peter CUMMING (Wynnum Manly)
Kim FLESSER (Northgate)
Steve GRIFFITHS (Moorooka)
Victoria NEWTON (Deagon)
Shayne SUTTON (Morningside)

Independent Councillor (and Ward)

Nicole JOHNSTON (Tennyson)

OPENING OF MEETING:

The Chairman, Councillor Margaret de WIT, opened the meeting with prayer, and then proceeded with the business set out in the Agenda.

APOLOGY:

160/2014-15

An apology was submitted on behalf of Councillor Norm WYNDHAM (McDowall) – LNP, and he was granted leave of absence from the meeting on the motion of Councillor Ryan MURPHY, seconded by Councillor Kim MARX.

MOTION OF CONDOLENCE – Terry Hampson

161/2014-15

The Right Honourable the LORD MAYOR, Councillor Graham QUIRK, announced that before proceeding with the formal business of the day, he would like to pay tribute to Terry Hampson, who had passed away last month.

LORD MAYOR:

Yes, thanks very much, Madam Chairman. Before proceeding with the formal business of the day, I would like to pay tribute to Mr Terry Hampson, former Australian Labor Party Councillor for MARCHANT who passed away last month. Terry provided a very distinguished service to the residents of Brisbane. He was a gentleman; he was a person who had very, very strong convictions. He was a person who always engaged in a level of debate which was around the

issues. I can never remember a time when Terry was personal in his debate. He was very much a man of conviction around the strength of an argument.

Whilst obviously there were many issues that we disagreed upon, there was always a very high level of respect in that debate, and I always very much respected that this was a man with a clear point of view, a clear conviction to that point of view, and a dedication to representing that view in the best way he possibly could. So Terry in every respect provided very distinguished service to the residents of Brisbane.

He was elected on 26 March 1994, and he held a number of key positions within Council. Terry was the Deputy Chairman of the Environment and Management Committee from 1994 to 1997. He was on the Customer Services Committee where he was Deputy Chair in 1997. He was Deputy Chair of the City Business Committee from 1997 to 2000, and on the Customer and Local Services Committee from 2000 to 2003, and on the Urban Planning and Sustainability Committee from 2003 to 2004.

Terry was an active member on the Conservation subcommittee from 1995 to 1996. He was on the Community Development Committee from 1994 to 1997, and on the Community Policy Committee from 1997 to 2004. Terry's service to his local community certainly didn't end when he left Council. He has carried on again, particularly in fields that he loved—fields of history, fields of the environment. He was President of the Chermside Historical Society.

He included in his interests his involvement in the Wilderness Society and the Rainforest Conservation Society and the Australian Fabians. They were just a few of Terry's involvements and commitment on the environment front. He was a passionate and highly regarded and practising environmentalist. In particular, Terry played a key role in the protection of Fraser Island. He spent nearly 30 years as an Executive Member on the Fraser Island Defenders Committee, as it was known. Many have credited Terry as playing an instrumental role in Fraser Island's eventual World Heritage listing.

Terry's service to the community is one which was distinguished; it's one which was also recognised rightfully so in 2001 when he was made a Member of the Order of Australia.

Accordingly, in view of Terry's outstanding service to past, present and future residents of Brisbane, the LORD MAYOR moved, seconded by Councillor Milton DICK, that—

"That this Council extends its sincerest and deepest sympathies to the family and friends of the late Terry Hampson and pay tribute to him for his dedicated service to the city and the people of Brisbane."

The Chairman called for any further speakers.

Chairman: Further debate on the motion; Councillor DICK.

Councillor DICK: Thank you, Madam Chair; I, too, rise to speak on this condolence motion. It is with great sadness that I rise, particularly ironically on the same day that Gough Whitlam has passed away. It is a very sad day for the broader Labor movement, but also I think it is fair to say if Gough Whitlam was an Australian legend, Terry Hampson was certainly a Brisbane legend.

Right across the community, no matter who you spoke with, people always said the same things about Terry. He was a very decent and honourable man. His service to Brisbane and Queensland is a very, very significant one. Attending his memorial service, I was touched and moved; I thought I knew Terry pretty well, through my 20 years of involvement with the Labor Party, but hearing so many different people talk about his varied list of achievements. A lot of these weren't headline making achievements. They weren't on the front page of the paper, but I think it is true to say Terry's life was dedicated to helping those who were marginalised, on the edge and the disadvantaged.

Throughout his life, Terry took up those causes that weren't necessarily popular, took up causes even before they became mainstream issues. As the LORD MAYOR touched on, particularly his work with the environment, and particularly his love and dedication to the protection of Fraser Island.

Terry was a conviction politician long before it became in vogue. I met Terry when I first joined the Labor Party, and had a lot to do with him over the years. He was a great support and strength to me during my time as State Secretary, and when I sought pre-selection to run for the Brisbane City Council, he sent me a very kind note that said, all the best State Secretaries go to local government. Of course, Terry's commitment through social justice was also in a practical way through the Australian Labor Party.

Becoming State Secretary and dealing with a fractious and divided Labor Party through the 1980s, Terry needed every bit of his skill and calmness to get the Labor Party ready for government after 32 years in the wilderness. His great strength was being able to work across the different groups inside the Labor Party to provide cohesion and to provide that critical policy development which we then saw Wayne Goss propel into Government in 1989.

But he also played a critical role in the election of Jim Soorley in 1991 as State Secretary, and there are many, many former councillors, and I know people who served in the Labor movement, that are very grateful for his unflinching support for unity and discipline when it came to providing a stable, cohesive, united Labor Party as we fought those elections.

Not only did Terry serve the Labor movement extremely well, he served the people of Marchant with distinction. For 10 years he gave it his all. It is true to say, with Terry Hampson, you also received as a representative the loving support of Anne Hampson. Anne was a fixture in everything that Terry has done. I know many in the community are still thinking about her as she grieves deeply for her husband, father and grandfather of their children and grandchildren.

Terry's work not only through the environment but also through the historical society continued right up until his passing. His legacy will continue to live, and you only need to move around the north side of Brisbane to see his many, many achievements. My sympathies and respect go to his family, and I know that his legacy will continue to live for many years to come.

Chairman:

Further debate; Councillor KING.

Councillor KING:

Thank you, Madam Chair; I, too, would like to rise in support of this motion. Terry Hampson was a wonderful local member for the Marchant Ward. He was the current President before his passing of the Chermshire Historical Society. He did many more stints before that, before he came back to the President's role. He was also a founding member.

He was also the previous Chairperson for the Mountains to Mangroves. Terry was extremely passionate about the environment. His love, of course, as others have spoken, was history and environment out across Brisbane but more particularly in the Marchant Ward.

Terry put his constituents first. He didn't play the person, as the LORD MAYOR said; he didn't play the politics; he was a true representative for the people of Marchant during his 10 years as councillor out in the ward. As the LORD MAYOR said, he was a true gentleman. As much as probably the Labor Party don't want to hear this, Terry was very supportive of me in my role. We used to speak often about the history of his time as being the councillor, as well as what was happening now. Terry never made an issue; you could always pick up the phone, as long as it was about representation and about the people of Marchant.

It was interesting when Councillor KNAPP and I were at the funeral a couple of weeks ago, he took a group of women—this is Terry Hampson all over—he took a group of women to Fraser Island, which we heard about, and because the

women weren't particularly taking direction from a man, they had to get around this somehow and made him an honorary woman so he could take the tour through Fraser Island.

There wasn't—as one of the gentlemen said—a stick on Fraser Island that Terry didn't know about. There wasn't a rock that wasn't unturned by Terry Hampson. I thank and commend his work in saving Fraser Island. He will be sorely missed by Councillor COOPER and myself, because I know he was a resident of Councillor COOPER's, but she shares my admiration for Terry. Again, he was willing to give advice to both of us and put politics aside. This is a sad day for the Australian Labor Party, a sad day for the people of Marchant Ward, and of course my condolences go out to Anne and the family. Thank you.

Chairman:

Further speakers; Councillor ABRAHAMS.

Councillor ABRAHAMS:

Thank you, Madam Chair; I, too, wish to express my condolences to Anne and their son and grandchildren at the passing of Terry Hampson, and just reflect on some of the experiences I had with Terry. I first met him when he was involved in the Fraser Island group, and he was very strong, and as a young person to Brisbane interested in the environment, Terry made sure I knew exactly what every environmentalist in Brisbane knew about the values of Fraser Island and how important it was to win that fight. He was, I believe, instrumental in that campaign.

I was also asked to work with Terry when he stood as the candidate for the new ward of Marchant. It was a time when a number of councillors had lost their pre-selection due to the boundary changes, and I thoroughly enjoyed my time with Terry, because he was hard-working; he took advice, even though he had been the Assistant Secretary of the party.

But on the night of the election, which he won, Terry was AWOL (Absent Without Official Leave) crying in the back room, because that day his dog had been run over and killed outside his house, and that, to him and his family was more important than the fact he had been voted in. I think that shows the very human and caring heart that Terry had, which was very strong. He always had time to talk to people. He always had time to make sure they understood why he had the passion for the issues that he had. So people and their connections to each other was just incredibly important for Terry.

I was working in Council when Terry knew that the Mountains to Mangroves corridor was going to be his legacy for his time in Council. He was determined, consistent, polite, clear and unrelenting to both Lord Mayor Soorley and to members in the environment to make sure that corridor and the two environmental centres were part of that corridor. Well after he had left the job, he was still there fundraising through the reaches of the Mountains to Mangroves corridor—which is outside Brisbane—because it was something he was totally focussed on.

Terry was someone that the Labor Party was proud of. They made him a life member, which really is something that the Labor Party does not do lightly and without considerable thought. It really is a passing of someone who was incredibly important to our Council, to Brisbane and to the environment of South-East Queensland.

Chairman:

Further debate on the motion; Councillor FLESSER.

Councillor FLESSER:

Thank you, Madam Chair. I am very proud to have known Terry Hampson and to have worked with him as a neighbouring councillor for many years in this Council. As Jim Soorley said at the celebration to Terry's life, Terry was not rich, but he was rich in character. I think that is something we should all be aspiring to, because in my dealings with Terry, he was a very professional person, he was a very dedicated person, and he always worked very hard for his own constituents.

One of Terry's not well groomed attributes was his pragmatism. He was not a pragmatic person. He was not willing to compromise on the things that he felt

very strongly about. Of course, they were the environment, social justice and Aboriginal Rights. I remember very early Caucus meetings in the Soorley years, there were quite robust discussions in those days, and Terry never allowed us to forget the things that are really important to Brisbane's residents.

It has been already mentioned, the great work he did to save Fraser Island, and the battles that he had to get World Heritage listing along with John Sinclair, his very good friend and partner in crime in Fraser Island. Also, the Mountains to Mangroves Committee, the great work he did there, and just to enlighten newer councillors, that has now migrated into the Green Heart fairs that we have across the city.

His work in Chermside District Historical Society in recent years, he was quite often contacting me, and I am sure he contacted Councillor KING as well with his activities with that society. Something that is probably not that well known is the work he did with Kids Space, a magnificent facility at Seventh Brigade Park. It was a bit before my time, but I understand that Terry was actually there on the day that the construction was done, and he was there working with his own hands to get that facility in place.

Of course, Terry was very popular with local residents. I suppose one good thing is that he left this place in his own time. He wasn't chucked out, which is often the fate of others of us in this Chamber. So, the loss of Terry Hampson was a sad day for Brisbane. Of course, I join the Chamber in extending my sympathy to Anne and his family and friends.

Chairman:

Further debate; Councillor NEWTON.

Councillor NEWTON:

Thanks very much, Madam Chair. I, too, rise to express my condolences on the passing of former councillor Terry Hampson, as an ex-neighbouring councillor. My relationship or involvement with Terry goes back much longer than that. I was a bit of a green-eyed newbie working on the election campaign during 1989, and it was interesting to be in party office at that time watching the team working so consistently and so hard to try to break the decades of National Party Government here in Queensland.

Terry was a quiet gentleman as we have heard, but don't mistake that his quietness was a sign of weakness or a lack of conviction, because, indeed, you would be sadly mistaken. It was certainly the opposite. He was very fierce and passionate about the things that he felt were important. He never saw himself above or below anyone, and treated everyone as an equal, and treated people with respect, which I think is one of the reasons why we see expressions of such respect across party lines today, but I am sure across the community more broadly.

He was a proud environmentalist. He was a proud Labor Party man. He was a staunch campaigner for social justice and reconciliation with our first people, the indigenous people, in Australia. As a neighbouring ward Councillor, he undertook some amazing achievements. He was certainly the classic quite achiever, because he would work very hard behind the scenes, but he wasn't afraid to roll up his sleeves. My colleagues today have talked a little bit about some of these achievements, including the formation and recognition of the significance of the Mountains to Mangroves corridor, not just seeing parcels of bush and green space as separate from one another, but the connectivity all the way through, which continues to be celebrated today.

Of course, his amazing achievements with Kids Space, which is an icon of the northside now and a favourite with kids from miles around. Families love to take children down there and see them disappear into this amazing world that was created in partnership between Terry, Brisbane City Council and, of course, the local Lions Club. But he also had a very strong vision around creating a key space around the Kedron Wavell RSL (Returned and Services League), and worked very hard again across partnerships with the local RSL and Brisbane City Council to achieve upgrades with the Chermside pool, the

local sporting fields, the Chermside Regional Centre Library—key achievements of his as well.

As has been mentioned, he was very passionate about history. Until his recent passing, he was the President of the Chermside and Districts Historical Society who do come over a little bit into my area. I enjoyed working with Terry on some local history projects. But there's a lot of local history recognition that would simply not have occurred without the dedication and passion of people like Terry.

He was an activist also in the peace movement, particularly during the 1980s. There was actually an issue that I caught up with him most recently about only a few weeks before he departed for his holiday in Cambodia. I enjoyed having an opportunity to catch up over a cup of coffee to talk about the People for Nuclear Disarmament work in the 1980s, but also the work that is ongoing with the Mountains to Mangroves network.

I think the shining light has been spoken about a number of times. His work with the Fraser Island Defenders organisation is probably not matched by many in our community at all. His staunch work meant that Fraser Island has been kept very pristine and certainly contrary to what was planned for the island, which has now resulted in, of course, the World Heritage listing of that island. I wish to express my condolences to the love of his life, Anne Hampson. It was love at first sight, she tells me, and they have been madly in love ever since. My condolences to her and her children and grandchildren. Terry will be greatly missed.

Chairman: Further debate on the condolence motion; LORD MAYOR, do you wish to wrap up at all? No. I will put the motion.

Upon being submitted to the Chamber by the Chairman, the motion of condolence was declared **carried** unanimously.

MINUTES:

162/2014-15

The Minutes of the 4448 (ordinary) meeting held on 9 September 2014, copies of which had been forwarded to each councillor, were presented, taken as read and confirmed on the motion of Councillor Ryan MURPHY, seconded by Councillor Kim MARX.

QUESTION TIME:

Chairman: Councillors, are there any questions of the LORD MAYOR or a Chairman of any of the Standing Committees? Councillor KNAPP.

Question 1

Councillor KNAPP: Thank you, Madam Chair; my question is directed to the LORD MAYOR. I understand that Brisbane is a changing city, a New World City. We have a growing international reputation as the destination of choice for business and investment, major events, international education, conventions and tourism. Our city is vibrant, young and entrepreneurial. We have an enviable climate and a relaxed lifestyle. Would you please update the Chamber on new developments and initiatives since the Council last sat?

LORD MAYOR: Thank you very much, Madam Chairman, and thank you very much Councillor KNAPP for the question. Well, I suppose a very significant aspect to this city's life has been the opening of a new hotel very recently in the form of Next in our Brisbane Mall. It has been interesting; I've often talked about the Queen Street Mall, about the success of that mall within the Australian context, the fact that it is the most successful mall in Australia. What I didn't know and what I have

subsequently been advised from those people at Silver Needle who undertook the Next development is that indeed Brisbane's Queen Street Mall is in the top 10 malls in the world.

So it was great to be able to open that hotel, to see the new level of digital friendly nature that it has brought to our city. It is also important that Forever 21 has opened downstairs, and that Brisbane is its first destination in terms of its retail offering within Australia. So they are great pluses.

But there is another big plus which this Council will debate a little later today, and it is that of what I have referred to as the missing link in Brisbane's river horizon—this is the Howard Smith Wharves. This Council is being asked to support what will be the development of that 3.42 hectare site. Some 80 per cent of the site under the proposal will remain as parkland and public open space, but indeed, the other 20 per cent will consist of 10 per cent of existing heritage-listed buildings, and 10 per cent of new development.

In relation to that new component, it will consist of what is a 150-room, five-star boutique hotel, three storeys in height in part, six storeys in height in other parts. But it is of a scale and level which we believe fits in with the landscape, with the cliff face. The other exciting component of this development is that it will engage with two lifts to go to the top of the cliffs—one at the hotel end, and one at the other end of the site.

The other component of the new development that is proposed is a 1,500 square metre exhibition space, and this space is proposed for markets, it could be festivals, it could be pop-up retail, it could be weddings; there is a whole range of opportunities that might pertain to that particular space.

One thing I should have mentioned in relation to the five-star hotel is that it is intended to be developed and operated by Asian Pacific Group, so that is just the hotel component. They are a part of the Deague group, and that is their plan. But the overall operation and proposal is recommended to HSW Consortium as the preferred operator; that is a consortium which is led by Adam Flaskas and Elisha Bickle. They are local people who live at New Farm.

It is not their intention to simply develop and move on. It is their intention to develop and operate the site. They have skin in the game. They are locals, and they want this to be another additional offering, another part of the story of Brisbane—Australia's New World City. So it is that this particular site I think will be a fabulous new addition.

Apart from the aspects that I have mentioned, the older buildings that are there, the heritage-listed buildings, will consist of restaurants. There will be potential for other retail markets within that particular site. The proposal also includes a marina, and the operators have the option to take this up. If, however, they decide not to, then Council will have at some point an opportunity to go in and to reassign an opportunity around that. We believe it is a great site for a marina development and would be a good addition to the river-scape.

The development itself does not provide the biggest return to Council. We always, when we went into this site, said what we wanted was an outcome which this city could be very proud of, an outcome which was sensitive to the cliff face, sensitive to the Story Bridge. We have already done a lot of stabilisation of the cliff. There is still a section to be done, and that is behind the proposed hotel. That will be part and parcel of the responsibility of the successful consortium, if determined by today's Council.

Chairman:

Thank you, LORD MAYOR. Further questions; Councillor DICK.

Question 2

Councillor DICK:

Thank you, Madam Chair; my question is to the LORD MAYOR. You announced in this Chamber on 2 December that the Audi car dealer, Mr Justin Trivett, whose business you removed from the Indooroopilly roundabout site, was an LNP political donor. You have granted a new lease to another Audi

dealer for the same site without going through an open, competitive tender process. Can Brisbane residents be confident that the decisions you make are not being influenced by who donates to the LNP?

LORD MAYOR:

Well, Madam Chairman, again, the question is flawed. There is no lease with the existing people that are operating on that site. It is a month-by-month occupancy of that site.

Councillors interjecting.

LORD MAYOR:

It is a situation where they are paying their rent.

Chairman:

Order!

LORD MAYOR:

They are paying their rent. That was not the case with the previous Audi dealer. He was behind. There were several meetings to get that previous occupant up to speed in terms of their paying their bills. I just don't quite understand what Councillor DICK is on about. Clearly he is peddling the view here today that we ought to have let the previous occupant continue to not paying his bills and dues to the ratepayers of this city. That seems to be what he is pushing. It is just wrong from a point of view of representatives in this place. We need to be acting from a financial point of view in the interests of ratepayers, and when somebody continues to not pay their bills, we have to act. If we do not act, we are negligent.

We gave that operator every opportunity to get up to speed in terms of the payment of their bills. It is well documented. We have done the right thing here. We have done the right thing by moving the original occupant on. They had the opportunity to pay their bills; they did not. We had to act in the interests of the ratepayers of this city.

If I had not acted, the Opposition Leader and his team would have had every right to say, LORD MAYOR, why are you protecting this operator when they are not paying their bills? That would have been the way they would have gone if I hadn't acted. So they are trying to have a bit each way here. I just can't for the life of me understand why you are trying to defend a situation where an entity were not paying—

Councillor interjecting.

Chairman:

Councillor JOHNSTON! Order!

LORD MAYOR:

—their bills. There is no long-term lease in relation to this site. It is a permit to occupy. It is on a short-term basis. Whenever that land is required by this Council, it will be required, and that will be the end of it. So there will be no great haggling over whether there is any lease agreement in place which Council will then have to somehow expire that agreement because we need the land. So that is why it is on this short term arrangement in terms of a month-by-month occupancy.

Once again I don't know what is driving the question. I cannot understand it. We have in every respect done the right thing in relation to the action we took on the previous occupant of this site, and that continues to be the position.

Chairman:

Further questions; Councillor McKENZIE.

Question 3

Councillor McKENZIE:

Thanks, Madam Chairman; my question is to the Chairman of the Infrastructure Committee, Councillor SCHRINNER. There can be no doubt that this Administration has an excellent record of delivering projects under budget which has meant that funding can be reinvested in other important Council work across the city.

Councillors interjecting.

Chairman:

Order!

Councillor McKENZIE: Can you please provide the Chamber with some examples that demonstrate this excellent model of infrastructure delivery?

DEPUTY MAYOR: Thank you for the question, Councillor McKENZIE, and a pertinent question as well. In the period that we've been in recess—or that some people have been in recess, and others have been working—the Council has finished three major infrastructure projects. These three projects started with an initial budget of \$353 million. The three I refer to are the two open-level crossings on the northside—Geebung and Bracken Ridge, and also the Riverwalk project.

Those three projects, as I said, were finished just recently during this recess period. Those three projects are now open and benefitting the residents of Brisbane as we promised. The interesting thing is, out of that \$353 million actual budget that we started off with, the final result was \$297 million, a saving of \$56 million on those projects—\$56 million.

Under the arrangement which some of these projects were contributed to—

Councillors interjecting.

Chairman: Order! Order!

DEPUTY MAYOR: They don't want to hear.

Chairman: Councillor FLESSER!

DEPUTY MAYOR: They only like to hear bad news, Councillor MURPHY. Some of these projects obviously had a contribution from the State Government and Federal Government, so some of those savings actually go back to the State Government. I am pleased to say that we've handed back more than \$30 million in savings to the State Government as a result of our project management—\$30 million that came across to Council—

Councillors interjecting.

Chairman: Order!

DEPUTY MAYOR: —and we have seen a great result for the people of Brisbane. I was a bit disappointed to see some quite negative and pithy comments from the Leader of the Opposition on the Riverwalk project. I think this has been a great outcome for the people of Brisbane, not only just for the local residents around New Farm but also people coming from all around Brisbane to use this great bit of sustainable infrastructure.

When I say sustainable, I don't mean it's just sustainable because it's supporting walking and cycling; I mean sustainable because it's going to stick around. It will be there in the future. This piece of infrastructure will not wash away like Labor's Riverwalk did. It will not wash away in just eight years after it was built, like the floating Riverwalk. This one will last the test of time.

It has been designed to a one in 2,000 year flood event standard. So we will see in future—

Councillors interjecting.

Chairman: Councillor JOHNSTON!

DEPUTY MAYOR: —flood events in the Brisbane River the requirement to maybe clean off the Riverwalk and replace a bit of damaged balustrading, but that structure has been designed to stand the test of time. It is important that we did that project properly.

But this recent example of Council managing projects and saving money wherever possible is part of an ongoing process that this Administration has been involved with. You will all remember the Road Action program—15 years' worth of work in four years. That was a project of a value of around \$1 billion—

Councillor interjecting.

Chairman: Order!

DEPUTY MAYOR: —\$1 billion of work that was delivered in four years.

Councillor interjecting.

Chairman: Councillor SUTTON! Councillor SUTTON! Stop yelling out. DEPUTY MAYOR.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Councillor SUTTON, I appreciate your strong support for the Wynnum Road upgrade project. I am looking forward to that continuing.

Councillors interjecting.

Chairman: Order!

DEPUTY MAYOR: The Road Action program was able to deliver savings of over \$117 million, and that money was reinvested right here into this building to help restore City Hall. So the great result we saw on City Hall was funded in a large part from the savings generated on road projects.

Also right under way at the moment we have the Legacy Way project, a project that is running very well, proceeding very well, and a project with a \$1.5 billion budget. That project now is 80 per cent complete, and we are on budget. This is the largest project Council has ever funded and managed, and it is on budget. So we are looking forward to a great result next year when that project opens.

Councillors interjecting.

Chairman: Order!

DEPUTY MAYOR: Certainly it's another example of how this Administration not only gets on with the job of delivering infrastructure, but works very hard to save the ratepayers of this city money. If we do make those savings, to reinvest them in important works and projects right across the city.

Chairman: Further questions; Councillor DICK.

Question 4

Councillor DICK: Thanks, Madam Chair; my question is to the LORD MAYOR. You've already admitted you know who are the political donors to the LNP. It has been reported in the media that your Howard Smith Wharves preferred redeveloper is a consortium whose cofounder, as you mentioned before, is Elisha Bickle. Ms Bickle is a partner of Katarzyna Group. The Electoral Commission of Queensland has revealed that the Katarzyna Group donated \$7,500 to the LNP last year. Can Brisbane residents be confident that the decisions you make are not being influenced by who donates to the LNP?

LORD MAYOR: Madam Chairman, it is good to see Brisbane boogeyman back in town. For a start, I have never ever said that I know who the LNP donors are. I have indicated previously that I was aware that Mr Trivett was a donor. I have not ever, ever, said that I am aware—

Councillor interjecting.

Chairman: Order!

LORD MAYOR: —of who the donors to the Liberal National Party are.

Councillor interjecting.

Chairman: Councillor FLESSER!

LORD MAYOR: Can I just say in relation to—

Councillors interjecting.

Chairman: Order!

LORD MAYOR: —Councillor DICK's not unexpected but very usual question, because he's been down this path now for months—it's all he's interested in. He's not interested in

the future of Brisbane; he is only interested in getting into a bit of gutter politics.

The proposal that he raises, the Howard Smith Wharves proposal, has been won by Howard Smith Wharves Pty Limited. There has been from day dot a person in place, externally, who has been a probity auditor for this proposal. That probity auditor has been involved in every step of the way.

Councillor interjecting.

LORD MAYOR: Yes, thanks Councillor—

Chairman: Just a moment, LORD MAYOR. Councillor JOHNSTON, I have already asked you to be quiet. If you continue, I will warn you formally. I direct you to cease your interjections. LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: So, Madam Chairman, in any discussions along the way relative to this proposal, that person has always been in attendance. Can I just say to you, Councillor DICK, that this was an important proposal. It was one which saw a lot of attention, a lot of attraction. You might recall that, at the very outset, we went to a company called Savills to go out to the industry, and there was interest, not only domestically but internationally. I think we had something like 200 expressions of interest initially. That was then short-listed down to an appropriate number of proposers, and further details were sought from those proponents. It ultimately then came down to a short list of five, and then to three, and then a final selection.

This process has, of course, been run by the officers of this Council, and it has been done so under the supervision of a trained probity officer from the private sector. So this is what we have also done with large tunnel projects. We don't do it with every single thing we do, but we do do it where they are significant development proposals, and where they are in the public interest to do so. So that person has been engaged and has been a part of this process from day dot.

Chairman: Further questions; Councillor OWEN-TAYLOR.

Question 5

Councillor OWEN-TAYLOR: Thank you, Madam Chairman; my question this afternoon is for the Chairman of Finance, Economic Development and Administration Committee, Councillor SIMMONDS. It is less than four weeks until Brisbane hosts the 2014 G20 Leaders Summit, the premiere forum for international economic cooperation and decision making. Can you please update the Chamber on Council's preparations for this world-class event?

Councillor SIMMONDS: Thank you very much, Madam Chairman, and thank you to Councillor OWEN-TAYLOR for the question. Well, yes, with just a few weeks to go until Brisbane hosts the G20 Leaders Summit, preparations are certainly under way in earnest. It is an incredibly exciting opportunity for our city to not only become the capital city of the world for three days, but to demonstrate our mantel as Australia's New World City.

The summit will doubtless provide Brisbane with some immediate and more substantial longer term benefits, not least the greater recognition within large visitor and investment markets that will see their leaders attend the summit. Just to emphasise to councillors the opportunity that is available to our city, it might interest the Chamber to know that between them, the G20 nations make up 85 per cent of the world's GDP (gross domestic product), 80 per cent of the world's trade, and more than 60 per cent of the world's population. All will be focused on Brisbane in just a few weeks' time.

With planning moving forward at a rapid pace, and with the Council playing a supporting role to our Federal and State Government colleagues, I was pleased to have the opportunity to brief councillors today on the latest information regarding traffic and logistical arrangements. I urge councillors to play a role in ensuring that their community members are directed to authoritative sources of information on the G20 arrangements, particularly the police and G20

Taskforce websites, as well as playing a role in rejecting insular notions regarding the perceived negatives of hosting the summit, and instead talking about the significant opportunities that it holds for our city.

For the most part, councillors who attended the briefing today heard that it will be business as normal for our city, particularly in the immediate lead-up and directly following the summit. However, of course, during the three days of the G20 long weekend, residents do need to bear in mind that disruptions will apply. Changes to parking and public transport will mean increased journey times for motorists, and residents should be sure to check the TransLink website, the police website, plan their travel and leave extra time to reach their destination.

In terms of buses, normal bus operations will continue right up until 7pm on Thursday 13 November. So, for all intents and purposes, the Monday to the Thursday are business as usual for working and school days. From 7pm on that Thursday, however, new arrangements will apply. So bus stops and busways in the CBD and South Brisbane will be closed, and buses will terminate short of the CBD and South Bank where passengers will have the opportunity to travel on to the CBD in the shuttle buses provided. Normal bus operations will then recommence in time for the morning peak on Monday 17 November.

Trains will not stop but travel through the South Brisbane Station between 10 and 13 November, but otherwise in the lead-up to the G20 they will run as normal. Trains will travel to the CBD during the three days of the summit, when the South Brisbane Station will be closed, via the Tennyson diversion loop.

Ferries will continue to operate as normal throughout not only the lead-up and after the summit and during the summit, but during those three days will operate on a public holiday timetable. So people will be able to continue using the CityCats throughout. In relation to road closures, road and lane closures will commence around sole use hotels from Monday 10 November but for the majority of the road closures, these will come into play again after that 7pm time on the Thursday. Again, with motorcades, residents are urged to both check the general traffic information through the police website and also through the G20 Taskforce website.

The domestic and international terminals will operate as normal, although travellers and Brisbane residents are encouraged to utilise the Airtrain to avoid possible motorcade closures.

All councillors will be kept up to date on the arrangements during the summit, through updates produced by Council's support team that will be distributed regularly to them, so that they in turn can keep their residents updates. In addition to all of these logistical arrangements, I really encourage all councillors and Brisbane residents to get involved in the exciting events occurring in the lead-up to the summit that are being undertaken by both the Queensland State Government and also Council.

In the G20 week, on 12 and 13 November, Brisbane will host the Global Café which will provide some thought-provoking discussion with a series of live events and keynote speakers right here in our very own City Hall. We're the first G20 host city to undertake a function like this, but it is a great opportunity to attract to Brisbane some fantastic speakers, leveraging off our G20 hosting abilities, and to involve residents and local businesses in that opportunity.

There will also be the Colour Me Brisbane light show running from this Friday, so it starts this Friday, through to 9 November. It will run from 6pm until 11pm, and light up 32 sites and buildings with lighting projections and lasers.

Chairman:

Councillor SIMMONDS, your time has expired, thank you.

Councillor SIMMONDS:

Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Chairman:

Councillor DICK.

Question 6

- Councillor DICK: Thanks, Madam Chair; my question is to the LORD MAYOR. You have admitted that you, your Chairperson and your political staff have had seven closed-door meetings with Cedar Woods over a development at Upper Kedron. This included you personally meeting with the developer, who purchased the land the day after Institutional Investments signed an Infrastructure Agreement with Brisbane City Council, which appears to have dramatically increased the value of the land.
- Electoral Commission Queensland records show that Institutional Investments and their owners donated \$12,200 to the LNP. On 30 September on ABC radio, Councillor Amanda COOPER refused to rule out a link between the Infrastructure Agreement signed by Council and Institutional Investments for the Upper Kedron land and political donations made to the LNP by that company. Do you still maintain that there is absolutely no link between the content of the Infrastructure Agreement and the political donations made by the former landowner to the LNP?
- LORD MAYOR: Madam Chairman, you know, this is all the Opposition Leader is interested in these days. Let me say this from the outset—
- Councillors interjecting.*
- Chairman: Order!
- LORD MAYOR: We would not be having any discussions at all about Upper Kedron were it not for the Labor State Government. That is the game, set and match. The only reason that there is development happening or to be considered on this site is because of the Labor State Government.
- Let me just take you through a bit of this, because—
- Councillors interjecting.*
- Chairman: Order!
- LORD MAYOR: —is the absolute—
- Councillor DICK: Point of order, Madam Chair.
- Chairman: Order!
- LORD MAYOR: No, I am going to, Madam Chairman.
- Chairman: Order!
- LORD MAYOR: He can ask his question and I will answer it. Madam Chairman, this is the absolute hypocrisy of the question being put forward by Councillor DICK.
- Chairman: Order!
- LORD MAYOR: I've got a letter here from Andrew Fraser.
- Councillor DICK: Point of order, Madam Chair.
- LORD MAYOR: Yes, well he doesn't want to hear this.
- Chairman: Point of order, LORD MAYOR.
- LORD MAYOR: He doesn't want to hear this.
- Councillors interjecting.*
- LORD MAYOR: He wants to ask the grubby questions, but he doesn't want the answers, Madam Chairman.
- Chairman: Order! LORD MAYOR, sorry, just a moment.
- Councillors interjecting.*

Warning – Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON

The Chairman then formally warned Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON that unless she desisted from interjecting and interrupting the proper conduct of the meeting she would be suspended from the service of the Council for a period of up to eight days. Furthermore, Councillor JOHNSTON was warned that, if she were suspended from the service of the Council, she would be excluded from the Council Chamber, ante-Chamber, public gallery and other meeting places for the period of suspension.

Chairman: Councillor DICK, you called a point of order.

Councillor DICK: I do, Madam Chair, and I remind the LORD MAYOR my question was not about Anna Bligh or Andrew Fraser; it was—

Councillors interjecting.

Chairman: Order!

Councillor DICK: I know that is the deflection of the LORD MAYOR today, but this is a specific question about political donations, and I ask you to bring him back to the political donations aspect, which is the core of the question.

Chairman: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: There is no connection.

Chairman: Further questions; Councillor HOWARD.

Question 7

Councillor HOWARD: Thank you, Madam Chairman; my question is to the Chairman of the Neighbourhood Planning and Development Assessment Committee, Councillor COOPER. Would you please update the Chamber on planning initiatives and activities that have occurred across our city since the last Council meeting?

Councillor COOPER: Thank you very much, Madam Chair, and I thank Councillor HOWARD for her ongoing and keen interest in the planning initiatives of this city. There has been a lot of activity, particularly on that front, and one very close to Councillor HOWARD's heart indeed is Spring Hill. Certainly we have been very much active in that particular area, and we have been kicking off that first round of community consultation for the draft Spring Hill Renewal Strategy. So just over a week ago, from Friday 10 October to midnight 21 November, for 30 business days, or six weeks, Council officers will be asking for feedback from the community. I am sure that Councillor FLESSER will be making a submission. He is talking about it right now, I feel confident.

There will be certainly an opportunity to see a transformation of this particular part of our city. It has one of Council's oldest plans. The Petrie Terrace and Spring Hill Neighbourhood Plan came into being on Christmas Day 1982, and we are holding a whole range of events to encourage people to be part of the process. We are offering two Talk to a Planner sessions; the first one was last Saturday at Bedford Park in Spring Hill—that was from 8am until midday. Councillor HOWARD was there. I think I just must have missed her. I must have arrived just as she had just left. But certainly people were coming along. It was a bit of a breezy morning, but certainly a beautiful opportunity for people to reconsider the future of Spring Hill.

We will also be having an event on Thursday 23 October from 3 in the afternoon until 6pm, again at Bedford Park. We also had an information staff for the draft strategy at Spring Hill Alive Fair—that was on 4 October, and while I did notice that Councillor HOWARD was dancing down the street at one point, she certainly was keen to answer questions from the local community, and it was great to see that event brought back. So Spring Hill certainly is, I think, a fantastic location and it deserves all the attention it is recently getting.

In relation to the planning objectives, it is about balancing future growth. It is also about, of course, protecting the much-loved areas of character and heritage

in that particular part of our city. So we are looking to protect and grow our health, educational and community sector, building on Spring Hill's strength as a heritage visitor destination, establish a network of green links to local destinations, improving recreational facilities in existing parks, and expanding parts of the city centre into the south-eastern area of Spring Hill.

We have distributed over 10,000 newsletters to residents, businesses and absentee landowners, as well as postcards that are going to local cafés and delicatessens, prompting people to think about the future of the local area. Spring Hill was identified as one of the key steps in the City Centre Master Plan, so our planning work is very much consistent with that.

We have also been out there with Hemmant-Lytton. So the draft Hemmant-Lytton Neighbourhood Plan has gone through to its next step. We have got a summary of feedback for that plan being made public in the submissions report. We undertook six weeks of community consultation also on the draft Kurilpa Master Plan with two Talk to a Planner sessions at Davies Park. We have recorded nearly 28,000 hits to the website, so a great deal of interest in what Council is proposing. It not only reflects our extensive consultation, but the level of interest in this vision to deliver one kilometre of riverfront access is certainly something unparalleled and a once in a generation opportunity to maximise these inner city precincts, and how they may be used into the future.

So there has certainly been quite a bit of activity. We have also been out there talking to residents at Wynnum. We have had two Talk to a Planner sessions. Councillor CUMMING came along and sat with me. He spent some quality time with me. He also brought a journalist along to have a chat to me. I really did appreciate that, thank you very much, Councillor CUMMING. It is great to see you taking such a hands-on approach to your local area. The Wynnum Golf Club seems to see a lot of activity in the planning space. So I do thank all of the councillors that have been involved.

We have had a very busy recess indeed, and certainly the people of Brisbane are responding. They are coming along to these events, and they are talking to us about the future of our city. They know that our city is growing, and they want to be a part of how we grow, to make sure we get great outcomes and to make sure we continue to deliver on our promise for Brisbane to be Australia's New World City. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Chairman:

Councillor DICK.

Question 8

Councillor DICK:

Thank you, Madam Chair; my question is to the LORD MAYOR. If you are confident there is actually no link between the content of the Infrastructure Agreement over the land at Upper Kedron and the political donations made by the former landowner to the LNP, will you voluntarily release all documentation, including emails between your staff, Councillor COOPER's staff, Council officers and the previous property owner in relation to the content of the Infrastructure Agreement?

LORD MAYOR:

Madam Chairman, there would only be one reason why Councillor DICK would want that, and that would be to set about the task of character assassination, which is all he is interested in in this Council these days. He seems to have lost the plot, the fact that we're representing people, in advancing a great city of Brisbane. He never talks about the city. He never talks about positivity in relation to Brisbane. He is only interested in this old campaign manual style politics from the Labor Party.

So, Madam Chairman, the fact of the matter is that this land was, by way of a letter from Andrew Fraser back in 2007, set aside for development. It was the forerunner—

Councillor FLESSER:

Point of order, Madam Chair.

Chairman:

Point of order, LORD MAYOR; just a moment. Yes, Councillor FLESSER.

- Councillor FLESSER: Madam Chair, the LORD MAYOR is not answering the question. The question was about whether he will release documents relating to this deal. It is not a round the world other issues about how we come to this, but will he release the documents or not?
- Chairman: Councillor FLESSER, I believe—
- Councillors interjecting.*
- Chairman: Order! Councillor SUTTON! I believe the LORD MAYOR is developing his argument, and he will answer the question. LORD MAYOR.
- LORD MAYOR: Thanks very much, Madam Chairman. It was in 2007 that the then treasurer, Andrew Fraser, under the Bligh Government, wrote to the former Lord Mayor here and he said: “I note and support the Council’s recognition of the importance of the Ferny Grove Upper Kedron area as one of the few remaining areas within Brisbane suitable for accommodating significant green field development.”
- He said: “I therefore encourage Council to ensure the strategic importance of this area is explored during the current preparation of its local growth management strategy to ensure the area is appropriately planned and developed in the future and its proximity to existing and proposed infrastructure and services is maximised. The outcome of this investigation could inform future amendments to the local plan and any future review of the South-East Queensland Regional Plan proposed for 2009.”
- Councillor DICK: Point of order, Madam Chair.
- LORD MAYOR: Yes, of course there would be. Of course there would be.
- Chairman: Yes, just a moment, LORD MAYOR. Yes, Councillor DICK.
- Councillor DICK: Madam Chair, that is great, the LORD MAYOR is referring to correspondence seven years ago. My question was specifically about correspondence this year. Will the LORD MAYOR answer the question?
- Chairman: Thank you, LORD MAYOR; to the question.
- LORD MAYOR: So, Madam Chairman, 2009 arrived. In that South-East Queensland Regional Plan, it said this: “Although Brisbane’s broad acre land supply is becoming exhausted, new areas are located at Rochedale, Lower Oxley Creek and Upper Kedron.”
- Wait for this; it says: “Developing these areas will deliver approximately 30,000 dwellings in the short to medium term.” I will say that again: “developing these areas will deliver approximately 30,000 dwellings in the short to medium term.” Of course you would be mumbling among yourselves. So Rochedale, Madam Chairman, Infrastructure Agreement in place. How many dwellings does it provide for—6,500. The Lower Oxley Creek area—4,400. On the back of that, of what the Labor State Government were wanting, that on my calculation leaves a total of some 19,000 dwellings for the Upper Kedron based on their 30,000 analysis.
- Councillor DICK: Point of order, Madam Chair.
- Councillors interjecting.*
- Chairman: Order! Order!
- LORD MAYOR: There you go.
- Chairman: Order!
- Councillor DICK: Point of order, Madam Chair.
- LORD MAYOR: So, Madam Chairman—
- Chairman: Order! Just a minute, LORD MAYOR. Councillor SUTTON, if you continue to yell out like that and interject, you will be warned as well.

LORD MAYOR: So Madam Chairman, that left 19,000—

Chairman: Sorry, LORD MAYOR; Councillor DICK, are you calling a point of order.

Councillor DICK: For my third time, yes, Madam Chair, I would ask you to draw the LORD MAYOR back, rather than this deflection, back to the core question about correspondence about his agreement, not anything that happened seven years ago.

Chairman: Yes, thank you, Councillor; LORD MAYOR, to the question please.

LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Madam Chairman, and this is the problem with the Labor Party. They only want to talk about a political agenda of theirs. They don't want to talk about—

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order, Madam Chair.

LORD MAYOR: —the facts of the matter, Madam Chairman.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order, Madam Chairman.

LORD MAYOR: They're not interested in those fact.

Chairman: Yes, just a moment, LORD MAYOR. Yes, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Madam Chairman, the LORD MAYOR is ignoring your direction. You referred him back to the question, and he is continuing to make political comments about the Labor Party. The question was about whether the LORD MAYOR would release correspondence from him, his Chairman and his staff about the Upper Kedron Infrastructure Agreement. In line with your previous ruling, I would ask you to draw him back to the question.

Chairman: Councillor JOHNSTON, I have drawn the LORD MAYOR back, and the LORD MAYOR is going to refer to the question.

LORD MAYOR: And they're wasting a lot of the time for me to give the answer appropriately, Madam Chairman, because based on the 19,000 that are left from that 30,000 figure, that is a lot of dwellings. What are we talking about in terms of the proposal before Upper Kedron? It is 1,350 dwellings.

The point being that none of this debate would be occurring—none of these questions would be occurring were it not for the Labor Party in the South-East Queensland Regional Plan putting that area into the urban footprint—

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order, Madam Chairman.

LORD MAYOR: That is the whole point of these questions.

Chairman: Point of order, LORD MAYOR.

Councillor interjecting.

Chairman: Yes, Councillor JOHNSTON?

Councillor JOHNSTON: Madam Chairman—

Chairman: Councillor JOHNSTON, I don't need you to tell me how to Chair the meeting. I have asked the LORD MAYOR to get back to the question. Is that what your point of order was?

Councillor JOHNSTON: I would like to make my point of order, Madam Chairman, so you can rule on it, and I believe I am entitled to do so under the Standing Orders in this Chamber. Madam Chairman, the LORD MAYOR is not being relevant and answering the question, which is about whether he will release all the correspondence between himself, his Chairman and his staff, about the Infrastructure Agreement for the Upper Kedron site. I would ask you in line with your previous ruling to draw him back to the question, and if he continues to ignore your direction, in line with the Rules of Procedure, I would ask that you warn him for failing to do so.

Chairman: LORD MAYOR.

- LORD MAYOR: Madam Chairman, there is a process in this place, and the Infrastructure Agreement—
- Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order, Madam Chairman.
- Chairman: Councillor JOHNSTON, you are unnecessarily interrupting this Question Time and burning up time. The LORD MAYOR had said three words.
- Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order, Madam Chairman.
- Chairman: Yes, Councillor JOHNSTON.
- Councillor JOHNSTON: Under the Rules of Procedure in this place, when a councillor rises to make a point of order, you are then required to rule on that point of order. You failed to do so, and I would ask for a ruling on the point of order that I have made under the Standing Rules.
- Chairman: Councillor JOHNSTON, I have already told you I have called the LORD MAYOR back to the question. The LORD MAYOR had said about three words when you interrupted again. There is a limit to how many times you will interrupt this Council and waste the time of the Chamber. LORD MAYOR, back to the question.
- LORD MAYOR: Thank you very much, Madam Chairman. There is an Infrastructure Agreement—that is true. That Infrastructure Agreement can be acquired by any member of the public. There is a small nominal fee that goes with that. The reality is that I am sure that, if they haven't already, there is no problem with that community group out there obtaining that Infrastructure Agreement.
- This is all a political beat up. If I sound a little frustrated, this is a political beat up to try and support Kate Jones, the very person who supported this land going into the urban footprint.
- Councillor DICK: Point of order, Madam Chair.
- Chairman: Thank you, LORD MAYOR.
- LORD MAYOR: That is what it's all about.
- Chairman: Thank you, LORD MAYOR.
- LORD MAYOR: Let's not beat around the bush. That's what this is all about.
- Councillor DICK: Point of order, Madam Chair.
- Chairman: Thank you, LORD MAYOR. LORD MAYOR, resume your seat, thank you. Councillor DICK.
- Councillor DICK: Now, for the fourth time, Madam Chair, I think I've been more than reasonable. You've called the LORD MAYOR back to answer the question. He has not answered the question. He is doing everything to duck and weave the basic question of: if he has nothing to hide, will he release the documentation.
- Chairman: Councillor DICK, I won't uphold your point of order. The LORD MAYOR's time has expired. Further questions.
- Councillor SUTTON: Point of order, Madam Chair.
- Chairman: Yes, Councillor SUTTON.

MOTION FOR SUSPENSION OF STANDING RULES:

163/2014-15

At that juncture, Councillor Shayne SUTTON moved, seconded by Councillor Kim FLESSER, that the Standing Rules be suspended to allow the moving of the following—

'motion of no confidence in LORD MAYOR Graham QUIRK and condemning the secrecy of this Administration when it comes to assessing development applications in this city, and set up a bipartisan committee to examine the evidence around the infrastructure agreement deal that was struck between this Council for potential referral to the CMC.'

- Chairman: Councillor SUTTON, you have three minutes to establish urgency only.
- Councillor SUTTON: Thank you, Madam Chair. I am moving this suspension of Standing Orders as an urgent matter because I am sick to death of this secrecy that this Administration has assigned to develop applications in general, but in particular this Cedar Woods development. Nothing that I have seen in my time as the councillor in this place for 10 years concerns me as much as the appearance of wrongdoing that I believe has occurred in regards to this development application.
- I am genuinely and legitimately concerned, and the LORD MAYOR's answer today gives me no confidence that he is dealing with this matter with integrity or—
- Chairman: Urgency, please, Councillor SUTTON.
- Councillor SUTTON: Well, Madam Chair, the reason I have moved this suspension of Standing Orders—
- Chairman: Just a moment, Councillor SUTTON; point of order, LORD MAYOR.
- LORD MAYOR: Yes, point of order, Madam Chairman. I would ask that you make an assessment as to whether in fact this motion is a legitimate motion—
- Councillor SUTTON: It is a legitimate motion.
- LORD MAYOR: It is a legitimate motion?
- Councillor SUTTON: Yes.
- LORD MAYOR: Well, I don't think it is.
- Councillor SUTTON: Are you debating me, or are you asking for a ruling?
- LORD MAYOR: Madam Chairman, no—
- Chairman: Councillor SUTTON, resume your seat.
- LORD MAYOR: —I am addressing the Chair, Madam Chairman, if I may. To my understanding, there is no such organisation as the CMC.
- Chairman: Thank you, LORD MAYOR.
- Councillors interjecting.*
- Chairman: Order!
- Councillor SUTTON: Madam Chair—
- Chairman: Councillor SUTTON, wait until you are called again. LORD MAYOR, in terms of anyone moving Suspension of the Standing Rules, they are entitled to do that. Councillor SUTTON has three minutes to establish urgency only. Councillor SUTTON.
- Councillor SUTTON: Thank you, Madam Chair, and my challenge to the LORD MAYOR is: support the Suspension of Standing Orders and you can debate that with me. That's my challenge to you.
- Madam Chair, for the LORD MAYOR of this city to try to get out of answering a legitimate question by the Leader of the Opposition on the basis of what some government did years ago, or some letter years ago that is completely and utterly unrelated is a sign of a desperate man trying to cover up—
- Chairman: Urgency.
- Councillor SUTTON: —trying to cover up a political nightmare that is brewing and coming his way.
- There is a whole heap of questions, legitimate questions, that need to be answered about this Infrastructure Agreement and the deals that were done behind closed doors. This LORD MAYOR, the Planning Chairperson and the two local councillors have had ample opportunity to voluntarily disclose even

the existence of this Infrastructure Agreement, and they refused to do it. It was only after one of the—

Chairman: Urgency.

Councillor SUTTON: —members of the committee found it on some obscure Federal Government website that they even acknowledged that it existed. This Council is continually making development application decisions behind closed doors, and I won't stand for this LORD MAYOR getting up and trying to blame the former Labor government for such an arrangement. It is contemptible. It is—

Chairman: Urgency, Councillor SUTTON.

Councillor SUTTON: —absolutely contemptible. It is ripping this—

Chairman: Councillor SUTTON! When I speak you stop. You are supposed to be establishing urgency as to why this must be moved right this minute at this time—

Councillor SUTTON: Because, Madam—

Chairman: —not debate whatever it is you wanted to put forward.

Councillor SUTTON: Because, Madam Chair, this is a matter that is concerning a large number of residents living around this area. It is also concerning the decision makers right now in this Council.

LORD MAYOR Graham QUIRK needs to come clean about the exact arrangements, the discussions that were had between McAllister, between his staff—

Chairman: Councillor SUTTON, your time has expired.

Councillor SUTTON: —and the landowners.

Chairman: Resume your seat. I will put the motion for the suspension of Standing Rules to allow a motion of urgency to be moved by Councillor SUTTON.

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

Thereupon, Councillors Shayne SUTTON and Victoria NEWTON immediately rose and called for a division, which resulted in the motion being declared **lost**.

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 8 - The Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Milton DICK, and Councillors Helen ABRAHAMS, Peter CUMMING, Kim FLESSER, Steve GRIFFITHS, Victoria NEWTON, Shayne SUTTON and Nicole JOHNSTON.

NOES: 18 - The Right Honourable the LORD MAYOR, Councillor Graham QUIRK, DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER, and Councillors Krista ADAMS, Matthew BOURKE, Amanda COOPER, Margaret de WIT, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Fiona KING, Geraldine KNAPP, Kim MARX, Peter MATIC, Ian McKENZIE, David McLACHLAN, Ryan MURPHY, Angela OWEN-TAYLOR, Julian SIMMONDS and Andrew WINES.

Chairman: That ends Question Time.

CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ESTABLISHMENT AND COORDINATION COMMITTEE:

ESTABLISHMENT AND COORDINATION COMMITTEE (Report of 8 September 2014)

The Right Honourable the LORD MAYOR (Councillor Graham QUIRK), Chairman of the Establishment and Coordination Committee, moved, seconded by the DEPUTY MAYOR (Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER), that the report of the Establishment and Coordination Committee held on 8 September 2014, be adopted.

Chairman: Is there any debate?

Chairman: Yes, thanks very much, Madam Chairman. Just before coming to the items, there's a number of issues I wanted to talk about. Just in regards of what we've just seen with that motion, once again it was an incompetent motion, but can I just say, they don't have to bring motions here. All they have to do is to take any evidence that they have to the CCC—the Crime and Corruption Commission. They will deal with it. That's all they've got to do. So rather than huffing and puffing—but we know that this is a campaign that's being run by Mr Bevis. We know that Mr Bevis is the son of a former Labor Federal Parliamentarian.

We know that this is a campaign to support Kate Jones, and we know that Kate Jones was in this business of putting this land into the urban footprint. She was up to her eyeballs in it. So that is the reality. I can take you back to speeches of a former councillor here, Ann Bennison, that met with Mr McAllister out there on that site. So, Madam Chairman, you know, it is all a political campaign. That's what it is all about. I just say again—

Councillors interjecting.

Chairman: Order!

LORD MAYOR: I say again: rather than the political displays in here, take the evidence to the CCC and let them deal with it.

Madam Chairman, I just want to acknowledge the passing of former Prime Minister Gough Whitlam. Whether we were political foes or political supporters of Gough Whitlam, he was none the less a former Prime Minister of this nation. It is appropriate that we do acknowledge his passing today. There was a former Federal President of the Liberal Party by the name of Tony Staley who many, many years ago recounted a story of a conversation that he'd had with Gough. In so many ways, it was a display of the humour of Gough Whitlam, the person behind the Prime Ministership. It went something like this—you will forgive me for the impersonation that goes with it.

This is Tony Staley to Gough: of course, Gough, you'd have known Henry Kissinger, wouldn't you? Gough: No, no, no, no, no—he knew me. So, Madam Chairman, that was so much of the Gough Whitlam humourist behind the Prime Ministership. Obviously the role of Prime Minister is one that is the nation's leading political position in this land and one which, through that position, we all respect, so we pay our respects to those relatives and friends of Gough Whitlam today.

There are a number of other aspects I just want to raise. Firstly, the Civic Cabinet yesterday made an appointment of Andrea Kenafake as the new head of the City Planning and Sustainability Division within Council, and we wish her well clearly in that role, and we thank all of those other applicants, many of them from within Council, but also across Australia, that put their name forward for that role. We thank them all for their interest.

The Asia Pacific Cities Summit will be coming up again next year. It will be the 10th summit next year. It will be staged here in Brisbane. Last time, of course, it was in Kaohsiung, and that was a summit that saw well over 1,000 delegates, 41 mayors, 44 deputy mayors from 104 cities. We saw representatives of one sort or another at an elected level, and businesses supporting that as well. We will have Lord Sebastian Coe as a keynote speaker next time, Randi Zuckerberg of Facebook fame will also be a speaker at that event, and other speakers to be announced in due course.

Today we launched the entity City Sightseeing Pty Limited will be running Brisbane Explorer. This is a new double-decker bus; there will be two of them initially, but more to come, and in the same sort of theme I suppose as the CityHopper, the idea for this CitySights Brisbane Explorer is that people will be able to hop on and hop off that bus service. It is a private enterprise run service, and we wish them well in their venture into Brisbane. They will be having multi-lingual commentary within that bus service, from not only Asian languages but also European languages, and so it is that that will be a great opportunity for people.

The other thing I wanted to do today was to table, if I may, the City of Brisbane Investment Corporation Annual Report. The board have reported a return this year of some 12.05 per cent for the 2013-14 year. It comes on the back of 14.64 per cent last year. So the equity now in that entity sits at \$236.3 million. It started at \$137.6 million, so the assets have grown considerably over that period of years. We will continue to see dividends returns to the ratepayers of this city from that.

Of course, we know that the Labor Party would just simply go out and spend that future fund at first opportunity. They've got to do that. They've got to do that; they can't have money in the bank. They've got to get out and spend that money. But that is something that we believe is a good future fund for the city in assets of this city. So it is that we thank those people involved in the good work that they are doing on behalf of ratepayers.

The month of October is breast cancer awareness month. We also had on 15 October the Ride to Work Day; 17 October we had Loud Shirt Day celebrated around Australia and lots of donations given to various charities around that. I also want to acknowledge the fact that we had the Lord Mayor's Business Achievers Awards between the last Council meeting and this, and I congratulate all of those people that were successful in awards. It is an event that highlights the innovation and the success of Brisbane business in a range of fields. Again we thank the Brisbane business community for all that they do and the jobs that they create.

Item A before us is the Contracts and Tendering Report, so there's a number of aspects here. Anzac Square Restoration Stage 2; structural remediation. This work is being undertaken by Kane Constructions Pty Limited. I had a report on this just a couple of days ago. They are about five days ahead of schedule at this stage. That is on a timetable that is hoping to see that work completed in February. Of course, we know the work needs to be completed by mid-April, but it is very much on track for a February completion, and I thank all of those involved in that work.

I thank Councillor BOURKE, too, for his overseeing of that project from a Council perspective. It is a joint State and Council undertaking. Provision of

The provision of landscape supplies. We've got a number listed there on a panel arrangement—\$8.5 million in relation to that panel. That is over a five-year term maximum, but initially over a couple of years. So Wood Mulching Industries are there—there's a whole list of them. They are all listed there; I won't go through every single one, but a range of quantum with respect to those various categories—bulk supply and delivery, small volume supply and delivery, supply and application, and so forth.

The next one, the provision of building conditions assessments. This is relating to asbestos and lead-based paint audits. UGL Services, trading as DTZ a UGL Company, they have achieved the highest value for money index there. GHD Pty Limited also achieved a high value for money index, and they are there in the preferred column. That is in category 1. Category 2 relates to asbestos and lead-based paint audits. The first one was a building condition assessment. So a number of companies there—Parsons Brinckerhoff, GHD, UGL Services, in that asbestos and lead-based paint audits area.

The provision of medical practitioner services to organisational wellness safety and health—again a number of entities that are listed there. So we thank them. The provision of brake, clutch and suspension components—\$1.07 million set aside there. GPC Asia Pacific Pty Limited—in other words, Repco, they trade as, so they are listed there as a successful proponent. Again, that is for a couple of years. It can be a five-year term, but initial term—

Chairman: LORD MAYOR, before you continue, your time has expired.

164/2014-15

The LORD MAYOR was granted an extension of time on the motion of the DEPUTY MAYOR, seconded by Councillor Ryan MURPHY.

Chairman: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: I thank the Chamber, Madam Chairman. I will only be another 30 seconds here. The next item there is the Microsoft Premier Support agreement for software maintenance and support services. This has gone to Microsoft Pty Limited. Their contract there is for a period of eight months. It aligns with the Microsoft Office 365 Premier Support Agreement. So this is an agreement which expires actually next year, but that is an existing one. It is a lump sum fee in relation to their services.

The provision of critical ICT (information and communications technology) infrastructure support and maintenance, that goes to Hewlett Packard Australia Pty Limited, \$287,398 in that case. Again, that contract was entered into without seeking competitive tenderers in accordance with exemption 7. The extensions to ICT maintenance and support arrangements are under schedule A of Council's annual procurement policy and contracting plan. Again, there was no benefit to a competitive arrangement in this particular case. That is it in terms of that tendering report.

Chairman: Further debate; Councillor DICK.

Councillor DICK: Thanks, Madam Chair; just briefly on the E&C item today which was held on 8 September that we are dealing with today, and I note we don't have any items that we will actually be dealing with apart from the adoption one which is the next E&C—this is the decision today.

Just on one item here which is the first one, which is the major contract that brought my attention, was for the Anzac Square restoration, which was Stage 2, the structural remediation of \$3.364 million. This is a project that certainly the Labor councillors are in support of. We know that we are coming up to the 84th anniversary of Anzac Square which was opened on Armistice Day 1930. There is a significant amount of community support for this project, as we head towards the centenary of the Anzac commemorations.

Just a couple of other items in here, Madam Chair. I guess I just flag as a concern on behalf of Labor councillors the growing trend towards sole-sourced tendering. There's a couple of items in here. There are sometimes good reasons as to why that is happening, but I just simply say again: that seems to be a growing pattern that we are seeing as contracts come in for debate and for approval. In my opinion, we should be looking for the best competitive tender that we can, and that is always opening up. It's bad enough that we know that there are some arrangements that we don't get told about, and we find out subsequently, but particularly when we see contracts.

I simply remind the LORD MAYOR and the Administration that it's good practice that we encourage and we see as many opportunities that we can, particularly for local business as well, so that they get a fair go and a fair opportunity, I guess, to bid for significant work for our city's industries.

Chairman: Further debate; Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, Madam Chairman, just briefly on this item that is before us today, I would certainly appreciate a little more information around the way in which the provision of medical practitioner services is used by this Council. I presume that these are doctors we have on call if there is any injury or issue with any Council officer. But I would certainly like some clarification about the types of uses that will be exercised under this contract. I believe that would assist with the understanding of this matter.

Chairman: Further debate; LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Madam Chairman, I will get back to Councillor JOHNSTON in relation to that. It is obviously in relation to the wellness, safety and health provisions within the Council, so that would be obviously relative to the various award categories within Council, and I will get back to her with a little bit more drill down detail.

Chairman: I will put the motion.

The Chairman restated the motion for the adoption of the report of the Establishment and Coordination Committee and upon being submitted to the Chamber, it was declared **carried** on the voices.

The report read as follows—

ATTENDANCE:

The Right Honourable the Lord Mayor (Councillor Graham Quirk) (Chairman); Deputy Mayor (Councillor Adrian Schrinner) (Deputy Chairman); and Councillors Krista Adams, Matthew Bourke, Amanda Cooper, Peter Matic, David McLachlan and Julian Simmonds.

A CONTRACTS AND TENDERING – REPORT TO COUNCIL OF CONTRACTS ACCEPTED BY DELEGATES FOR JULY 2014 **109/695/586/2**

165/2014-15

1. The Chief Executive Officer provided the information below.
2. Sections 238 and 239 of the *City of Brisbane Act 2010* (“the Act”) provide that Council may delegate some of its powers. Those powers include the power to enter into contracts under section 242 of the Act.
3. Council has previously delegated some powers to make, vary or discharge contracts for the procurement of goods, services or works. Council made these delegations to the Establishment and Coordination Committee and Chief Executive Officer.
4. The *City of Brisbane Regulation 2012* (“the Regulation”) was made pursuant to the Act. Section 227 in Chapter 6 (Part 4) of the Regulation provides that: (1) Council must, as soon as practicable after entering into a contract under this chapter worth \$200,000 or more (exclusive of GST), publish relevant details of the contract on Council’s website; (2) the relevant details must be published under subsection (1) for a period of at least 12 months; (3) also, if a person asks Council to give relevant details of a contract, Council must allow the person to inspect the relevant details at Council’s public office. ‘Relevant details’ is defined in section 227 Chapter 6 (Part 4) (4) as including: (a) the person with whom Council has entered into the contract; (b) the value of the contract; and (c) the purpose of the contract (e.g. the particular goods or services to be supplied under the contract).
5. The Chief Executive Officer provided the following recommendation and the Committee agreed.

6. **RECOMMENDATION:**

THAT COUNCIL NOTE THE REPORT IN ACCORDANCE WITH ATTACHMENT A, hereunder.

Attachment A

City of Brisbane Regulation 2012 – Chapter 6 – Contracting
Details of Contracts Accepted by Delegates of Council for July 2014

Contract/Quote No. & Successful Contractor/s	Delegate	Nature of Arrangement and Estimated Maximum Expenditure	Contract/Quote Purpose	Unsuccessful Tenders & Quoters	Prices Tendered	Approval, Start/End Dates & Term
BRISBANE INFRASTRUCTURE						
1. Contract No: 530175 Kane Constructions Pty Ltd – \$3,364,643 Achieved highest Value for Money Index (VFM) of 2.38	CEO	Lump sum \$3,364,643	Anzac Square Restoration Stage 2 – structural remediation	<u>Shortlisted tenderer</u> Canstruct Pty Ltd Achieved VFM of 1.87	\$4,269,223	Approved 22.07.2014 Start 22.07.2014 End Estimated completion within seven months
BRISBANE LIFESTYLE						
Nil						
BRISBANE TRANSPORT						
Nil						
CITY PLANNING & SUSTAINABILITY						
Nil						
OFFICE OF THE LORD MAYOR & CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER						
Nil						
ORGANISATIONAL SERVICES						
2. Contract No: 510067 <u>Category 1 – Bulk Supply and Delivery</u> Wood Mulching Industries – \$27,698* Achieved highest Value for Money Index (VFM) of 252.8 Pacific Silica Pty Ltd – \$34,462* Achieved (VFM) of 197.3 <u>Category 2 – Small Volume Supply and Delivery</u> Sapar Landscaping Supplies Pty Ltd – \$79,030* Achieved highest Value for Money Index (VFM) of 92.3 Conkel Pty Ltd Trading as Centenary Landscape Supplies – \$93,723* Achieved (VFM) of 78.5 TLS Online Pty Ltd trading as Tingalpa Landscape Supplies – \$95,648* Achieved (VFM) of 53.7 Wills Holdings Qld Pty Ltd trading as River City Trees (mulch only) – \$10,680*^ <u>Category 3 – Supply and Application of Mulch</u> Groundworks (Aust) Pty Ltd as trustee for	CEO	Panel Arrangement – schedule of rates \$8,500,000	Provision of Landscape Supplies	<u>Non-conforming offer</u> Western Landscape Supplies All other tenderers who submitted conforming offers have been included in the panel arrangement.	N/A	Approved 08.07.2014 Start 15.07.2014 End (Initial term) 14.07.2016 Max. Term Five years

Contract/Quote No. & Successful Contractor/s	Delegate	Nature of Arrangement and Estimated Maximum Expenditure	Contract/Quote Purpose	Unsuccessful Tenders & Quoters	Prices Tendered	Approval, Start/End Dates & Term
<p>Groundworks Unit Trust – \$939,960* Achieved highest Value for Money Index (VFM) of 82.5</p> <p>Tuff Yards Pty Ltd Trading as Blow It All – \$1,059,165* Achieved (VFM) of 61.3</p> <p>Wills Holdings Qld Pty Ltd trading as River City Trees (excluding mulch blowers) – \$337,095*^</p> <p><i>* Price for Categories 1 and 2 is a basket of goods. Price for Category 3 is the submitted rates multiplied by the estimated volumes of mulch products for application.</i></p> <p><i>^ VFM has not been calculated as the tendered response is part-only of the category requirements.</i></p>						
<p>3.</p> <p>Contract No: 510076</p> <p><u>Category 1 – Building Condition Assessments</u></p> <p>UGL Services, Trading as DTZ, a UGL company – \$800* Achieved highest Value for Money Index (VFM) of 102.8</p> <p>GHD Pty Ltd – \$1,955* Achieved (VFM) of 41.9</p> <p><i>* Final tendered price is the quote provided by the shortlisted tenderers to undertake a building condition assessment of a nominated building site. This practical exercise was the final stage of the evaluation process.</i></p> <p><u>Category 2 – Asbestos and Lead Based Paint Audits</u></p> <p>GHD Pty Ltd – \$75** Achieved highest Value for Money Index (VFM) of 10.9</p> <p>Parsons Brinckerhoff Australia Pty Ltd – \$89** Achieved (VFM) of 9.2</p> <p>UGL Services, Trading as DTZ, a UGL</p>	CEO	<p>Panel Arrangement – schedule of rates</p> <p>\$2,400,000</p>	<p>Provision of Building Condition Assessments, Asbestos and Lead Based Paint Audits</p>	<p><u>Category 1 – Building Condition Assessments</u></p> <p><i>Shortlisted offers not recommended</i></p> <p>Cardno (Qld) Pty Ltd Achieved (VFM) of 60.9 <i>(did not meet Council's contractual requirements)</i></p> <p>AssetFuture Pty Ltd Achieved (VFM) of 32.5</p> <p>AECOM Australia Pty Ltd Achieved (VFM) of 10.9</p> <p><i>Offers not recommended (Final tendered price and VFM not calculated – did not meet minimum quality requirements)</i></p> <p>Napier & Blakeley ATF The Napier & Blakeley Unit Trust</p> <p>Contour Consulting Engineers Pty Ltd</p> <p>Gleaba (07) Pty Ltd Trading as Environmental Earth Sciences Qld</p> <p>Gray Robinson & Cottrell</p> <p>SGA Property Consultancy Pty Ltd & SGA Consultancy Pty Ltd Trading as SGA Environmental</p> <p><u>Category 2 – Asbestos and Lead Based Paint Audits</u></p> <p><i>Shortlisted offers not recommended</i></p> <p>AECOM Australia Pty Ltd Achieved (VFM) of 6.1</p> <p><i>Offers not recommended (Final tendered price and VFM not calculated – did not meet minimum quality requirements)</i></p>	<p>\$1,330*</p> <p>\$2,010*</p> <p>\$7,462*</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>\$134**</p>	<p>Approved 15.07.2014 Start 18.07.2014 End (Initial term) 17.07.2017 Max. Term Five years</p>

Contract/Quote No. & Successful Contractor/s	Delegate	Nature of Arrangement and Estimated Maximum Expenditure	Contract/Quote Purpose	Unsuccessful Tenders & Quoters	Prices Tendered	Approval, Start/End Dates & Term
company – \$96** Achieved (VFM) of 8.2 ** Price is the average hourly rate calculated from submitted schedule of rates.				Coffey Environments Australia Pty Ltd SLR Consulting Australia Pty Ltd Gleaba (07) Pty Ltd Trading as Environmental Earth Sciences Qld SGA Property Consultancy Pty Ltd & SGA Consultancy Pty Ltd Trading as SGA Environmental Napier & Blakeley ATF The Napier & Blakeley Unit Trust Gray Robinson & Cottrell	N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	
4. Contract No: 520024 <u>Category A – Occupational Health</u> I & A Hadwen Medical Pty Ltd – \$195* Achieved highest Value for Money Index (VFM) of 476.9 Therese McGrath Medical Pty Ltd – \$364* Achieved (VFM) of 269.2 ME & EA Foley (Dr M Edward Foley) – \$365* Achieved (VFM) of 254.8 4cRisk Pty Ltd (Dr Nicholas Burke) – \$354* Achieved (VFM) of 231.6 <i>*Price is tendered hourly rate</i>	CPO	Panel Arrangement – schedule of rates \$1,312,560	Provision of Medical Practitioner Services to Organisational Wellness, Safety and Health	<u>Category A – Occupational Health</u> <u>Offers not recommended</u> OccMD Pty Ltd Dr Robert McCartney Achieved (VFM) of 180.3 Sonic HealthPlus Dr Andrew Lingwood Achieved (VFM) of 177.8 Medibank Health Solutions Pty Ltd Dr Keith Adams Achieved (VFM) of 156.4 <u>Offers not meeting minimum requirements</u> (VFM not calculated) Sonic HealthPlus Dr Tersia DeWilzem Jobfit Health Group Dr Sam Tsien Hsien Yang Dr Graeme Edwards - Streamline International Pty Ltd T/A Work & Health Risk Management Dr Graeme Edwards JobFit Health Group Dr Imlah Dr Christopher James Cunneen "Director of The Medical Advisor Pty Ltd" Medibank Health Solutions Pty Ltd Dr Jones Jobfit Health Group	\$488* \$450* \$569* \$450* \$260* \$500* \$440* \$500* \$569* \$440*	Approved 26.06.2014 Start 01.07.2014 End (Initial term) 30.06.2017 Max. Term Five years

Contract/Quote No. & Successful Contractor/s	Delegate	Nature of Arrangement and Estimated Maximum Expenditure	Contract/Quote Purpose	Unsuccessful Tenders & Quoters	Prices Tendered	Approval, Start/End Dates & Term
<p><u>Category B – Workers Compensation</u></p> <p>Dr William Wallace Sutherland – \$330* Achieved highest (VFM) of 281.8</p> <p>4cRisk Pty Ltd (Dr Nicholas Burke) – \$488* Achieved (VFM) of 178.3</p> <p><i>*Price is tendered hourly rate</i></p>				<p>Dr Sasan Beheshti</p> <p><u>Category B – Workers Compensation</u></p> <p><u>Offers not recommended</u></p> <p>Sonic HealthPlus Dr Andrew Lingwood Achieved (VFM) of 180</p> <p>\$450*</p> <p>Sonic HealthPlus Dr Tersia DeWiltzem Achieved (VFM) of 177.8</p> <p>\$450*</p> <p>OccMD Pty Ltd Dr Robert McCartney Achieved (VFM) of 172.1</p> <p>\$488*</p> <p>Dr Christopher James Cunneen 'Director of The Medical Advisor Pty Ltd' Achieved (VFM) of 168</p> <p>\$500*</p> <p><u>Offers not meeting minimum requirements</u> (VFM not calculated)</p> <p>Dr Graeme Edwards - Streamline International Pty Ltd T/A Work & Health Risk Management Dr Graeme Edwards</p> <p>\$500*</p> <p>JobFit Health Group Dr Sowby</p> <p>\$240*</p> <p><u>Non-conforming offers</u></p> <p>JobFit Health Group Dr Imlah</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>JobFit Health Group Dr Sasan Beheshti</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>Medibank Health Solutions Pty Ltd Dr Clem Bonney</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>Medibank Health Solutions Pty Ltd Dr Rosemarie Knight</p> <p>N/A</p>		
<p>5.</p> <p>Contract No: 520026</p> <p><u>Passenger and Light Commercial Vehicles</u></p> <p>GPC Asia Pacific Pty Ltd (Repco) – \$76,013 Achieved highest Value for Money Index (VFM) of 88</p>	CEO	<p>Panel Arrangement – schedule of rates</p> <p>\$1,070,000</p>	Provision of Brake, Clutch and Suspension Components	<p><u>Passenger and Light Commercial Vehicles</u></p> <p><u>Shortlisted offers not recommended</u></p> <p>Burson Automotive Achieved (VFM) of 78</p> <p>\$84,061</p> <p>Brisbane Brake and Clutch Supplies Achieved (VFM) of 71</p> <p>\$109,580</p>		<p>Approved 01.07.2014 Start 15.07.2014 End (Initial term) 14.07.2016 Max. Term Five years</p>

Contract/Quote No. & Successful Contractor/s	Delegate	Nature of Arrangement and Estimated Maximum Expenditure	Contract/Quote Purpose	Unsuccessful Tenders & Quoters	Prices Tendered	Approval, Start/End Dates & Term
<p>Trucks</p> <p>Multispares Ltd – \$134,831 Achieved VFM of 54</p> <p>Labour Components <i>No tenderers were recommended for labour components</i></p>				<p><i>Offer not shortlisted</i> Commercial Brake and Clutch Services Pty Ltd Achieved (VFM) of 53</p> <p>Trucks</p> <p><i>Shortlisted offers not recommended</i> Brisbane Brake and Clutch Supplies Achieved (VFM) of 53</p> <p><i>Offer not shortlisted</i> Commercial Brake and Clutch Services Pty Ltd Achieved (VFM) of 21</p> <p>Labour Components <i>No tenderers were recommended for labour components</i></p> <p><i>Shortlisted offers not recommended</i> Brisbane Brake and Clutch Supplies Achieved (VFM) of 22</p> <p><i>Offer not shortlisted</i> Commercial Brake and Clutch Services Pty Ltd Achieved (VFM) of 14</p> <p>Non-conforming offer Direct Clutch Services</p>	<p>\$130,254</p> <p>\$144,560</p> <p>\$325,492</p> <p>\$3,453</p> <p>\$4,776</p> <p>N/A</p>	
<p>6.</p> <p>Contract No: 570013</p> <p>Microsoft Pty Ltd – \$145,080</p>	CPO	<p>Lump sum</p> <p>\$145,080</p>	<p>Microsoft Premier Support Agreement (software, maintenance and support services)</p>	<p>Contract entered into without seeking competitive tenders in accordance with Exemption 7 (Extensions of ICT Maintenance and Support Arrangements) under Schedule A of Council's <i>Annual Procurement Policy and Contracting Plan 2013-2014</i>.</p> <p>Contract is for a period of eight months to align it with the Microsoft Office 365 premier support agreement which expires in March 2015 and will allow consolidation of both contracts.</p>	N/A	<p>Approved 15.07.2014 Start 15.07.2014 End Maximum term of eight months</p>
<p>7.</p> <p>Contract No: i100032-09/10</p> <p>Hewlett Packard Australia Pty Ltd – \$287,398</p>	CEO	<p>Lump sum</p> <p>\$287,398</p>	<p>Provision of Critical ICT Infrastructure Support and Maintenance</p>	<p>Contract entered into without seeking competitive tenders in accordance with Exemption 7 (Extensions of ICT Maintenance and Support Arrangements) under Schedule A of Council's <i>Annual Procurement Policy and Contracting Plan 2013-2014</i>.</p> <p>Council requires this continuing support for two categories of servers which are currently supporting a number of applications, some of which are due to be decommissioned, replaced or upgraded as BaSE and the Brisbane Road Asset Management System (BRAMS) projects are rolled out and implemented.</p>	N/A	<p>Approved 08.07.2014 Start 08.07.2014 End 30.06.2015</p>

ADOPTED

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

ESTABLISHMENT AND COORDINATION COMMITTEE (Adoption report)

The Right Honourable the LORD MAYOR (Councillor Graham QUIRK), Chairman of the Establishment and Coordination Committee, moved, seconded by the DEPUTY MAYOR (Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER), that the report setting out the *recommendations* of the Establishment and Coordination Committee during the Spring Recess 2014, on matters usually considered by that Committee, be adopted.

Chairman: Is there any debate? LORD MAYOR.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order, Madam Chairman.

Chairman: Yes, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Seriatim for debate and voting - Clauses A and G

At that time Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON rose and requested that Clause A, ANNUAL OPERATIONAL PLAN PROGRESS AND QUARTERLY FINANCIAL REPORT FOR THE PERIOD ENDED JUNE 2014, and Clause F, APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE BCC COUNCILLOR CONDUCT REVIEW PANEL MEMBERSHIP POOL be taken seriatim for debating and voting purposes.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Point of order, Madam Chairman.

Chairman: Yes, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Thank you, Madam Chairman. In pursuance of section 41(1) of the Meetings Local Law—

Chairman: Sorry, Councillor JOHNSTON, what are you moving further in relation to this report?

Councillor JOHNSTON: I am not moving anything further; I am making a point of order, Madam Chairman.

Chairman: Yes, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Thank you, Madam Chairman. In pursuance of section 41(1) of the Meetings Local Law, I seek the following further information regarding item G in the Establishment and Coordination Report. I am seeking the following information which is not available on the file or in the report itself. Which members of the CCRP (Councillor Conduct Review Panel) Committee have resigned or departed from the Councillor Conduct Panel? How many applications were received by Council for the new positions which we are being asked to appoint today? Thirdly, one of the applicants has a Certificate in Business and Law; I would like some source information about what institution that certificate has come from.

Chairman: Councillor JOHNSTON, can you give me all of that in writing, please? Thank you. Given that you have moved seriatim for debate and voting, your questions will be addressed at the debating stage for item G. LORD MAYOR, we will do item A first.

LORD MAYOR: Thanks very much, Madam Chairman. Item A is the Annual Operational Plan Progress and Quarterly Financial Report for the period ended June 2014. Firstly, can I say that the ratios as presented within this financial report remain very strong. We are within those ratios, always seeking an interest cover which is less than 10 per cent, and we are currently sitting at 4.68 per cent. We seek a debt servicing as a proportion of total income of less than 33 per cent; we are

currently sitting on 6.03 per cent. We seek a net debt to total income ratio of less than 150 per cent; that is currently at 95.68 per cent.

The working capital plus repayment and redraw, we seek to be more than one, and we are sitting at 1.38. The total assets and total liabilities, we seek to be more than three, and that is sitting at 6.95. The average debt maturity, we hope to be less than 15 years, and we currently sit at 13.99 years.

The 2013-14 year saw a modest increase in rates, demonstrating yet again that we are committed to making sure that we live within our means as an organisation, as a council, while still delivering significant improvements for our city. Over the course of the last 12 months, what we have seen is a rise in costs in this organisation of just 1.11 per cent. We have worked very hard to make sure that we get as much money as we can out on the ground working for the people of this city. Improved infrastructure, improved amenity, improved outcomes out there in the suburbs, whether it is part of the lifestyle, the festivals, and all the other things that make our city great, and the community development, but also, importantly, the important works that we do in infrastructure.

There's a number of variances in this quarter to note. Firstly, the Bulimba Ferry Terminal upgrade. That project now includes upgrading of access at the Oxford Street cul de sac. The Milton CityCat stop project now includes flood-resilient features, including DDA (Disability Discrimination Act) upgrades and a pedestrian bridge to avoid crossing the bikeway. Telegraph Road corridor is ahead of schedule, of course, due to the bringing forward of funding.

The ICB (Inner City Bypass) resurfacing, timed to coincide with works on the Legacy Way project, so there is a variation there. It was confirmed by property owner vote that the SCIPs (Suburban Centre Improvement Projects) at Alderley and Graceville would proceed. That is a good thing. There are also numerous savings from across the organisation that have been captured and reinvested into other projects as a part of this particular budget review that is before us today. So the quarterly financial report, the numbers and so forth are there for Councillors to see and to comment upon. Perhaps with those few words, I am happy to move item A.

Chairman:

Further debate; Councillor DICK.

Councillor DICK:

Thanks, Madam Chair, and I rise to speak on the Annual Operational Plan Progress and Quarterly Financial Report. Listening to the LORD MAYOR, you would think that this is just business as usual, and there is nothing to see here. We know that when we get that tone from the Administration that there is plenty to see and plenty to highlight about just what incompetence and wastefulness that we see from time to time. This is a claim that we make on behalf of the ratepayers of Brisbane, who we believe are getting short-changed by this Administration.

It is the same story quarterly report to quarterly financial report, where we will see, when the budget comes down, big announcements, big ticket items, and then you can set your watch to it, you will see the wind back and then the rollovers and the cutbacks. Then this is the final report that you will then see, oh, a couple of weeks later, great news, we've got it all sorted out when the budget came down earlier this year.

Well, the actual figures don't lie. One thing the LORD MAYOR didn't talk about—and I want to start with this today—is about bus patronage. This report backs up everything that we have been saying. When you rip out \$20 million of public transport funding, when you take away services, when you cut public transport and don't invest in public transport, you see figures drop. Why? Because there are less services, there are less opportunities for people to use public transport.

We hear question after question about the key lines and things, straight out of LNP research, keep talking about New World City, keep talking about hotel

openings, keep talking about the same thing week in, week out, but they never actually talk about the core services. The LORD MAYOR is right; I do like to hold him to account, whether it be political donations that he doesn't declare or want to avoid.

Councillors interjecting.

Chairman: Councillor DICK, to the report, please.

Councillor DICK: Sure. Sorry, I will withdraw that and say—

Chairman: Thank you.

Councillor DICK: —that the LORD MAYOR doesn't want to talk about. So they don't want to talk about it, that's right—

Councillor COOPER: Point of order, Madam Chair.

Chairman: Yes, Councillor COOPER; point of order against you, Councillor DICK.

Councillor COOPER: The comment made by Councillor DICK was that the LORD MAYOR did not declare donations. That is incorrect, and should be properly withdrawn.

Chairman: Yes, Councillor DICK.

Councillor DICK: I withdrew it, Madam Chair.

Chairman: Thank you, Councillor DICK. To the report, please.

Councillor DICK: Keep up, Councillor COOPER. So what we need to do—

Councillors interjecting.

Chairman: Order!

Councillor DICK: —what we need to do is actually analyse what these figures say. In any objective scheme you can see that Council has missed our bus patronage targets by 3.15 million passengers. That is right, 3.15 million passengers on what our target was. That is the LORD MAYOR's own figures when it comes to public transport. When compared with last year's actual performance, there were almost one million fewer passengers on Brisbane City Council buses. So that means two years in a row Brisbane City Council has failed to grow patronage—failed to encourage passengers to use our bus services.

We know that because Labor councillors out in the community, just about every single day they listen to the complaints about the lack of public transport services. Why? Because the LNP doesn't support public transport. If they did, they wouldn't have cut \$20 million in public transport services. That is the direct reflection on the LNP's poor performance when it comes to public transport.

So, we are back 3.15 million passengers on where we should be. Over all, we have gone backwards over the last two years, and this is a pattern, because this is an LNP Council not interested in public transport, this is an LNP Administration only interested in cutting public transport. The facts speak for themselves. That is what it says in black and white. Forget all the spin, forget all the rhetoric; when it comes to public transport, you cannot trust the LNP. They are fundamentally anti-public transport.

Councillors interjecting.

Councillor DICK: Well, they laugh, Madam Chair, but if you were true blue, you would get up and defend as to why. We never hear why they want to cut public transport. Their only reason is because the State Government told them to do it. That's the only reason.

Moving on, you will see a review of Moving Brisbane on page 34 that shows that seven projects have been changed in scope; 10 suffered from timing and delivery changes, and there is one change in deliverable. I've got a real concern about why these changes keep occurring, and why plans keep changing so

often. I don't believe enough is being done to properly plan at the beginning of these projects, just as we've seen huge cost blowouts despite all the spin from Councillor SCHRINNER.

We know that the Riverwalk issue was a debacle—a PR (public relations) nightmare for them, because we saw huge blowouts there, and then some sort of cobbled together response yesterday, and some damage control response. But we are seeing huge, huge blowouts and huge changes in scopes continually due to poor project management.

The other issue that I want to highlight is on page 37. It is revealed that Council spent an extra \$6.839 million in enforcement management costs, but got \$2.511 million less than it expected in eToll revenue. So we're spending bucket loads more to get less than what we expected to get. Talk about dodgy figures. It's the same story time and time again.

Also, despite receiving an early \$300 million payment from the Federal Government for Legacy Way, page 4, early in the piece, shows that other financial liabilities have increased by \$478 million due to an increase in general-purpose borrowing and special-purpose borrowings for Legacy Way. Did you hear what the DEPUTY MAYOR said during the Question Time today? They don't actually even keep up with their own documentation.

Where else saw Council spending less than what was promised? Well, we know \$691,000 wasn't spent in the property acquisition costs in the Bushland Acquisition Program. We've got around \$934,000 expenditure less on the new CityCat and DDA-compliant ferries projects, \$924,000 expenditure less on the bus build project, \$564,000 expenditure less on the Congestion Reduction Unit initiatives, and \$1.407 million for expenditure in relation to various SCIP projects.

What we are seeing time and time again is the big announcement, then the budget reports come in, and then we cut them and we chop them, and then we roll them over to next year, and say: good news, everyone, we're going to do some SCIPS. But hang on, you didn't do the SCIPS that you promised last year, so time and time again this is a pattern that we are seeing by the LNP.

Moving along, there's a whole list where Council spent less than we were promised in expenses—\$416,000 expenditure less in Active School Travel, Active Transport. What's going on? We're saying we're spending one thing and not spending it when the actual report comes through. Some \$304,000 expenditure on community subsidies; \$220,000 aerial spraying costs within the Mosquito and Pest Services—

Councillor interjecting.

Councillor DICK:

Yes, that's right, Councillor FLESSER, and \$415,000 for the Taskforce against Graffiti project costs, and \$856,000 Taskforce against Graffiti project costs. So this is what Council are spending less than we were actually promised.

So, Madam Chair, I would like some answers as to why this Council continually promises one thing to the community and then secretly cuts the funding and then brings in a report here which shows very clearly they aren't committed to what they promise. Where else has Council—there are a couple of areas, believe it or not, where Council got more money than we expected, and that was the \$2.274 million in developer contributions in park infrastructure charges, and \$2.908 million in funding for development assessment applications.

We know that we're actually getting more money in in some areas, but not doing the right thing and spending that money, because we have such a diabolical financial situation. I want to come back to this huge amount of money where Council has overspent—\$6.839 million in enforcement for management costs for the eToll for management of the network. That is a huge amount of money as an overspend that we didn't anticipate, yet, when you look at where Council got less—

Chairman: Councillor DICK, your time has expired.

166/2014-15

Councillor Milton DICK was granted an extension of time on the motion of Councillor Helen ABRAHAMS seconded by Councillor Victoria NEWTON.

Councillor DICK: Thank you, and thank you to the Chamber, Madam Chair; I will be very brief. So those figures where we're getting \$6.839 million in enforcement management costs, up from where we should be, yet \$2.5 million less than we were promised in those expenses from that same eToll; that is a huge disparity.

The LORD MAYOR, instead of just getting up today and saying it's business as usual, I know that Councillor SIMMONDS will be eager to answer some of these questions today, and it is right that he actually comes forward and owns up to why we are getting these figures botched so badly. When it comes to public transport, when it comes to delivery of services, when it comes to what we promised to spend matches what we are actually delivering across the community, this Council is found to be wanting.

Chairman: Further debate; Councillor SIMMONDS.

Councillor SIMMONDS: Thank you very much, Madam Chairman; I rise to support this item in terms of the June quarter financial report. Firstly I might seek the indulgence of the Chamber in relation to the report; it is not my preference to bring forward these quarterly reports when we are in recess, and I apologise, but in this case it was necessary. We did a lot of things at the end of the last session—the annual report, the audited financial statements all in a very short period of time, and something had to drop out the other end. It was this report. It wouldn't have been appropriate to then wait to bring a June report into the Chamber all the way in October, so that's the reason it has come as it has. So thank you very much to the Chamber for considering that.

Can I respond directly to the comments that Councillor DICK has made in relation to this report, because this report is very much about the good financial economic management that this Administration brings to Council, and in particular the excellent record that it has in delivering projects for this city.

First of all, if the Opposition and the Leader of the Opposition would like to have a debate on public transport, well, bring it on, I say, because this Administration is the best friend the public-transport users have ever had in terms of an Administration in this place—the best friend. I will tell you who wasn't a good friend of public transport, and that was the previous Labor government who introduced year on year, for three years running, 15 per cent fare increases. Councillor DICK even made the outrageous statement that, well, we haven't explained why we have made the changes to the services that we have. Well, we have, repeatedly, but here it is, here it is again so that he can actually listen this time.

It is because we did not want ongoing 15 per cent fare increases, because that was the Labor Party policy. That is what they had laid down. If there was one way to drive people off public transport, it is Labor Party's policy. In particular, this Administration—

Councillors interjecting.

Chairman: Order!

Councillor SIMMONDS: —is spending a record amount of money upgrading public transport infrastructure this financial year, a record. Even if I took away—I went through this during the budget—even if I take away the NDRRA (Natural Disaster Relief and Recovery Arrangements) money in relation to the ferry terminal transports, we still, with a brand new ferry terminal coming on line, with the ferry terminals that we are replacing and our record DDA compliance program, we are spending more money upgrading public transport than any

Administration before us. That is the reason why—and the facts do speak for themselves. That is the reason why patronage under this Administration has risen from 48 million under Labor to now almost 80 million. That is the reason why—because we have invested. All our buses are now air-conditioned.

Councillor interjecting.

Councillor SIMMONDS: Well, it hasn't gone backwards; it is up from \$48 million—

Chairman: Order!

Councillor SIMMONDS: It is well and truly above anything that you were ever able to achieve, to the Labor Opposition.

Chairman: Councillor DICK! You've had your say.

Councillors interjecting.

Chairman: I don't think your speech was entirely about that, either. Councillor SIMMONDS.

Councillor SIMMONDS: Now that we are actually having the debate, and the facts are put on the table, gee, he is quick to run away, isn't he? Whoa, he's quick out the door. Oh no, we don't want to talk about public transport. Public transport isn't in the report, despite him spending half his speech on it, Madam Chairman.

What this report clearly shows is that this Administration is putting more into the CSO (Community Service Obligation) than it ever has before, than any council has before, and is continuing to invest in public transport in record amounts of numbers.

Councillor DICK also took us to task about the changes to projects specifically outlined on page 34 of the report in relation to the Moving Brisbane program. He says: why are all these changes in scopes happening? Why are these changes in delivery happening? An entire page of them, he said. Well, let's go through the page. It is a very good question. The first one is a change in scope to the delivery and constructing key bikeways project. Why is that? Because we've added a project. Oh, we're delivering more. That's why the change in scope. Okay, I will go down. What's the reason why there's a change in scope for the ferry terminal upgrade at Bulimba? Because we've now added to that project with the Oxford Street cul de sac upgrade as part of that.

Okay, I will go to the next one. Why was there a change in scope to the CityCat Milton project? Because the project is now to include flood resistant features, DDA upgrades and a pedestrian bridge. So we've added to the project. I'll keep going. How many—do you want me to do them all? The railway crossing—there was a change in the timing of delivery, because it's ahead of schedule—ahead of schedule. This is what I have been taken to task for.

Okay, I will go to the next one. District projects—why is there a change in the deliverable to the district projects? Because there are additional projects added. The next one—Telegraph Road Crossing. Why was there a change in the timing of delivery? Because it was ahead of schedule. The bridge and culvert construction—why is there a change in scope? Because there's a new project, the Western Creek Bridge has been added. Congratulations. Road network resurfacing—why the change in scope? Additional projects added.

Madam Chairman, that is every single one of them—every single one of them. What a total furphy from the Leader of the Opposition. He's happy to selectively quote from the report, but doesn't actually want to go into the details, because the facts don't actually suit his political argument. He is all about opposition. He is all about no; he is the king of no, but he doesn't want to support good additions to projects.

In relation to the other things that he mentioned, I tried to keep up with the different ones that he skipped past, but I notice that again they find it difficult to read the report. I know he mentioned the bus build project. There was a variance in that. What he didn't read in the report was the giant capital F next to

it, which means it's a favourable variance, which means we have delivered all the buses for less of the costs. Well, well done—there is an example of good financial management by this Administration. I thank Councillor DICK for drawing the Chamber's attention to it.

Ferry terminals—again, he mentioned that. There is record expenditure in that project. Graffiti Task Force—well, I am sorry, Councillor DICK, that I cannot manufacture more graffiti so that the full budget can be expended. I apologise. I was never into that sort of thing. I don't have any artistic abilities at all.

Councillors interjecting.

Chairman: Order!

Councillor SIMMONDS: No matter how dedicated I am to delivering projects—

Chairman: Order! Councillor NEWTON!

Councillor SIMMONDS: No matter how dedicated I am to delivering projects for the people of Brisbane, I won't be going out there and manufacturing graffiti just so that we can spend the entirety of a budget. It is about delivering an outcome for the ratepayers of Brisbane, and if we can deliver that outcome with less financial costs to ratepayers, we will do that every single time.

In relation to the eToll enforcement, first of all I would say that when we do go through this budgeting process, we do make an assessment regarding how many tolls will need to be followed up. Then when we come to the end of the year, we do need to align that with actuals. There will be a variance. But again, we're starting to see a pattern from the Leader of the Opposition. First there was the question in Question Time about letting people off when they don't pay their rent when they are on Council properties. Now we're letting all the people avoid the tolls. Now there's no following up. We shouldn't be enforcing the tolls.

We shouldn't be spending the money to chase these people up, just because they don't pay tolls, just because they don't pay for their facilities, they don't follow the rules like the 99.9 per cent of good upstanding ratepayers. We shouldn't be following it up, says Councillor DICK. Again, the poor financial management, the poor financial management from those opposite. They don't want to do the hard yards that comes with governance.

There are some good things like delivering projects, and then there's some tough things, and the tough things are things like following up on the people who don't pay their tolls. But no matter what it is from Councillor DICK, whether it's delivering extra project scope, delivering projects early, or whether it's not chasing toll evaders, he's all about the negative politics, isn't he? He wants to oppose everything.

Councillor interjecting.

Chairman: Order!

Councillor SIMMONDS: He wants to oppose everything, no matter what it is.

Regarding the borrowings for Legacy Way that he mentioned, again, yes we did receive—

Chairman: Councillor ABRAHAM!

Councillor SIMMONDS: Yes, we did receive that early payment, and that is accounted for within this report—not at the place that he is looking at. I would urge him to seek a little bit of guidance; maybe talk to Councillor FLESSER about how to read these reports and educate himself about where to find it. I note that again it's a case of do what I say, not as I do, from those opposite. While they are happy to sit there and lecture us about delivering on projects, and not having carryovers, what are they themselves doing? Well, I can tell you. When it comes, for example, to the fundings under their control, the Ward Footpath and Parks Trust Fund, Councillor NEWTON managed to carryover 18 per cent of her budget this year.

Well done, Councillor NEWTON. Councillor JOHNSTON managed to carry over 15 per cent of her budget this year.

Councillor interjecting.

Chairman:

Order! Councillor JOHNSTON! You're on a warning.

Councillor SIMMONDS:

Councillor ABRAHAMS managed to carry over 15 per cent of her budget, but who takes the cake? Who gets the congratulations of being the king of carryovers? The king of carryovers in Labor land—who gets that? Councillor DICK carrying over 24 per cent of his Ward Footpath and Parks Trust Fund budget. So he is happy to lecture Council—

Councillors interjecting.

Chairman:

Order!

Councillor SIMMONDS:

—officers and this Administration about not carrying over when you're dealing with a \$1 billion infrastructure spend, but they can't even spend—

Chairman:

Councillor SIMMONDS, your time has expired.

Councillor SIMMONDS:

—a couple of hundred thousand dollars in a financial year. Thank you.

Chairman:

Further debate; Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON:

Yes, Madam Chairman, I rise—

Councillors interjecting.

Chairman:

Order!

Councillor JOHNSTON:

—to speak on the Annual Operational Plan Progress and Quarterly Financial Report for the year ended 12 June 2014. If only Councillor SIMMONDS had been upfront with what is happening with this quarterly report, we would actually hear more of a story about the financial mismanagement and incompetence of this Administration. Let's be clear about what is before us today for approval.

This is the last quarterly report from the end of the financial year related to the previous year's budget. Prior to this there were three previous reports that came to this Council, all of which within them, through last year, also had a range of cuts and changes to the operations of this Council. We are dealing with one quarter with respect to what is before us today.

The Finance Chairman has made a few points about the things that are going well. He would have had to look really hard to find those, because there is a fair bit of this Council's ordinary day-to-day work that this Council is failing to deliver—failing to deliver. I would like to start by outlining some of the areas where this Council's financial mismanagement and incompetence is making residents lose out on the delivery of services.

Firstly, Brisbane Transport—\$5.261 million which is described as lower than anticipated overheads with respect to public transport. Now, the price of petrol hasn't gone down; staff costs haven't gone down; I don't think the cost of buying infrastructure like buses has gone down. So, Madam Chairman, this is where we are seeing the dramatic cuts to funding from the Newman State Government biting at this Council, and this is where we are seeing the very real impacts of service cuts by this LORD MAYOR, Graham QUIRK.

They try and claim that there are no cuts. It was a bus optimisation program. But the 101 and the 102 in my area were completely cut. Corinda lost its 101 and 102 bus service. The 104 bus service in my area lost frequency and lost services. These are real cuts that are impacting on residents in our communities. All up there was about \$20 million cut from public transport last year, and we are seeing the very real impacts right across this city.

As Councillor DICK pointed out, there are 3.15 million fewer people using public transport than this Council expected. What is Councillor SIMMONDS'

explanation of this? Well, when the fares were going up by 15 per cent, so was patronage. Now the fares are only going up by 2.5 per cent, there's less people using the buses. That doesn't add up. It's the craziest assessment of what I see going on. Fares, he is saying, have dropped to a 2.5 per cent increase a year, but there are less people using public transport. The only outcome that that indicates is that the cuts to services are providing less opportunities for patrons to use the buses.

I am equally concerned about the \$4.1 million cut to Field Services, so that's our operational area, and I hope Councillor McLACHLAN stands up and today explains this statement: savings due to changes in work flow. What does that mean? What sort of cuts is that? Some \$4.1 million in the day-to-day operational business of this Council. That is absolutely wrong, and we can see those impacts out in the community.

In addition to that, I would like Councillor BOURKE to stand up and explain why in one quarter alone there is a \$1.7 million cut to expenditure for the repairs of exercise equipment in parks, for defects in car parks, and for maintenance in parks. That is one quarter—\$1.7 million less for repairs and maintenance in our local parks.

Flood preparation and information—almost \$1 million in cuts to catchment management planning and flood information activities. Where has that money gone? Probably rolled over, and it will get cut again this year, because this Administration cannot deliver on its promises, and the people who are suffering are the residents of Brisbane who are being absolutely sold a line at budget time by this LORD MAYOR who from quarter to quarter cannot deliver on his budget and consistently we see these problems. It's not like this is the first time it's happened; it's happening quarter after quarter.

It goes on; the drainage program. It seems there's been a \$1.1 million blowout in the backflow valve program. That is great for the 15 areas that got backflow valves. The other 36 that haven't got anything are on the never-never list by this LORD MAYOR. But to pay for the blowout in the backflow valve cost, he has cut the ordinary drainage program by \$900,000. This is robbing Peter to pay Paul, and it is not acceptable.

This LORD MAYOR is spending 80 per cent of drainage funds on the north side of Brisbane and only 20 per cent on the south side of Brisbane, and in this quarterly report alone, he is cutting \$900,000 from the ordinary core business of this Council, which is drainage projects. It is not good enough to take from one hand and put it in another, LORD MAYOR. You have to deliver on your promises to this city, and it is not good enough that you are failing to do so.

The LORD MAYOR has failed to deliver on local access network improvements, I see, which are local road projects, and interestingly, Councillor SIMMONDS pointed out that the Ward Footpath and Parks Trust Fund projects are underspent. Let me say, Madam Chairman, that this Council refused to allow me to upgrade a park in Rocklea. That money was set aside for that purpose, and this Council refused to allow it to happen. Those Rocklea residents are devastated, and they are very clear who is responsible for this decision. The LORD MAYOR and the Administration councillors have refused to allow seats, a bin, a tap and some trees in a park at Rocklea. It is disgraceful.

Cuts to the Congestion Reduction Unit. This has been the LORD MAYOR's pet program about doing local improvements to help manage traffic flows around the city, but in one quarter alone, half a million dollars was underspent. Not good enough. Some of the other underspends—Vibrant Laneways, \$700,000 cut; Neighbourhood Planning, a \$350,000 cut, and that's actually probably a good thing, given how neighbourhood planning works in this place; SCIPS, \$1.67 million less than was announced; DAs (development assessments), \$2.9 million less. Perhaps that explains why there's less notification with respect to DAs. Perhaps that explains why we are seeing a fast-tracking of impact assessable DAs to try and avoid scrutiny and public consultation.

It is massively problematic when ordinary town planning reports are not available on PD Online, and that is what is happening. We are seeing a \$700,00 cuts to CARS (Compliance and Regulatory Services)—I presume for inspection of DAs where there are problems; a \$1.15 million cut to Library Lending Services, upgrades and equipment. That is one quarter—\$1.15 million.

There's a \$290,000 cut to the Active and Healthy programs, and there is—and this is the big one, and we knew it was here, we can see it now—\$4.3 million less than this Council was expecting in grants from the Queensland Reconstruction Authority for flood recovery. Have we heard the LORD MAYOR jumping up and down, going down to George Street to fight with this Premier to say: we need that funding. We need that \$4.3 million to help this city recover. Not a peep. Not a peep. This LORD MAYOR, the 19th Minister for George Street, is more than happy to go along with what he's told. That's what he did when he was the Deputy Mayor, and that is what he is doing now as the LORD MAYOR of this city. He is still doing what he is told by Campbell Newman.

I expect the LORD MAYOR of this city to, number one, deliver on his promises. If he stands up and says: there will be \$X million available for works in our parks, or tree trimming or our libraries, or public transport services, I expect that he will deliver on those services. Clearly that is not happening. I also expect that the LORD MAYOR of this city will fight for the things that we need as a community—that is, money for drainage, money for backflow valves, money for flood recovery activities. But instead we are seeing—

Chairman: Councillor JOHNSTON, your time has expired. Thank you.

Councillor JOHNSTON: —these areas being starved.

Chairman: Councillor MURPHY.

ADJOURNMENT:

167/2014-15

At that time, 4.05pm, it was resolved on the motion of Councillor Ryan MURPHY, seconded by Councillor Kim MARX, that the meeting adjourn for a period of 15 minutes, to commence only when all councillors had vacated the chamber and the doors locked.

Council stood adjourned at 4.07pm.

UPON RESUMPTION:

Chairman: Further debate on item A. No further debate. LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Thanks very much, Madam Chairman. Well, Madam Chairman, the Opposition Leader has made certain comments today in relation to bus patronage, bus services. Madam Chairman, I just want to say that a number of years ago, it was around three to four years ago, I made the point that it's good that the Opposition are here to hear all of this too. But, Madam Chairman, I made the point that if the 15 per cent fare increase was kept going, there would be nobody left on buses. I made that point.

Now I often get accused by the Opposition, here, of not listening to people. Madam Chairman, I would have to say today that what we have seen in the comments that they have made is an arrogance to say the least in terms of something that the people have very extensively just been asked about. I remind the Opposition that people in this state have just had the question put to them; do they want more services or reduced fares. A very clear question.

People have voted overwhelmingly, overwhelmingly to go with less fares. So, Madam Chairman, what we have now is a situation where there will be a five per cent reduction in fares and there will be further a freeze on fares next year to make sure, Madam Chairman, that the impact around those continual 15 per

cent fare increases are reduced. So the people have just spoken on this very issue, they have said overwhelmingly that they want reduced fares, not more services.

Yet the Opposition Leader here today, as he did in the last session, is still carrying on about more services. Well I say, Madam Chairman, the people have spoken. They have spoken very loudly and very clearly that reduced fares is where they want to head. Now, Madam Chairman, around that, can I just say that the rot was started to set in around 2011, 2012 in terms of patronage. That was when it was started to bite, Madam Chairman. That bite has continued.

So I am hoping, obviously, but I believe that it will, that the reduction in fares now will see the tide start to turn back. But as Councillor SIMMONDS clearly pointed out, Madam Chairman, there's the projectile, that's the growth that we have seen from the Labor years, Madam Chairman, through in terms of patronage growth. We have seen that \$48 million become now \$80 million and of course it has reduced over the last few years just slightly each year, Madam Chairman. But I believe that we will see that turn around.

The point that we were making is that if you are going to offer reduced fares, you cannot continue to just let costs grow out of control. That is fraught with difficulty; it's fraught with, Madam Chairman, irresponsibility in terms of your dealing with people's money as custodians of the taxpayer and ratepayer moneys. So, Madam Chairman, that's the very essence of the point we make today, is that the people have made their own declaration around what they want and they have said, less fares is what they want.

So, Madam Chairman, in terms of the other aspects of the report, I think Councillor SIMMONDS and others have handled those points very well, they've covered off the points raised by the Leader of the Opposition and I'm happy to have the motion put.

Chairman: I will put the motion for item A.

Clause A put

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

Thereupon, Councillors Milton DICK and Helen ABRAHAMS 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 Graham QUIRK, DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER, and Councillors Krista ADAMS, Matthew BOURKE, Amanda COOPER, Margaret de WIT, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Fiona KING, Geraldine KNAPP, Kim MARX, Peter MATIC, Ian McKENZIE, Ryan MURPHY, Angela OWEN-TAYLOR, Julian SIMMONDS and Andrew WINES.

NOES: 7 - The Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Milton DICK, and Councillors Helen ABRAHAMS, Peter CUMMING, Kim FLESSER, Steve GRIFFITHS, Victoria NEWTON and Nicole JOHNSTON.

Chairman: LORD MAYOR, items B to F inclusive, please.

LORD MAYOR: Yes, thanks very much, Madam Chairman. Madam Chairman, item B is the minutes of the Audit Committee. That was the meeting held on 4 September. There for the perusal of councillors. Item C, Madam Chairman, again, Contracts and Tendering Report. The first part of that being the removal, supply and replacement of three footbridges. Those being at Finsbury Park, Wilston, Beckett Road Park at McDowall and Canterbury Park at Bald Hills. All of those

have been undertaken by Doval Constructions (QLD) Proprietary Limited. \$480,000 is the cost involved.

Structural repair program. This is to a number of localities. The Brisbane Women's Hockey Association at Herston, we have the St Lucia Central Scouts Association, Wynola Girl Guides Coorparoo, Belmont Scouts Association, the Rotary Club of Stafford, that's a cottage there at Everton Park. The Inala Community Hall, that's the awning. The Sandgate swimming pool, that's a chemical storage shelter. All of those works will be conducted by Building Solutions Brisbane Proprietary Limited for a combined cost of \$335,240.

The supplied installation of lighting infrastructure at City Hall. This is a lump sum of \$474,000. It's been undertaken by Stowe Australia Proprietary Limited. Tree relocation at the former Wynnum Central State School, Madam Chairman. This is \$165,000. It's Treescape Australasia Proprietary Limited are undertaking that work. Supply and delivery of trucks, 4.5 tonnes GVM (gross vehicle mass) and above, Category 2, the 22.5 tonne GVM asphalt trucks. Optima Financial Services Proprietary Limited as a trustee for Optima Trading Trust will be involved in that. They trade as Brisbane Isuzu, I think it's pronounced, \$4.74 million.

Provision of RSA envision software. Support and maintenance, that's by EMC Corporation Australia Proprietary Limited for \$253,000. The supply and delivery of road rollers, spare parts and servicing, being undertaken by Tutt Bryant Equipment Proprietary Limited for \$99,000. There's a number of other traders that are involved in that though. There's a whole panel, in fact, of contractors, for differing categories of the supply and delivery of road rollers and spare parts and servicing, they're listed there in the left-hand column.

Provision of an externally hosted and supported information technology services management solution gone to BCM Software Australia Proprietary Limited for \$1.41 million. There is also the provision of maintenance and planting services and that's gone to a number of entities. Treescape Australasia Proprietary Limited for \$4.2 million. Also Treescape Australasia but in a second area there—that was the \$4.2 million, sorry, there was another one Powerclear Proprietary Limited \$5.4 million and River City Garden and Lawn Proprietary Limited of \$6.1 million. So that's tree maintenance and planting services.

Provision of sand and asphalt manufacturing and concrete production, Corridor Sands Proprietary Limited for \$516,000. Pacifica Silica Proprietary Limited for \$569,000. There's a number of others there in different categories around the sand for asphalt manufacturing and sand for concrete production, both at Riverview and Bracalba respectively.

Provision of road and pavement making—or marking, rather, materials and services. Again, a number here of different categories. Category 1 being services, category 2 being thermoplastics and retroreflective pavement markets. Category 2b being paint and glass beads and that's—category 2c being line marking tape. So again, a range of differing companies that are involved in those important works.

We have the provision of internet services and that again goes to a number of differing companies but specifically there in category 1, TPG Network Proprietary Limited and iSeek Communications Proprietary Limited. Madam Chairman, there's the provision of security consultancy services, IPP Consulting Proprietary Limited have been the recipient of that for \$48,850 and also another one, the Hatamoto Holdings Proprietary Limited for \$45,950.

Madam Chairman, the last one being the supply and delivery of compressed industrial and medical gases. That's BOC Limited for \$189,860. We're in light of de-leasing some land to the African Communities Council Incorporated. The QACC (Queensland African Communities Council) estimate that they will expend around \$143,000 on their property over the next five years to improve

the facility for its members and provide ongoing services to the broader community. But this is a proposal in terms of relocation to the Balmoral Park.

Madam Chairman, it was previously a site at the East Brisbane Men's Bowling Park at Mowbray Park. So we're in that process of formalising this lease. That's for an agreement there are Balmoral Park. That's just to give approval for that to occur. That will be based at Bennetts Road, Morningside.

Item E is the Pest Survey programs under the *Land Protection Pest and Stock Route Management Act 2002*. This particular item is a survey program where Council officers are authorised, Madam Chairman, as they authorised persons under the Act to enter land, to map the distribution of declared pest species, to monitor compliance with the act and to take enforcement action where appropriate.

So this is done on a 28 day basis, programs can run for more than three months, but public notices must be given at least 14 days but no more than 28 days before the commencement of the program. So a review of the Act determined that the approval could be given to a blanket program covering the duration of the Brisbane Invasive Species Management Plan of 2013 to 2017. That is from the end of the current approved pests survey program, 7 October 2014 until the review date of the Brisbane Invasive Species Management Plan of 30 June 2017.

So we expect to have 10 survey programs approved in that period of time and so that's here for the consideration of Council. I think the other one, then, Madam Chairman, importantly is what we were discussion earlier which is the Stores Board submission. This is for Howard Smith Wharves Revitalisation Project. So the names of the entities, Madam Chairman, which were only revealed at the conclusion of the process—in other words all entities being presented under the observation of the Probity Auditor were essentially listed as entity A, entity B, entity C. But we now, of course, know who entities A, B and C were.

Madam Chairman, they are listed here with also the scorecard as derived by the Stores Board, officers of the Council, with the responsibility of coming up with a recommendation around the proposals. So the Howard Smith Wharves nominees, as I mentioned earlier, are the recommended proponent. They came in with an initial score of 762 against the nearest proponents of 707 and 699. After further negotiations by officers in relation to each of the proponents, those scores rose to 778 with the recommended proponent, 731 with the next closest proponent and 718 with the third proponent.

So as we can see from those figures, Madam Chairman, even after further negotiations, the highest—

Chairman:

LORD MAYOR, sorry, before you continue, your time has expired.

168/2014-15

The LORD MAYOR was granted an extension of time on the motion of the DEPUTY MAYOR, seconded by Councillor Kim MARX.

LORD MAYOR:

Yes, I apologise, Madam Chairman, I was so close to being finished too. Madam Chairman—thank you, Chamber. Madam Chairman, so even at the completion of further negotiations, the second and third proponents at that point had still not reached the score that the recommended proponent was at in terms of their initial proposal before even further negotiations which saw their score increase.

So obviously each of the proponents under negotiation improved their score line but even at the highest point of the second-best proponent, if I could use that term, Madam Chairman, they still didn't reach the original score line proposed by the recommended proponent HSW Nominees Proprietary Limited.

I've outlined, during question time, Madam Chairman, many of the aspects of this proposal. So I won't go into that further.

But importantly, Madam Chairman, as part and parcel of this, we saw the setting that was made right at the very beginning of this, in terms of its assessment, was that the major scorecard was around concept plan and the capacity to deliver. They dominated over any returns to Council, Madam Chairman. This is a unique site and we needed to look at it in that context. It was a decision that the cabinet firmly made, that we wanted to make sure that the concept and that the delivery were the priorities in terms of this proposal.

So it's presented for Council's consideration.

Chairman:

Further debate, Councillor DICK.

Councillor DICK:

Thanks, Madam Chair, and after those few remarks from the LORD MAYOR, I hope to liven up the debate a little bit today and talk about items—all the items; B, C, D, E and F. So just stand by, Councillor ABRAHAMS. Madam Chair, look, just on the contracts and tendering. I'll start with that one, first of all, which is item C.

The first one I want to turn to is the \$474,125 contract to Stowe Australia for supply and installation of lighting infrastructure at City Hall. Well I'd like an explanation why after spending a huge amount of money getting City Hall back to all its glory, we're spending what appears is another half a million dollars for the supply and installation of lighting? Now I'm not sure if that is for additional work or work that wasn't part of the original scope, there may be a really good explanation so we can get—

Councillors interjecting.

Councillor DICK:

—some explanation. I can see the chairmen now scrambling to each other wanting to work out who's going to respond to me. That's okay, they can take their pick. I just want an answer as to why we're asking the ratepayers to cough up another half a million dollars.

Now this may be for lighting at Christmas time, for our Christmas lights, which I know a lot of people enjoy. But half a million dollars after we've spent over \$200 million of ratepayers' money restoring this majestic building, I think deserves some explanation and I'm certainly looking forward to that.

Councillor interjecting.

Councillor DICK:

Look, the other big ticket item in today's contracts that I want to touch on is on page 6, contract 9, 510058 which is a contract for provision of tree maintenance and planting services of \$21 million. Now I'd like some assurances from the LORD MAYOR, because I have been briefed by people who work in Local Asset Services, particularly in the south region, that have been very, very concerned about the former contract that we had surrounding tree services, to the point where I have been advised that we actually had to stop some projects because Council was not satisfied.

I know in my own ward, we had problems with wrong trees being planted in the wrong areas, we had the wrong species and then having to be replanted. Parts of the suburbs that didn't know that they were getting trees and then ended up getting some trees planted. A whole, whole mess that we then had to go and fix up.

Now this is not a reflection on our hard working Council officers. Just before those opposite jump up and down about that usual line they go on about. It is not a criticism on our Council officers, it is simply to make sure that any contracts—and this is a significant one \$21 millions—when we allocate these sorts of large sums of ratepayers' money that we are getting the value for money and that we've got any of those bugs ironed out.

It was a huge disappointment, I know, to our Council officers and also local residents that unfortunately were the recipients of some of these mistakes. I

know other councillors have examples of this. So that gets back to making sure that when we allocate the funds, when we get to choose these contracts, these service providers, that we are getting the top professional advice and also that we're not wasting ratepayers' money.

Look, I'm going to switch now to the report of the Audit Committee, and the LORD MAYOR didn't spend much time on this as well. Reading through attachment A, which is the report on the Audit Committee on page one, I bring to the chamber's attention members present, which was the chair and an independent member and the third person listed was a Gerard Paynter on behalf of Carolyn Barker, the Brisbane Transport Advisory Board representative.

Now, I'm not sure if we are now sending proxies or what the arrangements are that people are being sent rather than the Transport Advisory Board Representatives. So I'm not sure if they're taking turns as to who goes on that. I do note that Mr Paynter is a well-known former Queensland Young Liberal President, former Australian Young Liberal President and also a member of the central campaign committee at the re-election of team Quirk at the 2012 Council election.

Councillors interjecting.

Councillor DICK: Well, that's right. Also, he's paid \$19,600 a year to sit on the Brisbane Transport Advisory Committee. So I'm not sure of what the qualifications are—

Councillors interjecting.

Chairman: Order. Councillor SUTTON.

Councillor DICK: —nothing to see here.

Chairman: Councillor SUTTON, keep it down.

Councillor DICK: Thank you, Madam Chair, for your protection.

Councillors interjecting.

Councillor DICK: I've been wanting to say that all day. So, Madam Chairman, perhaps the LORD MAYOR could provide what expertise besides being a Queensland Young Liberal President and an Australian Young Liberal President and a member of the re-elect central campaign committee for the re-election of Tim Quirk 2012 brings—

Councillor interjecting.

Councillor DICK: Oh, and I'm not sure about his level of donations, I'll check that whether Mr Painter has been a donor to the LNP. But perhaps, given that he is listed on the Audit Committee, that we could provide from the LORD MAYOR the expertise, what Mr Paynter brings to this Advisory Committee who's now sitting on behalf of Carolyn Barker for the Audit Committee. So I'm not sure what's happening there but it would be great if the public could be reassured that to be appointed to a \$20,000 a year job, you don't need to be an LNP apparatchik or donor.

So, Madam Chair, moving on, can I talk about—

Councillors interjecting.

Councillor DICK: Oh, sorry, it's just been brought to my attention, I do have the list of donations from Mr Paynter which was \$3,300, \$1,900, \$1,100, \$1,200, \$1,900—

Chairman: Councillor DICK. Councillor DICK, that is not relevant to this report.

Councillor DICK: Sorry, Madam Chair, and there were another two donations which I won't read out—

Chairman: Thank you.

Councillor DICK: —totalling, I don't know, maybe in excess of perhaps \$10,000 to \$12,000. So that's fine, Madam Chair. Besides that information, I'm unaware of any other

expertise that he has. So I look forward to the LORD MAYOR providing a detail on what performance he brings to that committee. But I'm not surprised that the LNP don't want me to talk about that, they never want me to talk about donations or contributors to the LORD MAYOR's re-election—

Chairman: Please get on with the item, Councillor DICK.

Councillor DICK: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Seriatim - Clauses B, C and F

Councillor Milton DICK requested that Clause B, REPORT OF THE AUDIT COMMITTEE MEETING ON 4 SEPTEMBER 2014, Clause C, CONTRACTS AND TENDERING – REPORT TO COUNCIL OF CONTRACTS ACCEPTED BY DELEGATES FOR AUGUST 2014, and Clause F, STORES BOARD SUBMISSION – HOWARD SMITH WHARVES REVITALISATION PROJECT, be taken seriatim *en bloc* for voting purposes.

Chairman: Just finally, Madam Chair, on the Stores Board submission, which is the Howard Smith Wharves Revitalisation Project, as the LORD MAYOR outlined in question time and also in the E&C debate. The HSW Consortium is a partnership between Elisha Bickle and Adam Flaskas. The Howard Smith Wharves Consortium and, as the LORD MAYOR confirmed, they've sold the hotel development right to Asia Pacific Group. I note in the report that the Howard Smith Wharves Consortium have taken on the maintenance of locations with the parkland.

Now this is one area where we haven't heard a lot of information about the project. Now, as people will recall and we were in the old chamber when at one council meeting the LNP decided to use its majority to take the money out of the Central Ward Park Trust Fund, remember that one?

Councillors interjecting.

Councillor DICK: To pay for the redevelopment of Howard Smith Wharves, to deliver the parkland which is the real reason that we're debating this issue because the community have been promised for a very long time new parkland in that area. Forget the bodgie figures around 80 per cent that they go on about when they include the cliff face as part of the 80 per cent, all of that nonsense.

Councillors interjecting.

Councillor DICK: That's right. When you can throw a frisbee against the rock wall. But, Madam Chair, we've received very little information about this and this is something that I know local residents and people who have been following this issue way back from years ago. We then saw the rezoning change onto that site, so residents wouldn't get a chance to object to that, remember that change came through Council as well?

Councillors interjecting.

Councillor DICK: They shot that one through so we could actually see a change there. So residents would be shut out of the process. Now we're seeing the hotel redevelopment, commercialisation of that site without any attention today by the LORD MAYOR regarding the flooding issues which I know have been raised continuously. Now it's been emerged that the family or the parent group of that developer are also LNP donors as well, which I raised in question time today as well.

Well there may be some—

Councillors interjecting.

Councillor DICK: I take the interjection, Madam Chair, that Councillor ABRAHAMS is suggesting it may be a pattern. I certainly hope there is no pattern involved because we want to see the highest quality development in Brisbane across the city with no connections to donors as well, but we'll be debating that a little

later today where those questions have been seriously raised regarding other developments. So I certainly hope some of those issues will be raised in today's debate. We've had very little information about what that will mean for the broader Brisbane community, about what we will be receiving there on that site.

It's an incredible opportunity for us to get this site, to make sure we deliver for our city.

Chairman:

Councillor DICK, your time has expired. Thank you. DEPUTY MAYOR.

DEPUTY MAYOR:

Thank you, Madam Chairman. I rise to speak on item F regarding the Howard Smith Wharves Revitalisation Project. This has been a long time coming. This site, the history of it, dates back many, many years and is crucially important to the city in terms of a historic site. Council was originally handed this site by the State Government. The site was sitting derelict for many years, no one could work out what to do with it, and it was handed to the Brisbane City Council.

Well, I can understand that, whenever someone wants to get something done, they hand it to the Brisbane City Council and we're making it happen. Not before time, I might add. This project will be absolutely sensational for the city of Brisbane. I have no doubt that this will become an iconic and much loved precinct in the city. It has all the elements that are particularly special to Brisbane; the river, Story Bridge, the cliffs behind, the outlook across the city reach, looking across to Kangaroo Point, it's got the Riverwalk off to the left. It is just absolutely a one-of-a-kind location in the city.

So we will see this city really—once this development rolls out—really come to love this precinct, I'm confident of that. Now, in relation to the documents that we have here and the arrangement that is being entered into with the HSW nominees, is a good outcome for the city in a number of ways. As the LORD MAYOR said, if Council was just looking for financial returns from this, there would have been a different outcome. We wanted something, though, that was best for the city, best for the people of the city and would be that iconic precinct that I mentioned before.

It's really disappointing to hear Labor's contribution to this. All we hear is negativity and carping. Particularly with something so important to the city and something which I know Councillor DICK will be down there at the cafes and bars when it opens, enjoying it. We know he will be, he'll be running along the riverfront there, he'll be enjoying a drink at the craft brewery, no doubt about that.

The way that he has approached this has been really disappointing, I think. It's a pattern of behaviour that we've seen on a whole heap of different things. Might I add that Labor opposed free Wi-Fi in parks? Another example, there are so many examples where they get up here and they make negative comments yet it turns out to be a great thing for the city, and this is another one of those examples.

The suggestion that the 80 per cent includes the cliff face is just wrong. It's just wrong. That was a line that David Hinchliffe was peddling years ago. So they've obviously dusted off the old notes from David Hinchliffe and recycled them. It is not true; the cliff face is not included in the 80 per cent. The suggestion that there's been nothing done to deal with flooding, once again, not true. Not true.

The development has to be built in the same way that any other development needs to be built when there is a potential flooding issue. So all of the floor levels will be built with the flooding issues in mind and we will see that incorporated into the assessment process when a DA is lodged. So once again, ridiculous claim.

The claim that Central Ward Park Trust Fund funds were going towards this park project is actually not accurate. It's not accurate. Once again, a little bit of twisting of the truth. What those funds will be used for is improving the top of

the cliffs, which are not part of this project at all. So those funds have been corralled for the time when this project occurs so that we don't have a situation where the bottom area will be great but the top area would be old and tired.

So those funds are still sitting there ready to be put into work to improve the top of the cliffs which, as I said, are not part of this project. Finally, I just wanted to say that the suggestions that have been made about the HSW Consortium and particular individuals and comments about donations are just completely inappropriate and wrong. The people that are involved in this consortium have other projects across the city. Those projects are very successful, and might I add, they have been in the past awarded tenders by the previous Labor Administration.

So it was okay for Labor to award those people a contract that involved Victoria Park Golf Course, but suddenly now they're raising those outrageous suggestions. They know it's not true but they just love to throw it in there. They love to throw the mud and hopefully they think some of it will stick. Well nothings going to stick here because this is a great project for the city of Brisbane and these are respected, experienced providers of great entertainment precincts in other areas and including our own Victoria Park Golf Course.

So I am confident they will do a great job, looking forward to this project rolling out to the benefit of Brisbane residents. As I said, very disappointed that Labor's not coming on board with something that is really good for the city.

Chairman:

Further debate, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON:

Yes, Madam Chairman, I rise to speak on maybe item B, now, and definitely item F, the Howard Smith Wharves Revitalisation Project. I did miss that, Councillor DICK, in the Audit Committee report for 4 September, that Mr Paynter had started on the board. He's increasingly taking a public role and a public profile with Council's business. He's personally known to me, 25 years ago we were in the Young Liberals together and I've known him for a long time.

But, Madam Chairman, it is a concern when overtly political people are being appointed to board positions. That's not being disclosed. Certainly I think the advisory board positions should all be brought here to Council. Certainly appointments to the Audit Committee should be brought here to Council for discussion.

Councillors interjecting.

Councillor JOHNSTON:

Yes, oh well there you go. It's quite interesting, isn't it, that the LORD MAYOR will stand up and say, these things are not relevant, yet the LORD MAYOR's political friends are appearing more and more in the business of this Council. I believe that the lack of transparency and accountability around the involvement of overtly political party people—and I'd say that both for the ALP and the LNP—is not appropriate.

If it is appropriate then I think it's incumbent on the LORD MAYOR to stand up and say—

Councillor SIMMONDS:

Point of order, Madam Chairman.

Councillor JOHNSTON:

Why?

Chairman:

Yes, Councillor SIMMONDS?

Councillor SIMMONDS:

Look, just irrelevance. This isn't an ability to talk about every board and organisation within Council. If she wants to talk about the Audit Committee decisions, go ahead, but otherwise—

Chairman:

Yes, I agree with you, Councillor SIMMONDS. Councillor JOHNSTON, if you wish to speak on the report, the content of the report, that's fine. But not on other matters.

Councillor JOHNSTON:

Yes, thank you, Madam Chairman. There were just a few remarks because the Audit Committee report does, for the first time, note that Mr Gerard Paynter has been appointed or is now attending this Audit Committee meeting. My point, Madam Chairman, is that given his political history that should be disclosed to this Council. I don't think that's unreasonable.

Now I would like to make some comments on the Howard Smith Wharves Revitalisation Project. I am really in two minds about this. Activation of the space down there would seem to be very important and it can be of great benefit to the city. The issue I have is, I'm not sure that the LORD MAYOR and this Administration have quite got the design and the scope of this right. I think given the importance of the space and the seriousness of the issue that we're looking at here today, that is a lease for 102 years to a small Brisbane private company that there does need to be a high level of scrutiny both within Council itself and by this Council with regard to the contracts being awarded.

What I note is when I went to look at the files, there is very little information on the files. There's a few post-market submissions and so forth but there is a lot of information missing that would help us make an informed decision as a Council today. I don't, Madam Chairman, just trust the LORD MAYOR and trust that they have done the right thing here because time after time we see mistakes and problems with the contracts that this Council enters into.

So this is one of these areas where, trust us; it's all okay, is not going to work. Now I note that in the Council papers before us today, the purpose of this project was—and this is paragraph 44—a developer is being procured to fund, construct, operate and maintain the finished development in return for long-term leasehold rights over the site at minimal cost to Council.

Now that's what we've been asked as the core mission of the revitalisation of this space. I note that several companies came forward with varying proposals and the proposal which is described in the papers variously as the A&E submission and the HSW submission is the one that Council is proceeding with today.

I guess I question a couple of core issues around this. Firstly, I note that this Council will invest \$4 million into the revitalisation of this space. That is due to occur after a minimum amount of some \$13 million has been invested by the proponent. That does not seem minimal to me, \$4 million is a lot of money and I am, I guess, a little confused as to how a project of this size and capacity is not self-funding and why it is that this Council is contributing \$4 million when we would normally, I think, here see more commercial terms.

I guess I'm just questioning why this Council is subsidising what is going to be a major economic investment for a private company in Brisbane. I note that there is a hotel going on the site, there is a retail and restaurant precinct going on the site and there's a small convention space going on the site. This Council is estimating that over the life of the lease, so three years for the commercial component and 99 year lease, that Council will receive \$528 million in revenue from the project.

So I guess the question to me is, if it is this economically significant and viable, why is this Council investing \$4 million? This is what I'm not sure about. Because I would want to see ratepayers' funds going into projects that can't be funded in some other way. I guess I would like a little bit more explanation of why this money is being put in by Council. I note that other proponents certainly were seeking some investment by Council into this but given the economic benefits that have clearly formed such a vital part of the assessment of this tender application, why is there a need for a \$4 million subsidy from this Council?

That's unclear to me. Particularly given the very substantial financial benefits that this Council expects to see flowing from the project. I think, Madam Chairman, that we really should have a little bit more information about this because the other concern that I have in the council papers before us today,

there's a summary, essentially, of the financial terms for the project. But on the files themselves there is very little information that you can read to actually look at the raw data, look at the material that's been submitted.

I note in one of the few documents, which is a summary of the recommended proposal and transaction, there are a number of documents that form part of the project agreement. That includes the project agreement itself which outlines the rights and obligations of both parties. It is a construction lease; it is the base precinct lease, the building management statement, the precinct plan and all of the easements and access rights.

Now, none of those documents are actually on the file. So we can't look at them. We're being asked to make a blind decision today because the relevant documents that are referred to, which are the heart of this transaction, have not been publically made available to the councillors today to review. That is really problematic. I know that the LORD MAYOR will stand up and say, well it's been recommended by the Council officers, and this is no reflection on them, but I would like to see the documentation that supports this deal and I would very much like to see some of the details around it so when I make a decision and vote in this place, I've done so fully informed.

That's not possible because the files do not contain any of the essential legal agreements and they have not been made available for councillors to review in the normal way. That is really problematic. So I am very concerned about the lack of transparency around this particular process. The other concerns I have relate to access, public access. The artists' impressions seem to provide access both along a new riverfront component and also along the pathway behind the back of the existing heritage buildings.

Now one thing is true, I do run down there as well and I vary it up a bit; sometimes I do the bridge loop, sometimes I go the other way, and I've tested out the new boardwalk. But what I will say is, at the moment, it is extremely wide access down there in that area behind the old heritage stores. You get hundreds of people cycling, walking, dogs, prams, runners. I am very concerned that we don't just see a standard three-metre path for community access through that area.

Because once you add in the retail component, you will have people milling around doing a very social activity versus the through traffic at the moment—

Chairman:

Councillor JOHNSTON, your time has expired.

Councillor JOHNSTON:

—and that is a concern together with the flooding.

Chairman:

Thank you. Further debate? Councillor HOWARD.

Councillor HOWARD:

Well thank you, Madam Chairman. Madam Chairman, I rise to speak to item F. I'd like to begin by saying how delighted I am that local business company such as HSW Consortium has been successful. Both Adam Flaskas and Elisha Bickle are very well known in my particular area and for the good works that they have done in that area. Madam Chairman, this is an important build for Brisbane. It's a facility for families to enjoy and a new backyard for many of my residents in Central.

So, Madam Chairman, you will have heard me talk previously about ensuring that Central Ward has parks as beautiful as our children. Howard Smith Wharves will be one of those parks and in years to come, as we all work together, we will transform an eyesore into an icon. I think the LORD MAYOR has made the point that it was a missing link. It has become an eyesore when you go down the river to see that area. So we're very much looking forward to that revitalisation.

Unlike previous and in fact some current representatives, I'm not here to play games with this parkland. The toing and froing whipped up by desperate politicians posturing from the past needs to stop. The posturing needs to stop because this is a remarkable opportunity to restore the last remaining wharf site

in Brisbane's city centre. The posturing needs to stop because the parkland will provide a magnificent public space for recreational activities. The posturing needs to stop because this will be a fantastic commercial development which will bring more tourists to the city and create more jobs.

So I am glad that Council sought a design that best meets the objectives to provide a high quality public realm that celebrates its history and prime waterfront location and delivers an inclusive space for residents, workers and visitors alike. Politics aside, it is a basic town planning principle that mixed use should be encouraged because it provides people with options, things to do and destinations to go.

Therefore, the amount of commercial activity for this site, like the proposed plan entails, is absolutely necessary in order to attract people to the planned 80 per cent parklands. I see that the design includes a covered events space which will activate the site, yet not be closed off to the public when events are not being held, and that the hotel in this proposal has a facade that is designed to blend into the cliffs.

These two aspects will be particularly important to the local residents. I know that the Howard Smith Wharves rejuvenation will celebrate the best that Brisbane has to offer and I am fully supportive of what the LORD MAYOR, Councillor COOPER, the State Government, our stakeholders in industry and the majority of the community want to see. We should all work together to give Brisbane a world class waterfront destination. Thank you.

Councillors interjecting.

Chairman: Further debate, Councillor—

Councillor JOHNSTON: Sorry, point of order, Madam Chairman.

Chairman: Yes, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Serialtim - Clause F

Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON, requested that Clause F, STORES BOARD SUBMISSION – HOWARD SMITH WHARVES REVITALISATION PROJECT, be taken serialtim for voting purposes.

Chairman: Thank you. Councillor ADAMS.

Councillor ADAMS: Thank you, Madam Chair. I rise to speak on item C. I was going to save it for my committee report to announce and talk about the lights on City Hall but I'm happy to respond to the questions we had about the contract there for the lights. Obviously we've had great success with the lighting of Story Bridge over the last 12 months since it was set up in June 2013. Over 57 events, we've had community groups recognised for their colours on the Story Bridge. It is a highly fought contest, sometimes, to get up on the bridge when our community groups have functions on the same weekend.

So we did realise that there was an opportunity for new LED lights for the exterior of City Hall as well, for those opportunities but also to make City Hall a part of our New World City and our 24/7 economy. During the City Hall Restoration Project there were some several nice-to-have items, this was one that wasn't within the original plans for the upgrade of City Hall and, however, it was one that we recognised was something that we'd like to do in the near future.

During the renovation process all the old external lights, fittings and fixtures and wiring were actually removed because they weren't up to standard. They wouldn't be ones that we would be using in the future. So we did have the opportunity when we saw new technology come ahead for external lighting, to significantly change what we could do on the outside of City Hall.

So we are actually installing 160 new, economical LED lights on City Hall. They'll replace almost 200 halogen and incandescent lights with LED. So the

beauty we're going to see here is an expected total energy saving of 80 per cent on our lighting on City Hall and with a nice lifespan of 10 years as well for these lights, which will definitely contribute to those energy savings that we have in City Hall as well.

Obviously we are trying to promote coming into the city and experiencing our beautiful capital here. We know what happens at Christmas and the city lights at Christmas time, everybody loves what we are able to do on City Hall. This will give us the opportunity to make City Hall look really spectacular through other times of the year. It wasn't planned to be done in time for G20, the opportunity has come, though, that it will be done in time for G20.

So it will actually be commissioned by late November and we will see some of those fantastic lights on City Hall and how beautiful this people's place really is. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Chairman:

Further debate on these items? LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR:

Yes, thanks very much, Madam Chairman. Well, Madam Chairman, again, in regards to Howard Smith Wharves, I believe that in the fullness of time when it's completed, I think it'll be an outstanding addition to our city. Madam Chairman, to use words that have been used before, it is the missing link on the river. The connection that Howard Smith Wharves will give to the Riverwalk, to that of the CBD, I think that it will be, in the future, seen as an outstanding precinct.

The whole connectivity through there, I think, Madam Chairman, will really ensure its success. One of the things I didn't mention earlier and perhaps should have is that one of the conditions that we've set in relation to this is that there needs to be public connectivity during the course of construction relative to river walk. So in other words, people during the construction phase will continue to be able to get connectivity through.

Now, Madam Chairman, the \$4 million that the Opposition Leader refers to and I think Councillor JOHNSTON made reference to it, it was in the budget, it was available to all—obviously all entities that were competing in relation to this bid. That's been there now for some time, it's been on the table. But as was pointed out also, that the projections are that the city will see a revenue return of some \$528 million over the life of this particular lease.

The actual numbers will of course be in alignment with the success of the facility. So the more successful the facility is, the more those revenue returns will be to this Council. That has been a similar arrangement in other entities that have been set up. When Jim Soorley, for example, put these proponents into the Victoria Park Golf Course and subsequently extended their lease. Madam Chairman, that was done on that basis. It was done on the basis of a revenue return based around a turnover and the like.

So we wish them success, we hope that they will be very successful. Because if they are successful, the city of Brisbane is successful. I believe though, Madam Chair, that people will flock to this site and I very much endorse the acceptance of this proposal, put forward by Stores Board. The officers that have worked on this, I thank them for their work, Madam Chairman, over a long period of time now. Let's hope that today we can go forward and get on with this development.

Chairman:

I will put the motion. Councillor JOHNSTON, Councillor DICK had already identified F as seriatim with B and C, are you happy to have them together? No. Okay. I will put the motion for Items B and C.

Clause B and C put

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

Thereupon, Councillors Milton DICK and Helen ABRAHAMS 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 Graham QUIRK, DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER, and Councillors Krista ADAMS, Matthew BOURKE, Amanda COOPER, Margaret de WIT, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Fiona KING, Geraldine KNAPP, Kim MARX, Peter MATIC, Ian McKENZIE, David McLACHLAN, Ryan MURPHY, Angela OWEN-TAYLOR, Julian SIMMONDS, Andrew WINES and Nicole JOHNSTON.

NOES: 6 - The Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Milton DICK, and Councillors Helen ABRAHAMS, Peter CUMMING, Kim FLESSER, Victoria NEWTON and Shayne SUTTON.

Chairman: I will put the motion for Items D and E.

Clause D and E put

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

Thereupon, the LORD MAYOR and Councillor Ryan MURPHY immediately rose and called for a division, which resulted in the motion being declared **carried**.

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 25 - The Right Honourable the LORD MAYOR, Councillor Graham QUIRK, DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER, and Councillors Krista ADAMS, Matthew BOURKE, Amanda COOPER, Margaret de WIT, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Fiona KING, Geraldine KNAPP, Kim MARX, Peter MATIC, Ian McKENZIE, David McLACHLAN, Ryan MURPHY, Angela OWEN-TAYLOR, Julian SIMMONDS, Andrew WINES, and the Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Milton DICK, and Councillors Helen ABRAHAMS, Peter CUMMING, Kim FLESSER, Victoria NEWTON, Shayne SUTTON and Nicole JOHNSTON.

NOES: Nil.

Chairman: I will put the motion for Item F.

Clause F put

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

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

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 18 - The Right Honourable the LORD MAYOR, Councillor Graham QUIRK, DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER, and Councillors Krista ADAMS, Matthew BOURKE, Amanda COOPER, Margaret de WIT, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Fiona KING, Geraldine KNAPP, Kim MARX, Peter MATIC, Ian McKENZIE, David McLACHLAN, Ryan MURPHY, Angela OWEN-TAYLOR, Julian SIMMONDS and Andrew WINES.

NOES: 5 - The Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Milton DICK, and Councillors

Helen ABRAHAM, Peter CUMMING, Kim FLESSER, and Victoria NEWTON.

ABSTENTIONS: 1 - Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON.

Chairman: LORD MAYOR, Item G please.

LORD MAYOR: Yes, thanks very much, Madam Chairman. Madam Chairman, in introducing item G, Councillor JOHNSTON earlier today raised some questions relative to this item. Madam Chairman, the Chamber—I'm happy to advise there are two members who have resigned from the original panel. The first of those was Mr Kevin Davies who resigned on 15 November 2012 and regrettably died soon after. The other was Mr Kevin Gordon and he resigned on 27 May 2013.

There were a total of eight applicants in relation to the item before us and, Madam Chairman, the reference to one particular applicant, I think Gayle Yates was the reference. Madam Chairman, Gayle Yates has a certificate from TAFE College in Dubbo. That was undertaken in the 1980s but it's not specified on the application. Madam Chairman, I think there were a couple of other aspects and I think I've lost that bit of paper.

Chairman: That's the answer LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: There were other aspects to her educational background, not just that but I think that answers—

Councillor interjecting.

LORD MAYOR: Where were you for the last vote? That's alright you seem to go missing at inappropriate times.

Councillor SUTTON: Yes LORD MAYOR. I went to the toilet. Is that okay?

Chairman: Councillor SUTTON. Councillor SUTTON, are you calling a point of order?

Councillor SUTTON: I was trying to call a point of order yes I was but just—when he made that comment I responded to it and I'm sorry I had the microphone on then. Sorry I was distracted. I let the LORD MAYOR distract me and I apologise. Actually I am rising because I did have a question about this particular report as well. That question was about the remuneration and allowances for panel members. Under the Act, they are able to be remunerated and be paid allowances. I don't have the clarity and I can't find it in previous information that's come to this Council about remuneration and allowances. I was wondering if that matter could also be clarified at some stage in the debate.

Chairman: LORD MAYOR, do you have any answer to that?

LORD MAYOR: Madam Chairman, I don't have dollar figures with me to be honest. Other than to say this that there is a set rate that they are paid in terms of a meeting rate. The panels are only called obviously when they are required. The rates are set in terms of normal tribunal rates I think via the State Government so there is a standard set of these around this but I do apologise. I don't have any set numbers.

Chairman: Except LORD MAYOR I don't think this item is about remuneration. It's simply about adding additional names to the list.

LORD MAYOR: Well no it's about appointments.

Councillor SUTTON: Point of order, Madam Chair. Can I just provide a little bit more clarity—

Chairman: Yes Councillor SUTTON.

Councillor SUTTON: —that may assist in responding to the question. It is a debating point that I do feel is relevant for the subsequent debate that I wish to make, not only in terms of my contribution but it's not so much even the dollar figure about whether or not the LORD MAYOR has just said it's a set rate. Is that a set rate per complaint or is it a set rate per number of days they sit and how long they sit. I guess that's the kind of clarification that I'm seeking.

Chairman: Councillor SUTTON as I've just indicated I don't believe that is relevant to this particular item. The item is not about anything to do with the CCRP. It is about the appointment of additional people to the list. Now if you want further information on it that can certainly be obtained in another area. DEPUTY MAYOR, are you trying to—

DEPUTY MAYOR: I can answer that question quite quickly if you don't mind.

Chairman: Thank you.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Yes so from memory and this is based on a couple of years ago the rate was a per meeting rate and I think it was about \$200 and something per meeting. So it's not based on the number of complaints that come in or anything, it's based on attending the meeting. It was an amount per meeting based on the state government tribunal rate at the time.

Chairman: Thank you, DEPUTY MAYOR. LORD MAYOR?

LORD MAYOR: Yes, Madam Chairman. Well, Madam Chairman, the recommendations are contained there in the report. Councillors have the details relative to the CVs (*curriculum vitae*) of those individual recommendations and it's brought here for the consideration and determination of this Council.

Chairman: Further debate? Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes, Madam Chairman, I rise to speak on Item G. Madam Chairman, I'll start my comments very clearly by stating that the three nominated people here today, Mr David Gill, Mr John Hocknull and Miss Gayle Yates may well be very good, very decent and very honest people. They may be good community members of this city and, Madam Chairman, the comments that I'm about to make relate solely to the purposes of the Item before us today and their fitness and qualifications to attend and be part of this Councillor Conduct Review Panel.

Madam Chairman, I am extremely concerned at the lack of appropriate governance around the appointment of these panel members. I am absolutely shocked; shocked that the LORD MAYOR has indicated somebody resigned two years ago and this Council wasn't told. That another person resigned over a year ago, 18 months ago and again this Council was not told. That is extraordinary; extraordinary that people who have been appointed by this Council have suddenly resigned, the reasons are unclear. Perhaps he'll help with one of them but we have not been told.

That has left four remaining panel members who I have seen time after time I would say, and, Madam Chairman, that is not good enough. Why on earth would this LORD MAYOR keep it a secret that a third of the panel members appointed two years ago suddenly aren't on the board anymore? Why is it—

Chairman: Councillor JOHNSTON. Councillor JOHNSTON you are imputing motive in the way you are saying that and I'd ask you to just think about the comments you're making.

Councillor JOHNSTON: I'm asking the question why it was kept secret, Madam Chairman, because it was. It's just been announced here today. If it's been announced publicly at some point before this I'd be happy to know, Madam Chairman. But it has not been as far as I'm aware. Secondly, I would certainly like to know why they have stepped off that board, why they've resigned and no reasons have been given. It is a real problem, Madam Chairman, that this has all happened and at some point, 18 months after the last resignation and two years after the one before that, that this Council gets around to appointing new board members.

Why the delay? Why the secrecy? These are genuine questions and I would expect the LORD MAYOR will stand up and advise us. Now I'll turn to the appointment of the three people who are nominated before us today. Madam Chairman, I note the LORD MAYOR's further comments that there are actually eight applicants. Now I've been and checked the files and the only thing on the

files are the exact information that's been provided to us in the report today and the attachment that councillors have.

Who are the other eight applicants or were there five, I don't know, including these three? Why is their information not available on the Council files? Why were they unsuitable to be appointed to the CCRP panel? There is absolutely no information on the files about how these people were interviewed, what checks were done on their CVs, whether they were interviewed, by whom; absolutely not a skerrick of information other than the CVs that have been given to councillors today.

Let me say, Madam Chairman, that these CVs demonstrate that at least two of the three people nominated today do not have the experience and the qualifications that are required under the City of Brisbane Act to accept this appointment. That they are being put forward by this Administration as suitable to be on the CCRP is absolutely negligent by this Administration. I will turn my comments specifically to those requirements under the City of Brisbane Act.

Now the City of Brisbane Act requires that a person is qualified to be a member of the pool if they have and I quote: "extensive knowledge and experience in one or more of the following; local government, community affairs, investigations, law, public administration, public sector ethics, public finance or they have other qualifications and experience that the Council considers to be appropriate." Now, Madam Chairman, one of the candidates does appear to have some of these qualifications. They have experience on other tribunals; they have a diploma in law which is an officially recognised university qualification.

They have worked in HR, they have worked in public sector agencies and David Gill may in fact be a suitable person based on the requirements of the City of Brisbane Act. But, Madam Chairman, the other two nominees before us today do not rise to the experience required by section 187 of the City of Brisbane Act. I draw this Council's attention to the following and particularly first the nomination of Miss Gayle Yates. Miss Gayle Yates is a retired legal secretary who has run a financial advisors office here in Brisbane.

She was a nurse when she left university but she's been a secretary and an office manager her entire life. Her claim to fame in the CV before us today is she's the area coordinator of the Hendra Ascot Neighbourhood Watch division. Now I am absolutely shocked, shocked that somebody with so little qualifications who might be a good person, I'm not saying she's not a good person—

Chairman:

Councillor JOHNSTON I'd remind you that there is no privilege in this place.

Councillor JOHNSTON:

Yes and I'm referring to her CV before us today and the Act. She does not have the qualifications in local government or experience in local government. Very limited experience in community affairs she sat on a few board committees and she's been the area coordinator of Neighbourhood Watch. Investigations—no; law—we've heard from the LORD MAYOR today she's got a certificate from TAFE from the 1980s.

Now was that a one day course, was that a six month course? We don't know, Madam Chairman, because there is nothing in the files and nothing before us today. Madam Chairman, that is not a qualification or experience in law. Public administration—no. She's worked for private companies; a law firm as a legal secretary and then a financial advisor as an office manager. This person is an administrative person. They are not a professional with professional qualifications and extensive experience in public administration, law or other significant areas required under section 187 of the City of Brisbane Act.

Does she have any public administration experience? No. Does she have any public sector ethics experience? No. Does she have any qualifications with public finance? No. All of her experience has been in the private sector with respect to the Administration of a law firm's office as a secretary and as the

office manager to a financial adviser. This does not in any way arise to the standard required by the Act. I am shocked that this Administration will put an unqualified person into the position of sitting in judgement of councillors in this place.

Given their track record with the Ombudsman and other matters, Madam Chairman, this Council should be looking for experienced people who have those qualifications and experience. Now the other candidate before us today is a Mr Hocknull. This is even more problematic, Madam Chairman. His claim to fame is that some 40 years ago he was a police officer in Papua New Guinea and together with his wife, he established the Northern Territory Scottish Association in Darwin.

He's been the president of the Kooralbyn Chamber of Commerce. He's been a director on the Greg Norman Junior Golf Foundation. Now, Madam Chairman, a good person but he does not have the requirements under section 187 of the City of Brisbane Act. Worse still, Madam Chairman, there are two councillors sitting in this place who have a conflict of interest with respect to this appointment and that is Councillor McLACHLAN and that is Councillor ADAMS. I see Councillor MURPHY, you're laughing, so if he should disclose something perhaps he should do that.

Councillor McLACHLAN sits on the Newstead Trust Board with Mr Hocknull. This is a board that is reliant on government funding including funding from Council from time to time. It is a person who is known to Councillor McLACHLAN and Councillor McLACHLAN—

Councillor SIMMONDS: Point of order, Madam Chairman.

Chairman: Yes point of order against you. Just a minute; point of order against you Councillor JOHNSTON. Yes Councillor SIMMONDS?

Councillor SIMMONDS: This is surely verging on imputing motive, character assassination.

Chairman: Yes. Councillor JOHNSTON I think the nature of your debate is fairly unsavoury. Again I'd remind you that there is no privilege in this place.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Madam Chairman, I'm not alleging any wrongdoing but what I am saying is there is—

Chairman: Well it sounds very much like it.

Councillor JOHNSTON —potential conflict of interest because Councillor McLACHLAN and Mr Hocknull serve on the same trust foundation, they are well known to each other and have been for several years now. Prior to Councillor McLACHLAN serving on that trust fund, Councillor ADAMS served on it.

Chairman: Councillor JOHNSTON, your time has expired. Thank you. Further debate? Councillor SIMMONDS.

Councillor SIMMONDS: Thank you very much, Madam Chairman. I just rise to support item G, relating to the details of the three people who are being proposed to Council to take part in the future CCRP meetings. Firstly if I could deal with those two members who have previously left the CCRP for the information of the Chamber, so both these men did a sterling job on the committee. Council very much extends to them the appreciation for their service or they did at the time when they were required to step down.

Both men resigned due to serious health concerns. Obviously one of them has since passed away. It did not at any point affect the functioning of the CCRP. What is important to remember is that we have a pool of people from which we draw three in order to form a committee. So while individual members may resign due to various personal circumstances and then from time to time we come into this place to propose new members, what it doesn't do is affect the appropriate and efficient running of the CCRP.

That said, the three extra members that we are proposing here today all have something to add to the pool. I'm certainly confident that they will be an

important part of that membership. I would implore—well frankly I have to say that like you, Madam Chairman, I found the nature of the debate that has occurred so far pretty unsavoury. In my opinion it's verged on character assassination of these people. Just to clarify what the Act actually says because it was very selectively quoted by the councillor who has been involved in this debate so far.

It's on page 29 of the report for all who wish to read. There are a number of examples of how a person may be considered qualified for the CCRP, not least their experience in local government, community affairs, investigations, law, public administration, public sector ethics or public finance. But also that they may have other qualifications and experience that the Council considers appropriate. So well—

Chairman:

Councillor JOHNSTON you're on a warning, just remember that.

Councillor SIMMONDS:

That experience that Council considers appropriate to have them placed on the CCRP and to recommend them to the full Council. So ultimately councillors here are entitled to vote against the recommendation of these members if they so wish. But the qualifications and experience that all three people bring is significant experience both within their own community dealings and their own professional dealings.

Ultimately what the CCRP is all about is holding councillors to a standard that the community considers acceptable. Holding councillors to a standard that the community considers acceptable and who better to judge that than active members of local communities. At the end of the day they are the people who we are—

Chairman:

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor SIMMONDS:

They are the people who we are responsible to come election time and they should be the type of people who assess us from time to time when matters arise that might not be in keeping with those community expectations. So the people that have been put forward to this chamber I would ask, I would implore the councillors to consider the three resumes in their totality, that between the three of them they offer a broad experience, some of them have experience in law, yes. Some of them have experience in public sector ethics and public administration and some of them have extensive experience in the community and what it means to hold the highest community standards.

In relation to the insinuations that the councillor has made regarding their connection to any individuals or councillors who are already in this place, well again I would draw the Council's attention to page 29. The Act is very specific in those people who are prohibited from sitting on this CCRP panel. There is quite a number of things that would disqualify you, including being a consultant engaged by Council, a contractor of the Council, an employee of the Council, a member of a political party, any kind of conviction. These people have satisfied all of those criteria.

All that the Act has asked of them they have met and for that basis, Madam Chairman, it's right and proper that they be considered for a position that they applied for and that they have offered their services to. All of the members so first of all Dr David Gill, so Dr Gill has significant experience in review boards. Since 2010 he's been a member of the appeal panel for the Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency who deal with disciplinary board decisions so significant experience there in public sector ethics.

He's also had significant experience with investigations particularly into matters of behaviour and misconduct during his tenure in the New South Wales Police Service and QPS (Queensland Police Service). Mr John Hocknull is a JP (Justice of the Peace) with all the qualifications and understanding of ethics and public administration ethics that that brings. He's also the Chair of the Newstead House Trust and has also been a police officer and again the

significant experience that that brings in terms of public administration of public sector ethics.

Then Miss Gayle Yates; who again is a qualified nurse with a bachelor of education, tertiary qualifications and with significant experience in our local community and working with community organisations. Now to me it smacks that anybody who is looking at these people and denigrating their qualifications, is in fact scared of the microscope that comes over them from people with a little bit of common sense right? At the end of the day, that's what these positions require is a little bit of common sense and decency and an understanding of community expectations.

Frankly if councillors are living up to those expectations they have nothing to fear. They have nothing to fear from good local community people who are simply interested in making sure that their representatives are acting in the best interest of the entire community. I know everybody on this side of the Chamber wants to live up to that and always seeks to live up to that. If other councillors don't, well, be that on their head and they will have to convince these panel members of the particular circumstances of those cases that might come before them.

But I would encourage all councillors to look at these resumes closely. I certainly support their appointment on the CCRP as three very qualified candidates. Thank you.

Chairman:

Further debate? Councillor SUTTON.

Councillor SUTTON:

Thank you, Madam Chair, I arise to enter the debate on this Item. My concerns about the nominations going forward are not so much about their individual credentials outlined in the CVs that have been submitted. My concerns primarily relate to how the appointment of these panel members fit within the overall context of the existing panel. I guess my key concern is that we don't have a real depth of views and perspectives on this panel if we are to proceed with these appointments.

Now I understand from the last, the resignations were, Mr Ken Davies and Mr Kevin Gordon who were previously on the Code of Conduct Panel. That leaves Mr Michael Halliday, Mr Ray Ovens and Mr Thomas Riggett and Miss Simone Bain as the only existing members of the panel. I have been provided with advice in a different forum that Miss Simone Bain is an extremely busy individual and finds it difficult to be able to participate in panel hearings.

Certainly in terms of the Code of Conduct complaints that I am aware of she has not participated in Code of Conduct hearings, on a number of Code of Conduct hearings for some time, particularly due to her personal, professional commitments outside of that. Why is that relevant, Madam Chair?

Chairman:

Yes I'm waiting for you to explain that very quickly.

Councillor SUTTON:

Yes I know I can see you've got a problem with that. Now why is that relevant is because that leaves us with an existing panel that are three men, three 50 plus white men. I think we should have a broader range of perspectives. I'm not saying that there is anything wrong with men of a certain age being in decision-making positions; certainly we have got huge numbers of them in this country, in this city and in this state. What I'm saying is that good decision-making comes from listening to a range of perspectives and consideration via a range of different filters.

What that means is that out of the three nominees that are before us, again two of those are in exactly the same demographic, exactly the same demographic and there is only one woman. So in terms of the nominees I would like to see a greater balance in terms of the types of perspectives that the panel members come from; the types of backgrounds that they come from and a broader range of community—a broader breakdown. We hear the LORD MAYOR and Councillor ADAMS and Councillor OWEN-TAYLOR talk about the rich

vibrancy of our multicultural community here in Brisbane. Yet we have got five 50 plus Anglo Saxon men determining outcomes on this panel.

Not that individually there is anything wrong with each of those individuals but as a collective determining these matters I think there is room for a broader perspective. I would like to see this Council support a broader perspective. Therefore I would like to have known who the eight applicants are and whether or not there was room to establish a broader range of perspectives in the make-up of these people. Do you know what? I have sat in Code of Conduct hearings on matters. They are quite frankly aggressive, intimidating and very, very, quite frankly disturbing and upsetting. That's the manner in which the ones that I have been involved with have been conducted. I have been subjected to hours—

Chairman: Councillor SUTTON that is not relevant to the Item that's here.

Councillor SUTTON: Well, Madam Chair, what I'm saying is that if as a result of the nature of—

Councillors interjecting.

Councillor SUTTON: Pardon?

Councillors interjecting.

Councillor SUTTON: No.

Chairman: Order, order.

Councillor interjecting.

Chairman: No, Councillor SIMMONDS. Councillor SIMMONDS.

Councillor SUTTON: I take Councillor SIMMONDS interjection and I'll respond to them by saying that certain men of that age can be guilty of a 'What would you know girly attitude'.

Councillors interjecting.

Councillor SUTTON: They are.

Chairman: Councillor SUTTON.

Councillor SIMMONDS: Point of order, Madam Chairman.

Chairman: Point of order.

Councillor SUTTON: Some, I did not say all.

Chairman: Councillor SUTTON.

Councillor SUTTON: I said some.

Chairman: Councillor SUTTON. There's a point of order against you. Yes Councillor SIMMONDS.

Councillor SIMMONDS: That was a direct assertion on the character of individuals operating within the Council and I ask that that it be withdrawn.

Chairman: Yes Councillor SUTTON those comments I find offensive and I ask you to withdraw them.

Councillor SUTTON: Madam Chair, Madam Chair—

Chairman: Councillor SUTTON I have asked you to withdraw them.

Councillor SUTTON: I will withdraw at your direction however I will say that I did not pinpoint any individual in making those comments.

Chairman: No but you've made it pretty clear who you're referring to.

Councillor SUTTON: No I did not.

Chairman: In the context of your debate you have. Don't argue with me because I'm finding some of what you're saying quite offensive.

Councillor SUTTON: Well, Madam Chair, I would like the ability to debate this Item and I think that if we are so sensitive that we can't have these discussions about a lack of perspective—you're happy to raise lack of perspectives in different contexts, when you talk and celebrate diversity in different contexts. But when somebody says to you that there is a lack of diversity in something that you're presenting, you won't hear of it.

I just think that this is—and I'm happy to go on the public record and make a General Business speech about some of the treatment and some of the issues that have been raised, that some of the things that I think have been quite frankly, Council officers and Council staff have been exposed to as part of this process. I am just saying that sometimes when you get a broader perspective in a room that can be helpful and conducive to good decision-making. That is the point that I am saying. I do not think the appointment of these three people today broaden out the diversity of this panel.

That is my key issue with this. So I would have liked to know who the eight applicants were. I would have liked to have seen their CVs. I would like for there to have perhaps been a bit of a bipartisan approach where we could have actually had an across the board conversation about the suitability. In the old days, Madam Chair, and I'm sure the LORD MAYOR would remember those days, there would have been a bipartisan approach to the appointment of these individuals. That died with Campbell Newman. I would have hoped that the LORD MAYOR could have seen it within himself to actually open up—

Chairman: Order.

Councillor SUTTON: —that bipartisanship when it came to these applications with the appointment of these panel matters. So that is—

Councillors interjecting.

Chairman: Order.

Councillor SUTTON: —my key concern. I do think there should be more women appointed to this panel. I do think that if we have a current member of the panel who has found for a whole range of reasons, has found it difficult to make herself available for hearings, that there should be further consideration of that. Because I don't appreciate the way in which the panel has operated in its current form. I would hope, I had hoped that these appointments and I knew that this was coming, I had hoped that the appointment of new people would have assisted with that but I'm disappointed that it hasn't.

The other thing in terms of the general qualifications is that there is a distinct lack of understanding of Council process. None of these CVs give me any comfort that there is going to be added to this panel a distinct understanding of Brisbane City Council's processes and the way in which it works. This is a very real and this is a very relevant matter, Madam Chair. In one of the Code of Conduct hearings I had to attend it was quite obvious that the panel members didn't understand the difference between a development application and the development construction and compliance stage.

When I questioned the panel members about which stage they were asking me about—

Chairman: Councillor SUTTON.

Councillor SUTTON: —I was accused of being facetious.

Chairman: Councillor SUTTON. Councillor SUTTON, again I say what you're talking about is not relevant to the appointment of these three people. You're talking about your past experiences of being called up to a conduct review panel with different people.

Councillor SUTTON: Madam Chair, what I'm trying to say is that when you have panel members that do not understand Brisbane City Council's processes, processes as basic and as simple as knowing the difference between a development application period

and a development construction and compliance period, and as much as you try to communicate the difference between the two processes internally within Brisbane City Council and you're accused of being facetious for asking that question, that is not a shortcoming of the councillor who is under consideration for conduct, that is a shortcoming of the conduct panel for not understanding the way in which Brisbane City Council works.

Now there is one person on that board that has this experience—

Chairman: Councillor SUTTON your time has expired.

Councillor SUTTON: —and that is it.

Chairman: Further debate?

Councillor OWEN-TAYLOR: Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Chairman: Councillor OWEN-TAYLOR.

Councillor OWEN-TAYLOR: Madam Chairman, I rise tonight to support these three people who have been put forward in this Item in respect of the Councillor Code Review Panel. Madam Chairman, what we've heard from certain councillors on the other side of the Chamber tonight has been nothing but a deplorable attack on individual's characters from putting their name forward to serve this city in a capacity—

Councillors interjecting.

Chairman: Order.

Councillor OWEN-TAYLOR: —on an independent review panel. Madam Chairman, what they seem to forget about over the other side of this Chamber is that there is a panel, a pool of people who have put their names forward to serve on the CCRP at times when a CCRP review panel is required. Having a pool of people provides flexibility in terms of making sure that we have enough people available to draw that panel together as it's required.

Now, Madam Chairman, I thought I'd just go back and see what the comments of the Opposition were in respect of the last time we made appointments to this because it is relevant in that—and I quote Councillor DICK. He said, “Labor councillors and as I am the leader of the Opposition, strongly support an independent panel to deal with situations and issues as they arise over the next four years.” So that was the last time he said that and that was in September 2012.

He also said at the time and I quote, “this side of the Chamber does support a strong and independent review panel” and also he said, “the best process is to have decision made at arms' length from the bureaucracy and also of course the elected representatives.” I hope that's still the case Councillor DICK because what is really important in appointing members to this CCRP is that as elected representatives we allow the officers to make the assessment and put forward the recommendations and as they have done today, we are discussing this here.

We are discussing the appointment. We are not into deplorable personal attacks on people's characters. What I find very interesting is that you have the councillor for Tennyson over there screaming out that there should be appointment based on merit, and then you have Councillor SUTTON screaming out that it should be based on different demographics. Interestingly she—

Councillors interjecting.

Chairman: Order.

Councillor OWEN-TAYLOR: —absolutely has flaws in her argument when she's saying—

Chairman: Order.

Councillor OWEN-TAYLOR: —the three people that are looking to be put forward are in the 50 plus white male bracket. Well I'm sorry one of those is a female Councillor SUTTON. There is diversity on that panel—

Chairman: Order.

Councillor OWEN-TAYLOR: —and, Madam Chairman, in response to the claims of secrecy on the other side and the lack of calling for diversity, these representations of expressions of interest came from an advertisement which appeared in none other than *The Courier-Mail* on 28 June 2014. That is a public call for expressions of interest. Anybody—

Councillors interjecting.

Chairman: Order.

Councillor OWEN-TAYLOR: —anybody could have—

Councillors interjecting.

Chairman: Order.

Councillors interjecting.

Chairman: Keep going, Councillor OWEN-TAYLOR.

Councillor OWEN-TAYLOR: Thank you, Madam Chairman. If anybody was interested in serving on the Code of Conduct Review Panel they too could have put an expression of interest in. Now I know they're sitting on the other side and Councillor SUTTON is laughing away but this absolutely bursts her little bubble. If people wanted to put in an application for an expression of interest to be considered there was nothing stopping them. There is no secrecy about these expressions of interest. If people considered themselves capable of doing this—

Chairman: Order.

Councillor OWEN-TAYLOR: —role, they had the opportunity. Those on the other side know this but they just want to put up a smokescreen and try to decry people in their qualifications. That is absolutely unacceptable that they are doing that to members of the public in this place.

Madam Chairman, in respect of Miss Gayle Yates who has put forward her expression of interest, I do note that she has certainly overseen the implementation process of the Future of Financial Advice legislation, which in many respects involves some parallels and provides her with certain qualifications which could be determined as having those other qualifications which are very similar to part of the process that the CCRP does in the fact that it is a process to handle misconduct or inappropriate conduct.

That there are conflicts of interests and there are hearings and decisions in respect of outcomes of complaints; that there are statutory requirements that have to be complied with in respect of legislation. So that's a very similar sort of process to part of what the CCRP deals with in respect of this *City of Brisbane Act*. Now also there were comments in respect to Mr John Hocknull and I do notice as well from his CV that he was also involved in investigations but he was also a gazetted local court magistrate. That in respect would have entailed certain hearings, certain different interpretations of legislation.

So for them to come in here and have a go at these people, these members of the public who have put themselves forward for this role I just say look, you really need to start thinking about what you are actually saying in this place, because quite clearly there are disparities in the opinions coming from over there in respect of merit and demographic base and the process. I say quite clearly this has not been a secret process. It has been out there in *The Courier-Mail*—

Councillors interjecting.

Chairman: Order.

Councillor OWEN-TAYLOR: —asking for people to submit their names which they have done of their own volition—

Councillors interjecting.

Chairman: Order.

Councillor OWEN-TAYLOR: —and certainly that has been a process that has been undertaken through this. I just think that those on the opposite side their behaviour tonight in decrying those people is totally inappropriate. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Chairman: Further debate? Councillor DICK.

Councillor DICK: Look, thanks, Madam Chair, and it's not surprising that the LNP have decided to go down this path. I want to be very clear. This is the process that the LNP have adopted. As Opposition councillors or Labor councillors on this side that I represent we get sent papers which include CVs for three people. We're not asked to be part of the selection process, we're not asked for our views. We're not consulted about which sort of people we think there should be included. That's okay; that's the majority ruling party of the day gets to set the rules. I get that.

But if we object or if we have some concerns about the oversight which is our role to do that, this is the only place where we get to do that, the LORD MAYOR wants to write to me and set up a bipartisan committee to sit down and look at these applicants. Councillor OWEN-Taylor was correct. In 2012 when we began this process I did offer my support. But you know what? Since then I've been advised I haven't had the privilege of appearing before the conduct review panel but the advice is that it needs improvement. It needs improvement.

I'm not going to outline my concerns tonight because we're dealing with the three CVs but this is the process that the LNP have set up, the only way. So what you're saying through you, Madam Chair, to LNP councillors if you somehow object, if you somehow think that the people aren't qualified which is the process you've set up to enable us to do this, we're somehow insulting these people. Well you know what, if you're concerned and I'm a little concerned too, Madam Chair, I won't be mentioning anyone by name in my remarks tonight. Other councillors have done that but I won't be doing that.

It is I guess in some ways unsavoury but that's the process we've got. That's the process you've set up. If you want something different, if you want to take this offline, if you want to do it more in a confidential bipartisan process I'm open to it. Labor councillors are willing to have that conversation. I say that very publicly tonight because as one of the speakers said before this does affect us. As Councillor OWEN-TAYLOR said, I do take this seriously. I do want this committee to work. I want to make sure the best possible people are appointed.

When you read the selection criteria under the *City of Brisbane Act* it states a person qualified to be a member of the pool of members only if, if, the person has extensive knowledge of experience in one or more of the following; local government, community affairs, investigations, law, public administration, public sector ethics, public finance or has other qualifications and experience that the Council considers appropriate. Clearly members of the Civic Cabinet which signed off on this believe that these individuals have those qualifications.

Well, Madam Chair, I've got some questions. I've got some questions about the sort people. Now this is the only place and the only forum where I can raise those questions. So it is with the greatest respect to those opposite, it is not attacking these individuals. This is the process that you have established. This is the area or the oversight where we get to raise these concerns. So I do get concerns when I see on a one page CV, that's all I've got, with 12 sentences on it which highlights an individual who established the Northern Territory Scottish Association in Darwin and the Australian Scottish Association here in Brisbane. This is what they've listed as their qualification.

Then on another applicant as a qualification as to why they should be appointed to this important civic responsibility, they're the committee treasurer for the Maserati Ferrari Charity Ball Committee, events manager for the Maserati Car

Club of Queensland. All admirable pursuits, all should be commended for their interests and abilities. But when that's the information delivered to me as an elected representative and then through this process I am asked to vote on the suitability matched up with the *City of Brisbane Act* requirements, of course I'm going to raise concerns and questions because that is the process that we are dealing it.

It is not a character assassination on these people. They are good hardworking honest citizens. I acknowledge that, I recognise that. But this is all we have to deal with. This is all we have to do to vote on tonight. If I had the opportunity to perhaps meet with these people or interview them or there was as I said a bipartisan approach to this, we mightn't have had to have this debate. But simply to say when you question anyone being put forward is somehow being disrespectful to these people is a nonsense. It is a nonsense and it's wrong because the process that we're dealing with tonight is to appoint these people.

Councillors have made valid criticisms of the qualifications. Yes, perhaps they should be more closely vetted and I would suggest by a bipartisan approach where councillors can have some input before we get to this stage, would probably be a more professional and more appropriate way to deal with ultimately, which is sensitive requirements for this committee, to ultimately deal with situations that arise from time to time. Yes, Madam Chair, I stand by my statement that I do want a committee that is independent, that is well qualified.

Unfortunately tonight the qualifications presented to me as an elected representative and leader of the Opposition do not match those requirements. I will not be supporting them tonight.

Chairman:

Further debate? LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR:

Well, Madam Chairman, we've had a broad range of views expressed tonight and that's not a bad thing. Of course I live in hope, Madam Chairman, that people won't put themselves in a position where they have to appear before this committee. It's not a nice experience as Councillor SUTTON will attest. Madam Chairman, in relation to the people leaving the former panel, Madam Chairman, our role here is a Council is to appoint new panel members and part and parcel of that is not to be advised every time a panel member leaves.

We appoint and after that the matter is in the hands essentially of the CEO to draw together panels when they are required. With respect to Councillor JOHNSTON not knowing that a couple of panel members have left I was somewhat surprised to hear that. My understanding and observation was that she seemed to be on first name terms with most of them. But that said, I have—

Councillors interjecting.

LORD MAYOR:

Well maybe not but there is a propensity there to put yourself in the position to appear regularly. Madam Chair, in relation to Councillor SUTTON's point I have—

Councillors interjecting.

Chairman:

Councillor JOHNSTON you're on a warning and I have given you a couple of—I've given you leeway, next time that's it.

LORD MAYOR:

I have a certain sympathy for the comments made by Councillor SUTTON. Madam Chairman, I thought that her speech was one from the heart from her own personal experiences. While she might have gone close to the edge a couple of times, she was speaking her mind. So we've had the first speaker Councillor JOHNSTON against the lady that we were wanting to appoint here today and Councillor SUTTON thinking that we ought to do more. I actually would be sympathetic to that view.

The problem we had, of the eight there was only one lady applied. I'd like to see more applying and putting their names forward, Madam Chairman. The one thing that was obvious was that there was a propensity of lawyers. Based on

what I'm hearing from Councillor SUTTON's experience that's not necessarily a good thing that we have a propensity of lawyers on this committee. Councillor JOHNSTON as a lawyer might like to see that. I don't know but it's—

Councillors interjecting.

Chairman:

Councillor JOHNSTON.

LORD MAYOR:

—but it was the Cabinet's view in terms of coming up with the names that we had to try and find good and decent people, that have had a bit of practical experience in life, that will take a fair and reasonable approach in terms of their dealing with councillors. In terms of, a lot of the debate seems to have centred around—I've lost her name—what's her name Gayle?

Councillors interjecting.

LORD MAYOR

What's her last name sorry? Gayle Yates I'm sorry, Madam Chairman. So Gayle Yates, I mean she's a Justice of the Peace, she's been involved in the authorising of warrants for a person's arrest or to search their property, she's been an office manager, a marketing coordinator in an international legal firm, a teacher. She's been a graduate nurse. She has then been on a whole raft of committees from chambers of commerce to the secretary of the Arthur Crawford Foundation, to a Racecourse Road Festival Committee, to Police District Conference Committee member. That's a pretty broad community experience I have to say.

She's someone who's been around, experienced the world a bit in a raft of background in terms of her roles, both community service and in her work life. So, Madam Chairman, all I think we want is some people that are fair, reasonable and pragmatic in terms of their dealings with this committee. In terms of the amounts they receive, Madam Chairman, it's \$291 up to four hours and if it extends beyond four hours I believe it goes to \$582. So the idea with this as has always been the case, a panel, the CEO at the time if there's a need to draw a panel together, then proceeds to try and get a panel together of those available. That's what it comes down to.

So hence three new names here today, Madam Chairman, to give that broad number on the panel to make sure there is always an availability of people to be pulled together if they need to. But again I come back to where I started. My great preference is that this panel never has to be drawn together. I think if we all behave sensibly and appropriately in this place that will be the case.

Chairman:

I will put the motion for Item G.

Clause G put

Upon being submitted to the meeting 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 Helen ABRAHAMS and Milton DICK immediately rose and called for a division, which resulted in the motion being declared **carried**.

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 18 - The Right Honourable the LORD MAYOR, Councillor Graham QUIRK, DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER, and Councillors Krista ADAMS, Matthew BOURKE, Amanda COOPER, Margaret de WIT, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Fiona KING, Geraldine KNAPP, Kim MARX, Peter MATIC, Ian McKENZIE, David McLACHLAN, Ryan MURPHY, Angela OWEN-TAYLOR, Julian SIMMONDS and Andrew WINES.

NOES: 7 - The Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Milton DICK, and Councillors Helen ABRAHAMS, Peter CUMMING, Kim FLESSER, Victoria NEWTON, Shayne SUTTON and Nicole JOHNSTON.

The report read as follows—

**A ANNUAL OPERATIONAL PLAN PROGRESS AND QUARTERLY
FINANCIAL REPORT FOR THE PERIOD ENDED JUNE 2014**
134/695/317/344

169/2014-15

1. The Divisional Manager, Organisational Services, provided the information below.
2. The *City of Brisbane Regulation 2012*, Sections 196(2) and (3), state that the Chief Executive Officer must present financial reports to Council at least quarterly. The reports are to state the progress that has been made in relation to Council's budget.
3. The financial report (Attachment B, submitted on file) separately identifies and reports the financial results of Brisbane City Council, Brisbane City Council Core Services (i.e. Council excluding business units) and Brisbane City Council Business Units. The written commentaries provide explanation of the figures.
4. Section 166(3), *City of Brisbane Regulation 2012*, states that the Chief Executive Officer must present a written assessment of the Council's progress towards implementing the annual operational plan to Council at least quarterly.
5. The previous financial report for the period ended 28 March 2014 was presented to Council on 10 June 2014. The current report relates to the period ended 30 June 2014.
6. The Divisional Manager, Organisational Services, therefore provided the following recommendation and the Committee agreed.
7. **RECOMMENDATION:**

**THAT COUNCIL RESOLVE IN ACCORDANCE WITH ATTACHMENT A,
hereunder.**

Attachment A
Draft Resolution

**TO ADOPT THE ANNUAL OPERATIONAL PLAN PROGRESS AND QUARTERLY
FINANCIAL REPORT FOR THE PERIOD ENDING JUNE 2014**

THAT IT BE RESOLVED

1. As:

- (a) Section 196 (2) and (3) of the *City of Brisbane Regulation 2012*, requires that the Chief Executive Officer present financial reports to Council at least quarterly.
- (b) Section 166 (3) of the *City of Brisbane Regulation 2012* states that the Chief Executive Officer must present a written assessment of the Council's progress towards implementing the annual operational plan to Council at least quarterly.

2. Then:

- (a) Council directs that the Annual Operational Plan progress and Quarterly Financial Report for the period ending June 2014, as set out in Attachment B,

be noted as submitted on file.

NOTED

B REPORT OF THE AUDIT COMMITTEE MEETING ON 4 SEPTEMBER 2014

109/695/586/6

170/2014-15

8. The Chief Executive Officer provided the information below.
9. Section 201 of the *City of Brisbane Regulation 2012* requires that as soon as practicable after a meeting of the Audit Committee, Council must be given a written report about the matters reviewed at the meeting and the Committee's recommendations about the matters.
10. The Chief Executive Officer is to present the report mentioned in subsection (1)(c) of section 201 at the next meeting of Council.
11. The Chief Executive Officer therefore provided the following recommendation and the Committee agreed.
12. **RECOMMENDATION:**

THAT COUNCIL NOTE THE REPORT OF THE AUDIT COMMITTEE MEETING ON 4 SEPTEMBER 2014 AS SET OUT IN ATTACHMENT A, submitted on file.

NOTED

C CONTRACTS AND TENDERING – REPORT TO COUNCIL OF CONTRACTS ACCEPTED BY DELEGATES FOR AUGUST 2014

109/695/586/2

171/2014-15

13. The Chief Executive Officer provided the information below.
14. Sections 238 and 239 of the *City of Brisbane Act 2010* ("the Act") provide that Council may delegate some of its powers. Those powers include the power to enter into contracts under section 242 of the Act.
15. Council has previously delegated some powers to make, vary or discharge contracts for the procurement of goods, services or works. Council made these delegations to the Establishment and Coordination Committee and Chief Executive Officer.
16. *The City of Brisbane Regulation 2012* ("the Regulation") was made pursuant to the Act. Section 227 in Chapter 6 (Part 4) of the Regulation provides that: (1) Council must, as soon as practicable after entering into a contract under this chapter worth \$200,000 or more (exclusive of GST), publish relevant details of the contract on Council's website; (2) the relevant details must be published under subsection (1) for a period of at least 12 months; (3) also, if a person asks Council to give relevant details of a contract, Council must allow the person to inspect the relevant details at Council's public office. 'Relevant details' is defined in section 227 Chapter 6 (Part 4) (4) as including: (a) the person with whom Council has entered into the contract; (b) the value of the contract; and (c) the purpose of the contract (e.g. the particular goods or services to be supplied under the contract).
17. The Chief Executive Officer provided the following recommendation and the Committee agreed.

18. **RECOMMENDATION:**

THAT COUNCIL NOTE THE REPORT IN ACCORDANCE WITH ATTACHMENT A, hereunder.

Attachment A
City of Brisbane Regulation 2012 – Chapter 6 – Contracting
Details of Contracts Accepted by Delegates of Council for August 2014

Contract/Quote No. & Successful Contractor/s	Delegate	Nature of Arrangement and Estimated Maximum Expenditure	Contract/Quote Purpose	Unsuccessful Tenders and Quotes	Prices Tendered	Approval, Start/End Dates & Term
BRISBANE INFRASTRUCTURE						
1. Contract No: 520029 Doval Constructions (Qld) Pty Ltd - \$480,267 <i>(precast reinforced concrete girder and abutments with driven concrete piles)</i> Achieved highest VFM of 18.53	CPO	Lump sum \$480,267	Removal, Supply and Replacement of three Footbridges <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finsbury Park, Wilston • Beckett Road Park, McDowall • Canterbury Park, Bald Hills 	<u>Shortlisted offers not recommended</u> BAC Technologies Pty Ltd t/a BAC Advanced Composites Technologies (fibre composite bridge and abutments with micro piles) VFM: 13.48 <u>Offers not recommended</u> Cragcorp Pty Ltd t/a Queensland Bridge and Civil (fibre composite bridge on pad footing) VFM: 12.75 Epoca Constructions Pty Ltd (precast reinforced concrete girder on pad footing) VFM: 9.71 Fleetwood Urban Pty Ltd (steel bridge and abutments with screw piles) VFM: 9.14 The Marina Specialist Pty Ltd t/a The Jetty Specialist (precast reinforced concrete girder and abutments with bored piles) VFM: 6.80	\$390,992 \$438,280 \$422,123 \$441,043 \$493,940	Approved: 29.08.14 Start: 01.09.14 End: Estimated completion within 16 weeks
2. Contract No: 530195 Building Solutions Brisbane Pty Ltd - \$335,240 Achieved highest VFM of 23.27	CPO	Lump sum \$335,240	Structural Repair Program Package 13 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brisbane Women's Hockey Association, Herston • St Lucia Central Scouts Association • Wynola Girl Guides, Coorparoo • Belmont Scouts Association • Rotary Club of Stafford (cottage), Everton Park • Inala Community Hall (awning) • Sandgate Swimming Pool (chemical storage shelter) • Holland Park Hawks Soccer Club • Kalinga Bowls Club (retaining wall) 	<u>Shortlisted offers not recommended</u> PBI Australia Pty Ltd VFM Achieved: 20.55 Hawley Constructions Pty Ltd VFM Achieved: 17.33 Signature Projects Pty Ltd VFM Achieved: 15.72 Anchor Building Services (Qld) Pty Ltd VFM Achieved: 5.37	\$434,489 \$484,994 \$517,710 \$587,022	Approved: 07.08.14 Start: 11.08.14 End: Estimated completion within 19 weeks
3. Contract No: 530199 Stowe Australia Pty Ltd – \$474,125	CPO	Lump sum \$474,125	Supply and Installation of Lighting Infrastructure at City Hall	No other offers received		Approved: 15.08.14 Start:

Contract/Quote No. & Successful Contractor/s	Delegate	Nature of Arrangement and Estimated Maximum Expenditure	Contract/Quote Purpose	Unsuccessful Tenders and Quotes	Prices Tendered	Approval, Start/End Dates & Term
Achieved highest VFM of 18.98						15.08.14 End: Estimated completion within nine weeks
4. Contract No: 530211 Treescape Australasia Pty Limited – \$165,685 Achieved highest VFM of 4.62	CPO	Lump sum \$165,685	Tree Relocation at former Wynnum Central State School	The Tree Doctor VFM Achieved: 4.12	\$191,900	Approved: 28.08.2014 Start: 01.09.2014 End: Estimated completion within 14 weeks
BRISBANE LIFESTYLE						
Nil						
BRISBANE TRANSPORT						
Nil						
CITY PLANNING & SUSTAINABILITY						
Nil						
OFFICE OF THE LORD MAYOR & CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER						
Nil						
ORGANISATIONAL SERVICES						
5. Contract No: 130222-002 Optima Financial Services Pty Ltd as Trustee for Optima Trading Trust trading as Brisbane Isuzu – \$4,741,386 Achieved highest VFM of 16.85	CEO	Preferred supplier arrangement – schedule of rates \$5,900,000	Supply and Delivery of Trucks 4.5 tonne GVM and Above (Category 2 – 22.5 tonne GVM asphalt trucks)	<i>Final shortlisted offer not recommended</i> Hino Motor Sales Australia VFM: 12.63 <i>Shortlisted offers not recommended</i> Daimler Trucks Brisbane VFM: 11.53 Volvo Group Australia Pty Ltd VFM: 5.50	\$4,876,561 \$4,616,718 \$7,396,632	Approved: 05.08.14 Start: 18.08.14 End: (initial term) 17.08.17 Max. term: five years
6. Contract No: 110074-003 EMC Corporation Australia Pty Ltd – \$253,809	CPO	Lump sum \$253,809	Provision of RSA envision software, support and maintenance	Contract entered into without seeking competitive tenders in accordance with Exemption 7 (Extensions of ICT Maintenance and Support Arrangements) under Schedule A of Council's <i>Annual Procurement Policy and Contracting Plan 2014-2015</i> . EMC own the RSA enVision software Intellectual Property rights in Australia, and have unique knowledge and resources to support and develop the software product.	N/A	Approved: 05.08.14 Start: 05.08.14 End: (initial term) 31.07.15 Max. term: three years
7. Contract No: 510043 <u>Category A (double drum 1.5 tonne)</u> Tutt Bryant Equipment Pty Ltd (preferred supplier) – \$99,426* Achieved highest VFM of 82.7 Hastings Deering (Aust) Pty Ltd (alternate supplier) – \$111,098* VFM: 77.4	CEO	Preferred supplier arrangements – schedule of rates \$1,320,000	Supply and Delivery of Road Rollers, Spare Parts and Servicing	<i>VFM not calculated for unsuccessful offers as equipment was not considered suitable for Council work requirements</i> <u>Category A (double drum 1.5 tonne)</u> <i>Shortlisted offers not recommended</i> Atlas Copco Australia Pty Ltd <i>Offers not recommended</i> Conplant Pty Ltd CJD Equipment Pty Ltd	\$91,902* \$51,875* \$61,870*	Approved: 29.07.14 Start: 05.08.14 End: (initial term) 04.08.17 Max. term: five years

Contract/Quote No. & Successful Contractor/s	Delegate	Nature of Arrangement and Estimated Maximum Expenditure	Contract/Quote Purpose	Unsuccessful Tenders and Quotes	Prices Tendered	Approval, Start/End Dates & Term
<p><u>Category B (double drum 2.5 tonne)</u></p> <p>Tutt Bryant Equipment Pty Ltd (preferred supplier) – \$1,691,998* Achieved highest VFM of 49.3</p> <p>Hastings Deering (Aust) Pty Ltd (alternate supplier) – \$2,048,641* VFM: 42</p> <p><u>Category C (double drum 4 tonne)</u></p> <p>Tutt Bryant Equipment Pty Ltd (preferred supplier) – \$107,576* Achieved highest VFM of 78.1</p> <p>Hastings Deering (Aust) Pty Ltd (alternate supplier) – \$126,300* VFM: 66.8</p> <p><u>Category D (double drum 7.5 tonne)</u></p> <p>Hastings Deering (Aust) Pty Ltd (preferred supplier) – \$680,725* Achieved highest VFM of 123.1</p> <p>Tutt Bryant Equipment Pty Ltd (alternate supplier) – \$731,148* VFM: 109.9</p> <p><u>Category E (double drum 10 tonne)</u></p> <p>Hastings Deering (Aust) Pty Ltd (preferred supplier) – \$253,343* Achieved highest VFM of 33.1</p> <p>Tutt Bryant Equipment Pty Ltd (alternate supplier) – \$246,936* VFM: 32.6</p> <p><u>Category F (vibratory multi tired 2.5 tonne)</u> No offer tendered</p> <p><u>Category F (vibratory multi tired 9 tonne)</u> No conforming offer tendered</p> <p>*Price is Whole of Life costs (WOL) consisting of initial purchase price, running and maintenance costs.</p>				<p><u>Category B (double drum 2.5 tonne)</u></p> <p><u>Shortlisted offers not recommended</u></p> <p>Atlas Copco Australia Pty Ltd \$1,523,253*</p> <p><u>Offers not recommended</u></p> <p>Conplant Pty Ltd \$1,100,837* CJD Equipment Pty Ltd \$1,313,655*</p> <p><u>Category C (double drum 4 tonne)</u></p> <p><u>Shortlisted offers not recommended</u></p> <p>Atlas Copco Australia Pty Ltd \$103,260*</p> <p><u>Offers not recommended</u></p> <p>Conplant Pty Ltd \$94,326* CJD Equipment Pty Ltd \$115,974*</p> <p><u>Category D (double drum 7.5 tonne)</u></p> <p><u>Shortlisted offers not recommended</u></p> <p>Atlas Copco Australia Pty Ltd \$646,734*</p> <p><u>Offers not recommended</u></p> <p>Conplant Pty Ltd \$562,150* CJD Equipment Pty Ltd \$578,048*</p> <p><u>Category E (double drum 10 tonne)</u></p> <p><u>Shortlisted offers not recommended</u></p> <p>Atlas Copco Australia Pty Ltd \$280,645*</p> <p><u>Offers not recommended</u></p> <p>Conplant Pty Ltd \$219,977*</p>		
<p>8. Contract No: 510052</p> <p>BCM Software (Australia) Pty Ltd – \$1,410,488* Achieved highest VFM of 58.29</p> <p>*Price is annual subscription fees measured over the potential maximum contract term including initial deployment and training costs</p>	CPO	Preferred supplier arrangements – schedule of rates \$1,410,488	Provision of an externally hosted and supported Information Technology Services Management (ITSM) solution	<p><u>Shortlisted offers not recommended</u></p> <p>Helpdesk Solutions Pty Ltd VFM: 55.77</p> <p><u>Offers not shortlisted</u></p> <p>Unisys Pty Ltd VFM: 20.94</p> <p>Keystone Management Solutions Pty Ltd VFM: 14.17</p> <p><u>Non-conforming offer</u></p> <p>Systemology Australia Pty Ltd</p>	<p>\$1,348,465*</p> <p>\$12,622,420*</p> <p>\$3,023,607*</p>	<p>Approved: 29.07.14 Start: 01.08.14 End: (initial term) 31.07.17 Max. term: seven years</p>
<p>9. Contract No: 510058</p> <p><u>Preferred Supplier Arrangements</u></p>	CEO	Panel preferred supplier	Provision of Tree Maintenance and Planting Services	<p><u>Shortlisted offers not recommended</u></p> <p>Heritage Tree Services Pty Ltd</p>	\$5,852,500*	<p>Approved: 29.07.14 Start:</p>

Contract/Quote No. & Successful Contractor/s	Delegate	Nature of Arrangement and Estimated Maximum Expenditure	Contract/Quote Purpose	Unsuccessful Tenders and Quotes	Prices Tendered	Approval, Start/End Dates & Term
<p><u>Category 1: North and West Regions</u> <u>Category 2: Central and East Regions</u> <u>Category 3: South Region</u></p> <p>Treescape Australasia Pty Ltd (preferred supplier) – \$4,203,075* Achieved highest VFM of 20.15</p> <p>Powerclear Pty Ltd (alternate supplier) – \$5,481,000* VFM: 15.31</p> <p><u>Panel Arrangement (Emergency/Disaster)</u></p> <p>Treescape Australasia Pty Ltd – \$4,203,075* Achieved highest VFM of 20.15</p> <p>Powerclear Pty Ltd – \$5,481,000* VFM: 15.31</p> <p>River City Garden and Lawn Pty Ltd – \$6,180,948* VFM: 12.65</p> <p><i>*Final tender price is the rate provided by shortlisted tenderers multiplied by the estimated volume for both tree maintenance and planting (tonnes) to be purchased in 2014/15.</i></p>		<p>arrangements – schedule of rates</p> <p>\$21,000,000</p>		<p>VFM: 11.25</p> <p>Aegina Pty Ltd ATF Galbraith Family Trust T/as Brisbane Tree Services VFM: 9.10</p> <p><i>Offers not shortlisted (VFM not calculated as tenderers did not meet Council's required capability levels)</i></p> <p>Vemco Group® (Linepro Pty Ltd)# \$5,075,864#</p> <p>Citywide Service Solutions Pty Ltd \$7,993,750</p> <p>Austcare Environmental Services Pty Ltd# \$1,586,125#</p> <p>City-Wide Tree Services (Qld) Pty Ltd \$5,403,904</p> <p>RST Systems Pty Ltd t/a Vinton Tree Services & Vinton Plant Hire# \$3,767,000#</p> <p>Enviromedics Pty Ltd trading as Woody Woodpekers Tree Services \$4,717,542</p> <p>Wills Holdings (Qld) Pty Ltd trading as River City Trees# \$9,327,500#</p> <p>Active Tree Services Pty Ltd \$8,417,062</p> <p>Arbor Direct Pty Ltd trading as Brisbane Tree Experts# \$6,987,570#</p> <p>Independent Tree Services Pty Ltd \$5,251,500</p> <p>Family Tree Care \$10,177,500</p> <p>Treesafe Australia Pty Ltd \$10,076,675</p> <p>The Trustee for the GF Property Maintenance Trust, T/A GF Property Maintenance (QLD) Pty Ltd# \$3,110,000#</p> <p>Bush Bourne Unit Trust T/A Australian Tree Services# \$4,385,000#</p> <p>Performance Mowing Pty Ltd T/A Performance Arboriculture# \$5,640,000#</p> <p><i># These tenderers provided part offers for only tree planting or only tree maintenance</i></p>	<p>\$7,404,050*</p> <p>\$5,075,864#</p> <p>\$7,993,750</p> <p>\$1,586,125#</p> <p>\$5,403,904</p> <p>\$3,767,000#</p> <p>\$4,717,542</p> <p>\$9,327,500#</p> <p>\$8,417,062</p> <p>\$6,987,570#</p> <p>\$5,251,500</p> <p>\$10,177,500</p> <p>\$10,076,675</p> <p>\$3,110,000#</p> <p>\$4,385,000#</p> <p>\$5,640,000#</p>	<p>10.08.14 End: (initial term) 09.08.16 Max. Term: five years</p>
<p>10. Contract No: 510082</p> <p><u>Category 1: Sand for Asphalt Manufacture (Eagle Farm)</u></p> <p>Corridor Sands Pty Ltd (preferred supplier) – \$516,000* Achieved highest VFM of 14.80</p> <p>Pacific Silica Pty Ltd trading as Southern Pacific Sands (alternate supplier) – \$569,000* VFM: 14.54</p> <p><u>Category 2: Sand for Asphalt Manufacture (Riverview)</u></p> <p>Wood Mulching Industries (preferred supplier) – \$245,000* Achieved highest VFM of 30.38</p>	CEO	<p>Preferred supplier arrangements – schedule of rates</p> <p>\$4,200,000</p>	<p>Provision of Sand for Asphalt Manufacture and Concrete Production</p>	<p><u>Category 1: Sand for Asphalt Manufacture (Eagle Farm)</u></p> <p>Wood Mulching Industries VFM: 13.06</p> <p>River Sands Pty Ltd VFM: 13.33</p> <p><u>Category 2: Sand for Asphalt Manufacture (Riverview)</u></p> <p>River Sands Pty Ltd VFM: 25.53</p> <p>Pacific Silica Pty Ltd trading as Southern</p>	<p>\$570,000*</p> <p>\$544,000*</p> <p>\$284,000*</p> <p>\$325,000*</p>	<p>Approved: 29.07.14 Start: 10.08.14 End: (initial term) 09.08.17 Max. term: five years</p>

Contract/Quote No. & Successful Contractor/s	Delegate	Nature of Arrangement and Estimated Maximum Expenditure	Contract/Quote Purpose	Unsuccessful Tenders and Quotes	Prices Tendered	Approval, Start/End Dates & Term
<p>Corridor Sands Pty Ltd (alternate supplier) – \$255,000* VFM: 29.96</p> <p><u>Category 3: Sand for Concrete Production (Bracalba)</u></p> <p>Pacific Silica Pty Ltd trading as Southern Pacific Sands (preferred supplier) – \$70,200* Achieved highest VFM of 117.99</p> <p>Corridor Sands Pty Ltd (alternate supplier) – \$78,000* VFM: 97.93</p> <p><i>*Final tendered price is the rate (delivered price) provided by the shortlisted tenderers multiplied by the estimated volume (tonnes) to be purchased in 2014/15</i></p>				<p>Pacific Sands VFM: 25.42</p> <p><u>Category 3: Sand for Concrete Production (Bracalba)</u></p> <p>River Sands Pty Ltd VFM: 89.91</p> <p>Wood Mulching Industries VFM: 87.37</p>	<p>\$80,640*</p> <p>\$85,200*</p>	
<p>11. Contract No: 510097</p> <p><u>Category 1: Services</u> Sub-categories</p> <p>a) Melt Ons b) Paint Transverse c) Cold Applied d) Thermoplastics Longitudinal e) Coloured Pavement f) Other</p> <p>Gumbay Holdings Pty Ltd trading as Avante Linemarking (a,b,c,d,e,f) – \$4,060,450* Achieved highest VFM of 21.66</p> <p>Dingo Road Services Pty Ltd (a,b,c,d,e,f) – \$7,511,275* VFM: 11.64</p> <p>TCP Pty Ltd (c,e) – \$3,759,441**</p> <p>STS Applied Systems QLD Pty Ltd (e) – \$3,100,192**</p> <p>Angle Linemarking (QLD) Pty Ltd (b,f) – \$656,583**</p> <p>Designer Pave Pty Ltd (e,f) – \$1,258,950**</p> <p><u>Category 2a: Thermoplastics & Retroreflective Pavement Markers</u></p> <p>Dura Product Industries Pty Ltd (DPI) – \$230,912* Achieved highest VFM of 42.26</p> <p>Ennis Traffic Safety Solutions – \$234,104* VFM: 41.71</p> <p><u>Category 2b: Paint & Glass Beads</u></p> <p>Ennis Traffic Safety Solutions – \$141,725* Achieved highest VFM of 68.90</p> <p>Damar Industries Pty Ltd – \$134,523* VFM: 68.30</p>	CEO	<p>Panel arrangements – schedule of rates</p> <p>\$31,500,000</p>	<p>Provision of Road and Pavement Marking Materials and Services</p>	<p><u>Category 1: Services</u></p> <p>Roadline Removal (North Coast) Hi Tech Linemarking</p> <p><u>Category 2a: Thermoplastics & Retroreflective Pavement Markers</u></p> <p>Rayolite Aust Pty Ltd TCP Pty Ltd Crystalite Designs Pty Ltd Vitec Trading Pty Ltd</p> <p>Asian Paints QLD Pty Ltd trading as Apco Coatings VFM: 37.61</p> <p><u>Category 2b: Paint & Glass Beads</u></p> <p>Asian Paints QLD Pty Ltd trading as Apco Coatings VFM: 64.94</p> <p>The Valspar Consumer (Australia) Corporation Pty Ltd) Dura Product Industries Pty Ltd (DPI) TCP Pty Ltd Potters Industries P/L</p>	<p>\$473,788** \$4,643,809*</p> <p>\$151,055** \$212,470** \$208,144** \$38,882**</p> <p>\$243,179*</p> <p>\$140,850*</p> <p>\$109,493** \$15,612** \$109,325** \$49,775**</p>	<p>Approved: 22.07.14 Start: 01.08.14 End: (Initial term) 31.07.17 Max. term: five years</p>

Contract/Quote No. & Successful Contractor/s	Delegate	Nature of Arrangement and Estimated Maximum Expenditure	Contract/Quote Purpose	Unsuccessful Tenders and Quotes	Prices Tendered	Approval, Start/End Dates & Term
Category 2c: Line Marking Tape 3M Australia Pty Ltd – \$4,461* VFM: 21.65 <i>*Final tendered price is derived from the aggregate baskets of goods for which the tenderers supplied rates</i> <i>** Rates not supplied for complete baskets</i>				Crystalite Designs Pty Ltd Category 2c: Line Marking Tape (VFM not calculated – product did not perform satisfactorily on Council test bed) Asian Paints QLD Pty Ltd trading as Apco Coatings	\$14,790** \$2,583*	
12. Contract No: 510132 Category 1: Primary Links – Holland Park Data Centre (a) TPG Network Pty Ltd (preferred supplier) – \$450,000* Achieved highest VFM of 143.70 iseek Communications Pty Ltd (alternate supplier) – \$548,500* VFM: 121.55 Category 1: Primary Links – Brisbane Square Data Centre (b) iseek Communications Pty Ltd (preferred supplier) – \$498,000* VFM: 133.88 TPG Network Pty Ltd (alternate supplier) – \$435,000* Achieved highest VFM of 148.66 <i>*Final tendered price is the estimated nominal contract expenditure over a five year period, including installation and implementation costs, fibre cabling and connection to Council's Data Centres, supply and support of contractor-owned Customer Premise Equipment.</i> Category 3: Service Management Agent for Internet Services iseek Communications Pty Ltd – \$220,000 VFM: 303.05^ <i>^ Final tendered price is the estimated nominal contract expenditure over a five year period, including installation and implementation costs, supply and support of contractor-owned Customer Premise Equipment and ongoing monthly service management fees.</i>	CEO	Preferred supplier arrangements – schedule of rates \$1,068,000	Provision of Internet Services	Category 1: Primary Links – Holland Park Data Centre (a) <i>Shortlisted offers not recommended</i> Optus Network Pty Ltd VFM: 123.60 <i>Offers not recommended</i> CITEC VFM: 50.81 Internode Pty Ltd VFM: 44.36 <i>Non-confirming offer</i> Telstra Corporation Limited Category 1: Primary Links – Brisbane Square Data Centre (b) <i>Shortlisted offers not recommended</i> Optus Network Pty Ltd VFM: 123.60 <i>Offers not recommended</i> CITEC VFM: 61.43 Internode Pty Ltd VFM: 40.67 <i>Non-confirming offer</i> Telstra Corporation Limited Category 3: Service Management Agent for Internet Services <i>Shortlisted offers not recommended</i> Optus Network Pty Ltd VFM: 119.08 <i>Offers not recommended</i> (Final tendered price and VFM not calculated as offer was embedded in Category 1 and 2 bid pricing and not able to be assessed as a separable portion. Offer was not considered further after failing to be shortlisted for Category 1 or 2)	\$625,000* \$1,468,280* \$1,505,466* \$625,000* \$1,214,460* \$1,641,829* \$648,718^	Approved: 12.08.14 Start: 12.08.14 End: (Initial term) two years Max. term: five years

Contract/Quote No. & Successful Contractor/s	Delegate	Nature of Arrangement and Estimated Maximum Expenditure	Contract/Quote Purpose	Unsuccessful Tenders and Quotes	Prices Tendered	Approval, Start/End Dates & Term
				CITEC Internode Pty Ltd		
13. Contract No: 510158 IPP Consulting Pty Ltd – \$48,850* Achieved highest VFM of 174 Hatamoto Holdings Pty Ltd acting as the Trustee for the Hatamoto Unit Trust – \$45,950* VFM: 150 <i>* Price is a basket of goods based on estimated hours required for a typical project</i>	CPO	Panel arrangement – schedule of rates Rates \$1,000,000	Provision of Security Consultancy Services	<i>Offers not recommended</i> GHD Pty Ltd VFM: 133 Blackhall & Perl VFM: 111 <i>Non-conforming offers</i> Southern Cross Projection Pty Ltd Jacobs Group (Australia) Pty Ltd	\$57,105* \$44,300* N/A N/A	Approved: 14.08.14 Start: 17.08.14 End: (Initial term) 16.08.17 Max. term: five years
14. Contract No: 520027-000 BOC Limited – \$189,860 Achieved highest VFM of 46.94	CPO	Preferred supplier arrangement – schedule of rates \$1,216,168	Supply and Delivery of Compressed Industrial and Medical Gases	<i>Shortlisted offers not recommended</i> Air Liquide Pty Ltd VFM: 44.46 Coregas Pty Ltd VFM: 39.63	\$200,649 \$213,756	Approved: 21.08.14 Start: 01.09.14 End: (Initial term) 31.08.17 Max. term: five years

NOTED

D LEASE TO QUEENSLAND AFRICAN COMMUNITIES COUNCIL INCORPORATED

112/445/439/131

172/2014-15

19. The Divisional Manager, Brisbane Lifestyle, provided the information below.
20. Council is the trustee of a Reserve for recreation purposes, which comprises Balmoral Park, on Bennetts Road, Morningside. Part of this land was previously leased by Balmoral Bowls Club, which has dissolved and now vacated the site. The premises includes a building, former bowling greens and associated car park.
22. Queensland African Communities Council Incorporated (QACC) is currently operating out of the former East Brisbane Men's Bowling Club at Mowbray Park, Lytton Road, East Brisbane. They do not have any formal tenure over this site. Council was in the process of formalising a lease agreement for use of this site when the opportunity to relocate QACC to Balmoral Park became available.
23. Balmoral Park is a more suitable venue for the activities undertaken by QACC and offers better long term options for the organisation. Balmoral Park is also a more accessible site, situated near public transport and has better parking facilities for visitors. QACC has agreed to relocate to this site and a lease is now proposed for five years, as set out in Attachment B, submitted on file.
24. Over the proposed five year lease term, QACC has advised Council of their proposed plans to upgrade the existing building, including refurbishing the kitchen and bar area, installing a PA system, and replacing furniture. They will also undertake upgrade works to the grounds including filling the greens to create a flat level area, installing a water system, landscaping and lighting improvements.
25. QACC estimates they will expend approximately \$143,000 over the next five years to

improve the facility for its members and provide ongoing service to the community.

26. As this lease is over Reserve land for which Council is the trustee, consent from the Minister for Natural Resources and Mines will be required.
27. The Divisional Manager, Brisbane Lifestyle, provided the following recommendation and the Committee agreed.
28. **RECOMMENDATION**

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

Attachment A
Draft Resolution

TO ENTER INTO A LEASE WITH QUEENSLAND AFRICAN COMMUNITIES COUNCIL INCORPORATED

THAT IT BE RESOLVED

1. As:
 - (a) Council is the trustee of a Reserve for recreation purposes, which comprises Balmoral Park, on Bennetts Road, Morningside, and is described as Lot 1 on CP882322, Parish of Bulimba. Part of the land was leased to Balmoral Bowls Club that has since expired; and
 - (b) Queensland African Communities Council Incorporated has requested to be granted the lease over Lease C on SP121771, Parish of Bulimba, Balmoral Park, Bennetts Road, Morningside.
2. Then Council:
 - (a) Approves entry into a lease for five years with Queensland African Communities Council Incorporated for Balmoral Park, on Bennetts Road, Morningside:
 - (i) In accordance with the terms for lease as set out in Attachment B; and
 - (ii) Otherwise on terms and conditions satisfactory to the Divisional Manager, Brisbane Lifestyle and the Chief Legal Counsel, Brisbane City Legal Practice.

NOTED

E PEST SURVEY PROGRAMS UNDER THE LAND PROTECTION (PEST AND STOCK ROUTE MANAGEMENT) ACT 2002
109/800/286/138, 288/140-0

173/2014-15

30. The Divisional Manager, Brisbane Lifestyle, providing the information below.
31. Under the *Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002* (the Act), Council must ensure that declared pest species are managed within its area in accordance with the Act

and the principles of pest management. To carry out this function, Council has prepared, adopted and implemented a pest management plan consistent with pest management principles, strategies and guidelines, and conducts regular pest survey programs.

34. Under a pest survey program, Council officers who are authorised persons under the Act, may enter land to map the distribution of declared pest species, monitor compliance with the Act and take enforcement action where appropriate. As a pest survey program allows an authorised person to enter land without first obtaining the occupier's consent, the Act places strict conditions on how programs are approved, their length and officers' conduct.
35. Programs can run for no more than three months and public notice must be given at least 14 days (but no more than 28 days) before the commencement of the program.
36. A review of the Act determined that approval could be given to a blanket program, covering the duration of the *Brisbane Invasive Species Management Plan 2013-2017* (BISMP). That is, from the end of the current approved pest survey program (7 October 2014) until the review date of the BISMP (30 June 2017).
37. It is proposed that 10 pest survey programs be approved, from November 2014 to June 2017. If approved, they will be rolled out across the city, separated by the required advertising periods. The pest survey programs identified in attachments B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J and K, submitted on file, are based on the inspection of land in all areas of the City to map species distribution, monitor compliance and undertake appropriate enforcement action.
38. The Divisional Manager, Brisbane Lifestyle, provided the following recommendation and the Committee agreed.

39. **RECOMMENDATION**

TO APPROVE PEST SURVEY PROGRAMS UNDER THE *LAND PROTECTION (PEST AND STOCK ROUTE MANAGEMENT) ACT 2002*

Attachment A
Draft Resolution

THAT IT BE RESOLVED

1. As:
 - (a) Council proposes to monitor compliance (including enforcement) with requirements about declared pests under the *Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002* (the Act) and to map their distribution.
 - (b) Under section 241 of the Act, Council may approve a pest survey program under which authorised persons may enter a place to monitor compliance with the Act.
2. Then:
 - (a) Council resolves to approve pest survey programs, described in attachments B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J and K, for the purposes of section 241 of the Act.
 - (b) Council authorises the Divisional Manager, Brisbane Lifestyle to do all the things required of Council under sections 242 and 243 of the Act in respect of the programs.

Attachment B

Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002 Pest Survey Program

Purpose	To map the distribution of declared pest plants under the <i>Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002</i> (the Act) and monitor compliance (including enforcement) with the requirements of the Act about declared pests.
Period	5 November 2014 to 21 December 2014
Criteria for selection of places	Land containing an area of vegetation of sufficient size to support declared pests.
Type of place to be entered and inspected	All vacant land and all improved land parcels with an area greater than 600 square metres.
Area	The City of Brisbane local government area.

Attachment C

Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002 Pest Survey Program

Purpose	To map the distribution of declared pest plants under the <i>Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002</i> (the Act) and monitor compliance (including enforcement) with the requirements of the Act about declared pests.
Period	5 January 2015 to 29 March 2015
Criteria for selection of places	Land containing an area of vegetation of sufficient size to support declared pests.
Type of place to be entered and inspected	All vacant land and all improved land parcels with an area greater than 600 square metres.
Area	The City of Brisbane local government area.

Attachment D

Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002 Pest Survey Program

Purpose	To map the distribution of declared pest plants under the <i>Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002</i> (the Act) and monitor compliance (including enforcement) with the requirements of the Act about declared pests.
Period	13 April 2015 to 12 July 2015

Criteria for selection of places	Land containing an area of vegetation of sufficient size to support declared pests.
Type of place to be entered and inspected	All vacant land and all improved land parcels with an area greater than 600 square metres.
Area	The City of Brisbane local government area.

Attachment E

Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002 Pest Survey Program

Purpose	To map the distribution of declared pest plants under the <i>Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002</i> (the Act) and monitor compliance (including enforcement) with the requirements of the Act about declared pests.
Period	27 July 2015 to 25 October 2015
Criteria for selection of places	Land containing an area of vegetation of sufficient size to support declared pests.
Type of place to be entered and inspected	All vacant land and all improved land parcels with an area greater than 600 square metres.
Area	The City of Brisbane local government area.

Attachment F

Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002 Pest Survey Program

Purpose	To map the distribution of declared pest plants under the <i>Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002</i> (the Act) and monitor compliance (including enforcement) with the requirements of the Act about declared pests.
Period	9 November 2015 to 7 February 2016
Criteria for selection of places	Land containing an area of vegetation of sufficient size to support declared pests.
Type of place to be entered and inspected	All vacant land and all improved land parcels with an area greater than 600 square metres.
Area	The City of Brisbane local government area.

Attachment G

Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002 Pest Survey Program

Purpose	To map the distribution of declared pest
----------------	--

plants under the *Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002* (the Act) and monitor compliance (including enforcement) with the requirements of the Act about declared pests.

Period	22 February 2016 to 22 May 2016
Criteria for selection of places	Land containing an area of vegetation of sufficient size to support declared pests.
Type of place to be entered and inspected	All vacant land and all improved land parcels with an area greater than 600 square metres.
Area	The City of Brisbane local government area.

Attachment H

Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002 Pest Survey Program

Purpose	To map the distribution of declared pest plants under the <i>Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002</i> (the Act) and monitor compliance (including enforcement) with the requirements of the Act about declared pests.
Period	6 June 2016 to 28 August 2016
Criteria for selection of places	Land containing an area of vegetation of sufficient size to support declared pests.
Type of place to be entered and inspected	All vacant land and all improved land parcels with an area greater than 600 square metres.
Area	The City of Brisbane local government area.

Attachment I

Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002 Pest Survey Program

Purpose	To map the distribution of declared pest plants under the <i>Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002</i> (the Act) and monitor compliance (including enforcement) with the requirements of the Act about declared pests.
Period	12 September 2016 to 11 December 2016
Criteria for selection of places	Land containing an area of vegetation of sufficient size to support declared pests.
Type of place to be entered and inspected	All vacant land and all improved land parcels with an area greater than 600 square

metres.

Area The City of Brisbane local government area.

Attachment J

Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002 Pest Survey Program

Purpose To map the distribution of declared pest plants under the *Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002* (the Act) and monitor compliance (including enforcement) with the requirements of the Act about declared pests.

Period **2 January 2017 to 2 April 2017**

Criteria for selection of places Land containing an area of vegetation of sufficient size to support declared pests.

Type of place to be entered and inspected All vacant land and all improved land parcels with an area greater than 600 square metres.

Area The City of Brisbane local government area.

Attachment K

Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002 Pest Survey Program

Purpose To map the distribution of declared pest plants under the *Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002* (the Act) and monitor compliance (including enforcement) with the requirements of the Act about declared pests.

Period **17 April 2017 to 30 June 2017**

Criteria for selection of places Land containing an area of vegetation of sufficient size to support declared pests.

Type of place to be entered and inspected All vacant land and all improved land parcels with an area greater than 600 square metres.

Area The City of Brisbane local government area.

NOTED

F **STORES BOARD SUBMISSION – HOWARD SMITH WHARVES
REVITALISATION PROJECT**
165/210/179/807

174/2014-15

40. The Chief Executive Officer provided the information below.

41. The Chief Executive Officer and the Stores Board considered the following submission,

contained in Attachment A, submitted on file, on 9 October 2014.

Purpose

42. To seek Council approval to enter into a Project Agreement with HSW Nominees Pty Ltd, ACN 166 209 874 (trading as HSW Consortium), for the Howard Smith Wharves Revitalisation Project. The Project Agreement is summarised at section 7.5 and includes the granting of:
- A construction lease for a term of three years commencing after HSW Consortium has obtained development approval for its concept plan; and
 - A base lease and associated precinct leases for a term of 99 years commencing after the completion of construction.

Background/Operational Impact:

44. Council wishes to revitalise the 3.43 hectare Howard Smith Wharves site and has sought development proposals. A developer is being procured to fund, construct, operate and maintain the finished development in return for long-term leasehold rights over the site, at minimal cost to Council. The project is expected to create a vibrant, welcoming and safe public space that delivers economic benefits to Brisbane in a high quality riverside parkland setting.
45. In September 2009, E&C approved a Significant Procurement Activity Plan that outlined the procurement process for the Revitalisation of Howard Smith Wharves. Proposals were received in December 2010. The procurement process was terminated in May 2011 after the January 2011 flood event, which resulted in the floating Riverwalk being washed away. Since this date, market conditions for property development have improved and the New Farm Riverwalk Replacement has been constructed.
46. A further Significant Contracting Plan (SCP) was approved by E&C on 22 July 2013.
47. The process used for the tender was a Public Request for Proposals (RFPs) with provisions permitting negotiations. The closing date for responses was 16 October 2013.
48. Summary of Responses

Name	Address and ABN/ACN	Detailed assessment score (pre-negotiation)	Detailed assessment score following negotiations
Recommended Proposal			
HSW Nominees Pty Ltd (HSW Consortium)	Level 1, 875 Ann Street Fortitude Valley, QLD 4006 ACN 166209874	762	778
Proposals shortlisted but not recommended			
Australian Pacific Investment Corp. (Mantle Group)	c/- Gill McKerron & Associates Level 2, 49 Station Road Indooroopilly QLD 4068 ABN 6613639112	707	731

Walker Group – Option 1*	Governor Macquarie Tower Level 21, 1 Farrer Place Sydney, NSW 2000 ACN 001215069	699	718
Proposals not shortlisted			
Pelicano Group	Not provided	598	Not applicable
Prime Space Projects	Level 3, 150 Grenfell Street Adelaide, SA 5000 ACN 128682520	576	Not applicable
Non-conforming proposals**			
Greencube Constructions	PO Box 5746, West End, QLD 4101 ABN 63143833363	Not applicable	Not applicable
HSW Creative Collaborative	Not provided. Not believed to be incorporated.	Not applicable	Not applicable
HSW Silverstone Developments Consortium (Silverstone)	24 Macquarie Street Teneriffe, QLD 4003 Advised ABN Pending	Not applicable	Not applicable
Property Solutions Group	61 Petrie Terrace Brisbane, QLD 4000 ACN 085075675	Not applicable	Not applicable
Walker Group – Options 2, 3 and 4*	As for Option 1	Not applicable	Not applicable

*The Walker Group proposal included four separate options, three of which were non-conforming.

** Refer to paragraph 54 for details regarding non-conformances.

Evaluation of Responses

49. The evaluation team comprised:

- Principal Project Manager, City Projects Office, Brisbane Infrastructure (Evaluation Team Chair)
- Section Manager, Built and Natural Environment, City Projects Office, Brisbane Infrastructure
- Principal Urban Planner, Urban Renewal Brisbane, City Planning and Sustainability
- Manager, Economic Development, City Planning and Sustainability
- Deputy Director-General, Major Projects Office, Queensland State Government Department of State Development, Infrastructure and Planning
- Specialist advice and assistance was provided to the evaluation team by:
 - LH Property Partners – Feasibility and Net Present Value calculation of shortlisted offers
 - PriceWaterhouseCoopers (PwC) – Transaction Advisory Services: financial

assessment of the shortlisted tenderers.

50. The evaluation criteria were as follows:
- (a) Mandatory/essential criteria: Nil
 - (b) Non-price weighted evaluation criteria
 - (i) Experience, capability and capacity (30 per cent weighting)
 - Demonstrated ability of the tenderer to undertake the management financing, design, construction and operation.
 - Demonstrated ability of the individual tenderer team members to perform the specific roles involved in undertaking the management, financing, design, construction and operation.
 - (ii) Concept Scheme (60 per cent weighting)
 - Distinctiveness of identify and sense of place
 - Commercial attractiveness of development
 - Activation and quality of public spaces
 - Site accessibility of all transport modes
 - Effectiveness of river interface and user activities
 - (iii) Financial benefit (10 per cent weighting)
 - Financial benefit to Council and economic return to Brisbane.
 - (c) Price model:
 - Not applicable. Revenue and other price considerations were factored into the above weighted evaluation criteria.
51. Three addenda were issued before the closing date for proposals and are summarised as follows:
- (a) Addendum 1, issued 12 September 2013, provided a Building Condition Report on the Heritage Sheds.
 - (b) Addendum 2, issued 4 October 2013, provided information on park budget and what constitutes a non-conforming offer.
 - (c) Addendum 3, is issued 6 October 2013, provided high quality photographic images of the proposed parkland to illustrate Council's reference design for the park.

52. The following three proposals were received on the date for submission but after the nominated closing time of 12 noon:
- (a) 12.19pm: HSW Consortium
 - (b) 12.35pm: Silverstone
 - (c) 3.07pm: HSW Creative Collaborative.
- All of the above late proposals were admitted for evaluation following consultation with the appointed probity auditors (BDO (Qld) Pty Ltd) and Council's Chief Legal Counsel. Admission of the late proposals was in accordance with the RFP conditions and Council's procedures.

Conformity Required

53. Tenderers were required to comply with the RFP conditions and provide all information requested by the RFP. In addition, Addendum 2, issued 4 October 2013, included that:
- 'There are two requirements stated in the Information Memorandum (in sections on Site Ownership and New Development Opportunities) that must be complied with to be a Conforming Offer. These are:*
- 1. *Any new buildings will have ground level coverage of less than 10 per cent of the total site area.*
 - 2. *No permanent residential development is permitted on site.*

Non-conforming proposals received

54. Five non-conforming proposals were received as follows:
- (i) The Greencube Constructions proposal did not propose any development on the site. Instead the proposal was made up of 21 apartment studios in the Brisbane River adjacent to Howard Smith Wharves. The proposal was non-conforming because it did not meet the scope requirement of providing a commercially attractive development on the Howard Smith Wharves site.
 - (ii) The HSW Creative Collaborative proposal did not include any plans of the proposed development and accordingly did not meet the requirements of the RFP. The tenderer acknowledged that their proposal did not comply with the RFP requirements.
 - (iii) The Silverstone proposal included 100 apartments with the hotel development. This did not conform with the requirement for no permanent residential development on the site.
 - (iv) The Property Solutions Group proposal included a building footprint of 5,700 square metres for the development which exceeded the allowable ground level coverage of 10 per cent of the site (approximately 3432 square metres).
 - (v) The Walker Group (Options 2, 3 and 4) all exceeded the allowable ground level coverage of 10 per cent of the site. Additionally, Option 4 included residential development which did not conform to the RFP requirements.

Summarise any modification/clarification of tenders undertaken

55. A number of clarifications were requested in relation to the proposals. The clarification information was received to the satisfaction of the evaluation team. No significant changes to the RFP scope were undertaken and therefore no formal modification of proposals was required.

Initial Evaluation

56. The initial evaluation involved a compliance assessment. For the reasons noted in paragraph 54, the following proposals were considered to be non-conforming and did not progress to the detailed assessment stage:
- Greencube Constructions
 - HSW Creative Collaborative
 - Silverstone
 - Property Solutions Group
 - Walker Group (Options 2, 3 and 4)

Short listing and additional stages

57. During the second stage of the evaluation, a detailed assessment against the criteria was undertaken. A summary of the scoring is provided at the Summary of Responses above. Following the detailed assessment, three Proposals were shortlisted for negotiation. Following the negotiations further assessment and scoring was undertaken. Additional negotiations with the highest scoring tenderer were also conducted.

- (a) Shortlisting for negotiations
 - (i) Shortlisted tenderers:
 - HSW Consortium, Mantle Group and Walker Group (Option 1) were shortlisted for further evaluation and negotiation based on their higher weighted evaluation scores achieved during the detailed assessment.
 - (ii) Pellicano Group was not shortlisted.
 - Pellicano Group was not shortlisted for negotiations due to its lower score against the weighted criteria. The central feature of this

submission was a futuristic 199 room hotel. This was complemented by a large building under the Story Bridge that provided significant car parking in addition to office and retail space. The parking is not ancillary to the adjacent uses and it was considered that provision of such a large car park is not consistent with the objective of creating a vibrant riverside recreational precinct comprising a mix of leisure orientated and commercial uses. This proposal did not score as highly as the shortlisted proposals for the commercial attractiveness of development and activation and quality of public spaces.

(iii) Prime Space Projects was not shortlisted

- Prime Space Projects was not shortlisted for negotiations due to its lower score against the weighted criteria. The submission included a hotel in the central part of the site, with an office building adjacent to the Story Bridge and restaurants within the heritage listed sheds. Although the hotel only provided 143 rooms, it appeared to dominate the site. This, in addition to less effective interface with the river than the shortlisted proposals, resulted in this submission receiving a lower score.

(b) Revisions to scoring following negotiations:

Following the negotiations further assessment and scoring was undertaken.

(i) HSW Consortium

The score for the HSW Consortium increased from 762 to 778. This increase in score was primarily attributable to a slight improvement in their financial offer and better activation of the public spaces through the inclusion of a second lift to the top of the cliffs.

(ii) Mantle Group

The score for the Mantle Group increased from 707 to 731. This increase in score was primarily attributable to changing the public car parking from the hotel podium to a single level basement. This increased the amount of car parking on the site and resulted in higher scores for the commercial attractiveness of the development and site accessibility.

(iii) Walker Group – Option 1

The score for the Walker Group (Option 1) increased from 699 to 718. This increase in score was primarily attributable to an improved financial offer to Council. In addition, the Walker Group altered the proposed use of the building under the Story Bridge from hotel to commercial. This change created a larger public plaza under the Story Bridge which resulted in a higher score for “Activation and quality of public spaces”

(c) Additional negotiations with HSW Consortium:

At the completion of the revised scoring, the HSW Consortium was the highest scoring tenderer against the weighted evaluation criteria. Additional negotiations were undertaken with the HSW Consortium to finalise the draft Project Agreement and improve the value for money outcomes to Council.

Objectivity and Probity:

58. Complaints were dealt with to the satisfaction of the probity auditors. BDO (Qld) Pty Ltd (BDO) were engaged as probity auditors for the RFP process. Reports have been received from BDO confirming that a fair and equitable process was followed in accordance with the documentation, and the evaluation process was carried out in accordance with the established criteria.

Recommended Tenderer (Most advantageous outcome for Council)

59. The most advantageous recommended tenderer is HSW Consortium. Of the three shortlisted proposals, HSW Consortium had the highest score for their concept design, had the second highest score for financial benefit and was ranked equal second for their experience, capability and capacity. It is noted that the overall score included a 60 per cent weighting for the concept design. The major reasons why the HSW Consortium achieved the highest score for their concept design are:
- The design included a covered event space which would activate the site yet not be closed off to the public when events were not being held;
 - The event space was low level compared to other proposals which resulted in more of the cliffs being visible from the river;
 - The hotel was smaller than other proposals and the façade design blended the hotel into the cliffs;
 - HSW Consortium's proposal to Build, Own and Operate including maintenance obligations within the park and other public areas, was viewed more favourably than proposals that sold on the development and obliged Council to maintain the park and other public areas;
 - The extent of development is significantly less than proposed in the other shortlisted proposals which would be more acceptable to the community but also consistent with heritage principles; and
 - The public spaces would be activated by events and were more extensive than shown on other shortlisted proposals.

Environmental sustainability, Quality Assurance, Access and Equity, Zero Harm and Support for Locally Produced and Australian Products:

60. HSW Consortium is an Australian owned entity. The Project Agreement obliges the HSW Consortium to:
- Comply with directions from Council or the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection (DEHP) with regard to odour or other nuisance;
 - Implement strategies for environmentally sustainable development; and
 - Comply with all laws and other requirements of the Project Agreement for work health and safety.
61. The HSW Consortium has sold the hotel development rights to Asian Pacific Group Pty Ltd, ACN 147 287 769 (Asian Pacific Group), an Australian business based in Melbourne.
62. Council's involvement in regular development coordination group meetings will help to ensure that the HSW Consortium fulfils its obligations in relation to environmental sustainability and zero harm. As the project will be largely developed and funded by the private sector, Council's policy regarding a 10 per cent training component for Council construction contracts is not considered applicable.
63. The risks associated with this contract (including mitigation strategies) are set out in the below table.

Procurement Risk	Risk Rating	Risk Mitigation Strategy	Risk Allocation
<i>Planning and design phase</i>			
Community objections to the approved design causing delay or the HSW Consortium (the "developer") to abandon their offer	Medium	Communicate how the approved developer's design is consistent with the Local Plan and Council's previous commitments regarding development on the site	Council and developer
Approved developer's design does not meet the approval of	Medium-High	Project Agreement allocates this risk to the developer	Council and

Procurement Risk	Risk Rating	Risk Mitigation Strategy	Risk Allocation
DEHP, and a Development Application (DA) is not approved		Engage with DEHP to review developer's scheme	developer
Further sale of the rights for the development of the hotel	Low	Project Agreement prohibits sale without Council approval Note: In the event of hotelier insolvency, financiers will have sale rights. Removal of these rights would negatively impact the hotelier's ability to obtain finance for the project	Council
Sale of the development rights for the retail precinct	Low	Project Agreement prohibits sale without Council approval Note: In the event of developer insolvency, financiers will have sale rights. Removal of these rights would negatively impact the developer's ability to obtain finance for the project	Council
Construction phase (3 year lease term)			
Construction causes disruption to business, pedestrian and vehicular traffic	Medium-High	Manage risk via DA approval and the conditions of the construction lease.	Council
Costs for cliff stabilisation, possible contamination remediation and rectification of heritage buildings is greater than estimated by the developer, resulting in their development no longer being viable	Medium	Developer to review feasibility periodically Project Agreement allocates this risk to the developer	Council and developer
Contractor insolvency	Medium	Rate of return is considered to be consistent with industry standards and is suitable for obtaining funding for the project Project Agreement requires: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A company charge in Council's favour over all the assets and undertakings of the HSW Consortium. Initially this will be a first ranking charge. Council would cede priority to the senior financier - A side deed with the builder allowing Council (or a party nominated by Council) to step in as principal under the building contract to complete the works - Bank guarantee in amount of \$800,000 to be provided by the developer as security Note: In the event of developer insolvency, financiers will have sale rights. Removal of these rights would negatively impact the developer's ability to obtain finance for the project	Council and developer
Public space improvements do not meet expectations (in terms of the money spent or the quality)	Medium	The developer has a vested interest in ensuring a high quality outcome as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the quality of the outcome will impact 	Council and developer

Procurement Risk	Risk Rating	Risk Mitigation Strategy	Risk Allocation
achieved) due to insufficiency of specification		<p>the rental yield; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the developer is responsible for maintenance obligations for the 99 year lease term <p>Project Agreement specifies scope of public space improvements to be delivered and minimum spend on works (including the spend calculation)</p> <p>Project Agreement requires Council review of design (prior to DA lodgement) to ensure that it complies with the Project Agreement</p> <p>DA approval of concept design including adherence to legislative requirements and Council standards for design and construction</p>	
Operation and maintenance phase (for the 99 year lease term)			
Insufficient maintenance by developer resulting in lower quality public spaces	Medium	Maintenance obligations to be incorporated in the lease documents	Council
Revenue from hotel and retail precinct lower than expected resulting in low/no revenue to Council	Medium	<p>Project Agreement provides for a base rent at 30 per cent of the projected turnover rent</p> <p>HSW Consortium's commercial model evaluated and considered to be satisfactory</p> <p>Contingent sale of the hotel development rights to separate assets (see section 7.3 below)</p>	
Flood impacts resulting in risks to the public and/or reduced public use and reduced revenue for the developer and Council	Medium	<p>The Project Agreement requires the developer to consider potential flood impacts in design, construction and subsequent completion of the works</p> <p>Project Agreement requires developer to hold minimum levels of insurance.</p>	Developer

Summary of the Recommended Proposal and Transaction

64. Under the terms of the Project Agreement, the developer is to develop the site in accordance with the agreed master plan and will bear the cost of the planning, design, construction and maintenance for the lease term, including the cost of cliff stabilisation works west of the Story Bridge. The development delivered by the HSW Consortium will include:
 - a dining, retail and tourism centre utilising the existing heritage listed buildings
 - 120 room 5 star boutique hotel
 - 331 space underground car park
 - new public open spaces that may be used for markets and festivals
 - a parkland that incorporates two lifts linking the site to the top of the cliffs
 - a 1500m2 covered event and exhibition space
65. The Project Agreement allows for changes to the scope of the development, however Council consent for changes will be required. It is expected that any changes would relate to car parking and hotel room numbers and in no circumstances would a reduction in park and public open space be permitted.

66. The financial offer from the HSW Consortium is as follows:
- (a) The HSW Consortium proposes to spend at least \$13.31 million on building public space improvements within the Howard Smith Wharves site. Under the proposal, Council will make a \$4 million contribution to these works, resulting in a total spend of at least \$17.31 million on public space improvements at the site.
 - (b) The developer will maintain (at its cost) all of the public space improvements throughout the 99-year lease period. The estimated annual maintenance costs to the developer are \$1 million per annum, escalating at an anticipated rate of 3 per cent per annum. In addition, the developer will be required to pay rates for the hotel, car park, retail precinct and the event pavilion once these developments are operational.
 - (c) The developer will provide rent for the long term lease of the site, excluding the hotel precinct. The rent applied will be the greater of a turnover rent and a base rent for each year of the lease. The turnover rent and base rent are as follows:
 - (i) The turnover rent is a percentage of the turnover for the retail lease of the heritage listed sheds, the car parking and the exhibition space. The percentage of turnover rent increases over the first 10 years of operation such that the rent from year nine to year 99 is 4 per cent of the turnover.
 - (ii) The base rent is equivalent to 30 per cent of the projected turnover rent and is thus only applicable if the turnover is less than 30 per cent of that projected for that year of the lease.

Key considerations

67. Negotiation regarding the level/value of public space improvements and Council rates has been protracted. Details of these considerations and other conditions precedent are as follows:
- (a) Public space improvements

The scope of park and public space improvements will be further refined prior to development application (DA) approval being sought, however, they will include the following elements:

 - (i) refurbishment of existing air-raid shelters
 - (ii) pedestrian and shared paths throughout the site
 - (iii) turfing and other soft landscaping
 - (iv) a kayak ramp
 - (v) public amenities
 - (vi) public space furniture such as bollards, bins, seating and cycle racks;
 - (vii) two lifts and one set of stairs to the top of the cliffs
 - (viii) public board walk structure adjacent to the river

The above elements were considered appropriate for the site. Selection of the final park and public space improvements will be determined by the developer subject to:

- Minimum spend of \$13.31 million by the developer on these improvements;
- Review by Council officers to ensure consistency with the master plan proposed by the developer; and
- Assessment during the DA process.

Site servicing (such as stormwater, water, sewer, electrical services, and telecommunications) required for the commercial development, the park and public spaces has been estimated by the developer to be \$2.6 million. The final cost is to be apportioned between the commercial development, the park and public spaces. The apportionment will be determined by a Quantity Surveyor, when the design and specifications of the trunk and other service infrastructure are available. The apportionment will consider the relative use and benefit derived by the Precincts from

the infrastructure having regard to uses, demand and nature of the infrastructure. The park and public space proportion of the site servicing cost will be paid from the \$17.31 million allocated to public space improvements.

- (b) Council rates
Once the long-term leases become operational, the developer will be required to pay Council rates on the Retail Precinct Lease, the Car Park Precinct Lease and the Hotel Precinct Lease.
- (c) Use of Parklands Precinct
The parkland and public space will be leased to the developer who will be responsible for maintaining these areas. The conditions of the lease have been drafted as such that these areas will be generally open and accessible for use by the public. There will be periodic events, functions and other activities carried out in the parkland and public spaces to activate the site; however Council can require proposed events to be cancelled if it considers that the proposed activities will result in the parkland and public spaces not being available to the public.
- (d) Conditions precedent to the Project Agreement
The Project Agreement contains a number of conditions precedent which must be satisfied to enable the Project Agreement to continue. These conditions precedent are as follows:
 - (i) DA approval - The proponent is obliged to lodge a DA within eight months and then has a further 18 months to obtain DA approval.
 - (ii) The parties agreeing on the terms of the four separate leases for the retail, park, hotel and car park precincts. These separate leases must be created within two weeks of the signing of the Project Agreement but will be based on agreed principles stated in the Consolidated Form of Lease that is included in the Project Agreement.
 - (iii) Similarly the Building Management Plan must be changed to match the four leases.
 - (iv) Resolution of the wet leases with Department of Natural Resources and Mines (DNRM). A meeting has been held with DNRM and the developer to discuss the wet leases. The principles agreed at the meeting were acceptable to all parties but these principles have yet to be formalised, to enable Council to sublet these areas to HSW Consortium.
 - (v) The parties being satisfied with the proposed reconfiguration of the land, noting that plans must be drawn up to exclude the Story Bridge and an access strip near Boundary Road from the land that will be leased.

Contingent sale of the hotel development rights:

- 68. During the negotiation with the HSW Consortium, the parties identified an opportunity to decrease risks to Council and the HSW Consortium by selling the development rights for the hotel to a third party. The HSW Consortium has engaged Asian Pacific Group as the buyer for the hotel development rights. The sale is contingent on Council and the HSW Consortium entering into the Project Agreement. The sale of the hotel development separates the commercial viability of the hotel from the retail precinct to be developed and maintained by the HSW Consortium. This offers greater certainty that the entire site, including the hotel, will be developed.

Project Agreement

- 69. The documents that form the Project Agreement are as follows:
 - (a) Project Agreement – this document sets out the rights and obligations of both the

developer and Council which include Council agreeing to granting leases for the Howard Smith Wharves site, in return for the developer agreeing to procure the carrying out and completion of the project works. Appended to this document will be other documents such as a Council security deed, a finance deed, and the scope of works for public space infrastructure works.

- (b) A Construction Lease – this has a term of three years which commences after HSW Consortium has obtained development approval for its concept plan.
- (c) Base Precinct Lease - this includes the rent to Council for the 99 year lease. It is noted that this is a base lease and further leases will be developed for each precinct on the same terms as provided in the base lease. The base lease and associated precinct leases will commence after the completion of construction.
- (d) Building Management Statement (BMS) – this document incorporates all of the rights and obligations of the lessee of each separate leased precinct and how these are managed and regulated as one site.
- (e) Precinct Plan – this shows details of boundaries of the long term leases and the proposed location of easements.
- (f) Easements – these are for drainage and the thoroughfare through the site to Riverwalk.

Execution of Project Agreement

- 70. The Project Agreement has been prepared, including the conditions present summarised above. HSW Consortium is expected to sign the Project Agreement to formalise its offer to Council on 10 October 2014. The Project Agreement will then be ready for execution by Council, should this post market submission be approved.

Estimated Expenditure

- 71. Under the Project Agreement, Council will be required to provide a \$4 million contribution to the development once HSW Consortium has spent \$13.31 million on public space improvements. This funding is not expected to be required until 2016-17. In addition, approximately \$500,000 will be required for project management, legal fees and independent certification in relation to the developer's progress and obligations.

Budget to meet the total spend

- 72. Budget line item:
 Program: Program 2 – Moving Brisbane
 Service: 2.3.2.2 Howard Smith Wharves

Financial Year	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Capital	1,873,670	200,184	2,803,415
Expenses	-	-	-
Revenue	-	-	-

- 73. Although there is sufficient budget to fund the \$4 million Council contribution towards the public space improvements, the timing of the contribution may result in either a bring forward or carry-over of the budget for a particular year. The \$4 million contribution is made in the 2016-17 budget.

Savings/revenue

- 74. Revenue to Council from the retail precinct has been estimated at \$4.767 million for the first 10 years of operation noting that no revenue will be received for the first two years of

operation. Over the 99-year lease period, the forecast total revenue to Council from the retail precinct is \$528 million.

75. The Chief Executive Officer therefore provides the following recommendation and the Committee agrees.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council approves:

- Entering into a Project Agreement with HSW Nominees Pty Ltd, ACN 166 209 874 (trading as HSW Consortium), for the Howard Smith Wharves Revitalisation Project. The Project Agreement includes the granting of:
 - A construction lease for a term of three years, commencing after HSW Consortium has obtained development approval for their proposed concept plan; and
 - A base lease and associated precinct leases for a term of 99 years, commencing after the completion of construction.
- That the terms of the Project Agreement will be to the satisfaction of the Chief Legal Counsel, Brisbane City Legal Practice.
- That the Executive Manager, City Projects Office, Brisbane Infrastructure, is empowered to sign and manage the Project Agreement on Council's behalf.

NOTED

G APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE BCC COUNCILLOR CONDUCT REVIEW PANEL MEMBERSHIP POOL
137/225/137/220

175/2014-15

76. The Chief Executive Officer provided the following information.
77. Council adopted a pool of BCC Councillor Conduct Review Panel (CCRP) members on 11 September 2012 for a term expiring six months after the quadrennial election in 2016.
78. The *City of Brisbane Act 2010* (CoBA) requires that a CCRP formed to review a complaint must be constituted by at least three members chosen from the pool of members, and that the pool of members must be appointed by resolution of Council. Attachment B, here below, contains the criteria applicants must meet in order to become a member of a CCRP.
79. There are only four members remaining in Council's remaining in Council's current pool of members making it sometimes difficult to form a panel. Accordingly additional members should be appointed.
80. An expression of interest for membership of the CCRP was advertised in The Courier Mail on Saturday, 28 June 2014, Attachment B, as submitted on file.
81. As a result, the following people are recommended to be added to the CCRP membership pool for a term of appointment up until six months after the quadrennial election in 2016:
- Mr David Gill
 - Mr John Hocknull
 - Ms Gayle Yates
82. Copies of resumes are submitted on file, Attachment C.

Customer Impact

83. The appointment of new CCRP members will provide a wider pool of possible candidates for the CCRP to provide open, fair and transparent accountability measures. This will ensure objective and impartial reviews of complaints about the conduct of Councillors.
84. The Chief Executive Officer provided the following information and the Committee agreed.
85. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT COUNCIL RESOLVE IN ACCORDANCE WITH ATTACHMENT A.

Attachment A
Draft Resolution

TO PROPOSE TO APPOINT MEMBERS FOR THE COUNCILLOR CODE OF CONDUCT REVIEW PANEL MEMBERSHIP POOL

THAT IT BE RESOLVED

As

- (1) The City of Brisbane Act 2010 (COBA) requires that a BCC Conduct Review Panel (CCRP) formed to review a complaint must be constituted by at least three members chosen from the pool of members, and that pool must be appointed by resolution of Council.
- (2) COBA sets out the criteria applicants must meet in order to become a member of the CCRP.

Then

- (3) Determines that the following persons are suitably qualified, and that they be appointed to the CCRP membership pool for a term expiring six months after the quadrennial election in 2016:
 - a) Mr David Gill
 - b) Mr John Hocknull
 - c) Ms Gayle Yates

Attachment B

Criteria to be a member of a Councillor Conduct Review Panel

Section 187 of the *City of Brisbane Act 2010* states (in part):

- (2) A person is qualified to be a member of the pool of members only if the person—
 - (a) has extensive knowledge of, and experience in, 1 or more of the following—
 - (i) local government;
 - (ii) community affairs;
 - (iii) investigations;
 - (iv) law;
 - (v) public administration;
 - (vi) public sector ethics;
 - (v) public finance; or
 - (b) has the other qualifications and experience that the council considers appropriate.
- (3) However, a person is not qualified to be a member of the pool of members if the

person—

- (a) is a councillor of a local government; or
- (b) is a nominee for election as a councillor; or
- (c) accepts an appointment as a councillor; or
- (d) is an employee of the council; or
- (e) is a contractor of the council; or
- (f) is a consultant engaged by the council; or
- (g) is a member of an Australian Parliament; or
- (h) is a nominee for election as a member of an Australian Parliament; or
- (i) is a member of a political party; or
- (j) has a conviction for an indictable offence that is not an expired conviction; or
- (k) is an insolvent under administration (within the meaning of the Corporations Act, section 9); or
- (l) is a type of person prescribed under a regulation.

NB: No person is currently prescribed under a regulation pursuant to s187(3)(l).

NOTED

NOTATION OF *DECISIONS* OF THE ESTABLISHMENT AND COORDINATION COMMITTEE AS DELEGATE OF THE COUNCIL:

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Councillor Amanda COOPER, Chairman of the Neighbourhood Planning and Development Assessment Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Vicki HOWARD, that the report setting out the *decisions* of the Establishment and Coordination Committee as delegate of the Council during the Spring Recess 2014, on matters usually considered by the Neighbourhood Planning and Development Assessment Committee, be noted.

Chairman:

Is there any debate?

Councillor COOPER:

Thank you very much, Madam Chair, and I'll get my skates on. We have eight petitions that have come through in the recess. The first one is for Latrobe Terrace. This is a development application lodged with Council for the corner of Latrobe and Given Terraces at Paddington. It was lodged in August 2013, for 48 units short-term accommodation, indoor sport and rec. Council issued an information request to the applicants soon afterwards on 27 September. The applicant responded to Council's information request and reduced the number of units to 45 as well as making changes to the design.

It has gone out there for public notification with 91 formal submissions, 19 in support, and 72 against. I actually met with two of the submitters to listen to their feedback on the application so thank you to them for coming in to discuss the matter with me. It is still under assessment with officers and I understand the applicant is working through the submissions to understand and review the application in line with that, the feedback.

Item B, this is a petition with 16 signatures requesting what was called demolition control precinct under City Plan 2000 be extended to this area of Gaythorne. As we would all recall under City Plan 2014 we were not allowed to use the name anymore and DCPs are now traditional building character areas. So this was reviewed as part of the Mitchelton centre Neighbourhood Plan and the number of properties included in the then DCPs was actually increased as part of the planning and consultation, including Bellview Avenue where some of these petitioners reside. So there is existing protection in place in Duke Street and Birkin Street also retained so that is the result of that particular one.

For C, there was a recent article, I note, where Victoria was actually laying claim to being the first ever special entertainment precinct to deal with noise. Not so, Madam Chair. This clearly is outlined in the petition that Council actually on 1 July 2006 created the first designated special entertainment precinct in Fortitude Valley.

So this precinct has got very clear requirements to the development industry to ensure that the entertainment industry and in particular the music component can be maintained. I note Councillor HOWARD is very much clear on how this precinct works and that all who come to the area should understand what is required of them, the buffers particularly ensure that everyone enjoys the vibrancy of the Valley.

So the response outlines very clearly that the buffer is established as set out as a transition from the core to existing residential areas and has a very important role as a result of that. So the issues raised generally fall under the Queensland Government and Council will be responding back to the head petitioner with advice of how to lodge a complaint with the Office of Liquor and Gaming regulation.

Item D, one for Councillor SCHRINNER, where the Sporting Shooters Association lodged a petition seeking that the Belmont shooting complex, which has been in existence since 1916, put in place a special precinct to deal with noise issues and they sought to have a neighbourhood plan.

So in particular we looked at the issues that they were concerned about and of course we feel that they are a very important part of the local community and we feel that perhaps their application to write a neighbourhood plan to deal with some of these issues was probably not the best way forward. Council officers have already engaged with them and will continue to meet with them to look at how we might be able to address their needs.

Item E, this is 48 Government Road, Richlands. This is the site of the former bus depot. There has been an application to create two allotments on the site. That was approved on 22 November last year. Following that, there has been an application for a preliminary approval lodged on February this year. Officers sent an information request on 19 March and the applicant responded on 30 July.

So it has gone out for public notification. It was an impact assessable application and no submissions were received, either informal or formal.

Clause F, this was for Englefield Road, Oxley. So this was an application lodged with Council on 16 June this year and lodged under the Superseded Planning Scheme. It is from material change. It used to go from extracted industry to low medium density. It proposes .4 hectares for road widening, a park dedication of over 3 hectares with a 6.11 hectares of residential. So officers have issued an information request on 19 August seeking further information on issues such as density, how the residential and industrial would work and how long the long term viability of the onsite ecology would be protected.

So the application is currently as they are under the Sustainable Planning Act allowed six months to respond to that. Once that comes into Council they will then go out for formal notification for 30 business days. So that is ongoing. How am I going, Madam Chair? I am rushing.

This was one for Chapman Place, Oxley. This was lodged with Council on 29 June and is proposing to subdivide one lot into 10. It is zoned environmental protection and low density residential under City Plan 2000 and under the new City Plan it is low density residential and environmental management. It triggered the highest level of assessment so it is an impact assessable application and Council has sent an information request on 8 August seeking further information about lot size, drainage, onsite ecology, tree protection,

detailed rehabilitation plan, stormwater management plan and how bushfire risk would be mitigated.

This, of course, is in line with Council's requirements. I am really trying to rush.

Chairman: You have plenty of time, Councillor COOPER.

Councillor COOPER: Thank you, Madam Chair, I appreciate that.

So in terms of this particular application, Council cannot refuse to assess an application. This is a right that is established under the Sustainable Planning Act and I would expect all Councillors would be well aware of that. So Council officers will be looking at this matter once the applicant has responded.

There is also a referral to the state agency so there will be a formal notification period of 15 business days once that has been addressed. But they of course have until February of next year to respond to the information request.

Clause H. I made it, Madam Chair. This is a petition requesting properties in, I think it is Travill Street—I am getting the nod from the local councillor—Newmarket be included in what was called the Grange District Local Plan Precinct at 3.7. This street is zoned under City Plan 2000 low medium density and is in a demolition control precinct.

So the existing zoning and level of protection has not changed in City Plan 2014. That zoning remains the same as has been the case since City Plan 2000 came into effect many years ago. So the homes in the street are now protected under what is called the traditional building character zone so that has been reflected in both the traditional character building code and traditional character building overlay.

So Council is exceptionally clear and upfront to both residents in any potential investors as to its expectations for this particular area. In fact, in the information provided, you can see very clearly that if there was any development that was to occur, it had to be in line with the low medium designation and must be integrated with the traditional character of the street. So a very specific requirement there.

So I thank those residents for their comments and I thank the local Councillor who is very clearly on the record as supporting them. Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

Chairman: Further debate? Councillor DICK.

Serialim - Clauses C, D and H

Councillor Milton DICK requested that Clause C, PETITION - REQUESTING THAT ROBERTSON STREET, FORTITUDE VALLEY, BE REMOVED FROM THE SPECIAL ENTERTAINMENT PRECINCT BUFFER AREA, AND FOR ANY LICENSED PREMISES TO BE REQUIRED TO FINISH THEIR ACTIVITIES AT A REASONABLE HOUR IN ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE EXTENT OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT IN ROBERTSON STREET AND SURROUNDS, Clause D, PETITION – REQUESTING THE PREPARATION OF A NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN TO PROTECT THE ONGOING OPERATIONS OF THE BELMONT SHOOTING COMPLEX, and Clause H, PETITION – REQUEST TO AMEND THE GRANGE DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN IN THE <i>BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2000</i> , be taken serialim <i>en bloc</i> for voting purposes.
--

Councillor DICK: Thank you, Madam Chair. Labor councillors will not be supporting a number of items today because once again, and sadly, we are seeing eight petitions that were done in the recess and tonight we are only noting the decisions. We do not actually get a chance to vote on these. I would remind, through you, Councillor COOPER, that residents spend a lot of time signing petitions, they spend a lot of time going door to door, getting support from their communities and—

Chairman: Sorry, Councillor DICK, just a moment. Which of these items are you speaking on?

Councillor DICK:

All of them.

Chairman:

Okay.

Councillor DICK:

So that it is disappointing that we do not get the chance as a Council and as elected representatives to actually vote on these decisions. We are only noting them tonight because all of these decisions were done in secret.

On items particularly that I am concerned about tonight, items E, F and G. Now, I spoke some time ago in the Chamber when I presented those petitions to the Council about the huge amount of concern from local residents. They are deeply, deeply concerned about the potential development on those three sites at Richlands and two at Oxley and they are particularly worried about the amenity and impacts on their local streets, particularly the one at Chapman Place, which is land on a very steep decline that has significant overflow issues and to a number of residents, and I am speaking on their behalf tonight, who are gravely concerned about the environmental impacts if we were to see significant development on that site.

As I said in my earlier remarks, I attended a public meeting where the concern and the anger was palpable. Residents are deeply concerned that this Council would be even considering development on that site, equally so on Englefield Road. The big feedback that I want to place on record tonight is whilst residents understand the need for expansion and residential houses being developed, they are also concerned about it being too close, the proximity, of future industry which would be literally hundreds of metres from future houses there as well.

So they are concerned about traffic which would, as a result of this development, be forced on to Englefield Road. They are worried about the impacts on existing parkland there, particularly Rikki Bailey Park, and they are also worried about what that is going to mean for the future pressures of getting in and out of the suburb as well.

When the neighbourhood plan was delivered for Darra-Oxley, Madam Chair, I opposed the neighbourhood plan, as it did many residents, precisely because of the conflicts that we will see between development and industry and how this Council was not taking those issues seriously. Sadly we are seeing this development application as a result and a potential conflict with residential being so closely located to future industry.

The development at Government Road, Richlands, which is the old bus depot, this was an application put in by Council to Council. So I want to be clear on that. Council has owned that land and we are looking at potentially seeing five storey developments on that site. So the residents who live off Rudyard Street throughout Forest Lake and surrounding streets are very concerned at the size and scale of development on that site as well.

So I will not be supporting those recommendations tonight. Residents have made it very clear to me how strongly they feel about those developments. There are a number of residents which are actively campaigning against these developments and I pledge tonight that I will continue to work shoulder to shoulder with them.

Just in conclusion on item A, which is the petition to request the refusal of the application for a mixed use development at 2 Latrobe Terrace, Madam Chair, I have been contacted by a number of residents there and I have attended a meeting of residents there who are concerned about the bulk and size of this development and those who are particularly worried about shadowing impacts and also parking.

In and round the Paddington precinct there is huge issues, and I think always has been huge issues, around parking. Residents want to make sure that the end development on that site fits in within the character of that existing suburb but also some of those amenity impacts of shadowing and making sure that we are getting the best possible result of development on that site and that we will not

see further complications with additional parking problems throughout those streets.

It is a busy precinct, it is a busy commercial area and I have been told a number of stories from businesses and residents about how parking is just getting beyond ridiculous in and around that area. The residents who have signed that petition in good faith tonight are also deeply, deeply concerned as a result of the application.

So I am confident that there will be a suitable outcome there that will address those concerns. The residents who paid tribute tonight have been campaigning long and hard. They know that they have got a fight on their hands but I will certainly be doing everything that I can to support them.

Item B is requesting identification protection of traditional housing character and heritage in the Gaythorne area and suburbs. Labor Councillors do not believe that the Council is adequately addressing their concerns. As I said before, we will be supporting Items C and D, yes, and I do acknowledge that Brisbane was the first area with an entertainment precinct buffer area and I know that was a lot of the hard of former local councillor, David Hinchliffe, who worked closely with residents and some of the commercial operators there to get that established and we need to make sure that from time to time we are listening to residents and their concerns and item D was the petition requesting the preparation of the neighbourhood plan to protect the ongoing operation of the Belmont shooting complex which Labor Councillors also support.

Chairman:

Further debate? Councillor MATIC.

Councillor MATIC:

Thank you, Madam Chairman. I rise to speak in respect of item A which is the petition for the mixed use development of 2 Latrobe Terrace, Paddington.

Madam Chairman, obviously within this e-petition, as Councillor COOPER was saying, there are 386 signatures. Madam Chairman, as a local Councillor and going out and talking to local residents about this issue, dealing with the emails, dealing with the correspondence, talking to the representatives of various groups that have now formed in opposition, there are far more than 386 concerned residents about this development, Madam Chairman.

It would be the suburb of Paddington that is genuinely concerned about this development and what it proposes to change what is fundamentally the character of Latrobe and Gibbon Terrace.

Madam Chairman, it has an interesting history, this building, owned by the union. In a cooperative sense, there are different factions within the union that have a role here. They have been up there for a very long time, since the 1960s, and so this corner has played various roles through the union itself, though its affiliation with the Australian Labor Party in its role that it has played.

It has also, Madam Chairman, unfortunately, despite the long history that it has had in the local community, chosen to unfortunately disregard the concerns of local residents around what they are proposing in this development. Unfortunately throughout that process, the consultation that they undertook has not been as effective or as widespread as initially proposed.

So when the application went up, Madam Chairman, it was a complete surprise to a lot of local residents and hence the move towards presenting a petition. Of course, there were also a number of submitters in this process and through my own conversations with them and assisting them through that process, there have been 72 submitters opposing this application as well, all of them making well thought out, well-constructed submissions in respect of the height and density.

The key, Madam Chairman, in considering what is going on with this application is not that residents are opposed to a development occurring at this site. In fact, they embrace and look forward to the continual, if you like, evolution of Latrobe and Gibbon Terrace to meet the needs of a growing

community. There are more and more families moving into the area. The Terrace is becoming more and more cosmopolitan and the amount of different restaurants, cafes, fashion, businesses, that are continually evolving and growing within the precinct and so there is a growing demand.

But what residents are asking for, Madam Chairman, is that there is empathy for the local community, there is empathy for the local plan in that it should be properly reflected in the development that is proposed by the union. There are a significant number of units that are proposed for this site. It is not the retail or commercial aspects of the businesses proposed within the plan that are of concern but more about the density of the units. It is the height, Madam Chairman. It sits on the peak of the Latrobe and Gibbon Terrace precinct and so there are substantial and significant views to be enjoyed.

Unfortunately the co-op has decided to maximise that by creating what effectively is five storeys from the front and because of the drop off at the back and the car park at the rear, it becomes another two storeys and so it is seven storeys at the rear which provides no relief whatsoever to the existing tin and timber homes that are at the back of the property. Of course, Madam Chairman, the shadowing and the impacts of that are quite significant for those residents that are adjoining the development at the rear.

Also the parking is a significant issue and one of the keys for me, as the local Councillor, Madam Chairman, is that whatever developments are proposed within the Terrace that there has to be more than enough off street parking to accommodate whatever is proposed, whether it be retail, whether it be commercial, Madam Chairman, as well because there is physically no more parking available on the Terrace or off the adjoining streets, Madam Chairman, as well.

It is limited. There is a growing number of families moving in and so there is a significant number of vehicle increases. But importantly also, Madam Chairman, with the growing number of different businesses, there are a lot of people visiting the Terrace and so that parking becomes a premium. So if business are going to attract visitors and tenants to their precinct, to their development, then there has to be an adequate and generous, Madam Chairman, approach towards off street parking.

Unfortunately this development does not address that need, even though I had previously made representations to the applicant in regards to these issues. Unfortunately they provided what is the minimum that is there. So, Madam Chairman, it is good to see that this application is still going through the process. There is certainly a number of significant issues that need to be addressed. The officers are going through that, which is great. I only hope, Madam Chairman, that the co-op takes those on board and provides a genuine and honest and earnest approach to being able to address those issues and the concerns of residents so that their application is properly reflected.

If Councillor DICK, if he is genuine in his wanting to assist, if he could talk to his colleagues in the union co-op with different affiliations and factions that he knows, not only in his role as previous state director but as current leader in opposition, Madam Chairman, to talk to his member and his friends there and say to them, listen to the residents, take on board the concerns they have and work genuinely with the local community to provide an outcome that is reflective of those needs and of the local plan as well.

Chairman:

Further debate? Councillor WINES.

Councillor WINES:

Thank you, Madam Chairman. I rise to speak on items B and H, principally around protecting the character in the suburbs of Gaythorne and Newmarket and there is always a conflict and a challenge around a change. Change can often be very confronting in our communities, particularly where there are what was once demolition control, where there is character residential and traditional building character, also works near longstanding low to medium residential zoning.

So Newmarket and Gaythorne are identified as low to medium residential areas some decades ago, before any of us were in this place, for that use. However, there are also older suburbs that have a lot of character that people find very attractive.

So in Gaythorne, it is not unusual to see standalone single dwellings to be replaced by multi-unit dwellings. This petition seeks to review the current neighbourhood plan to make sure that it is accurate, that Council's traditional building character record is accurate and correct. I just wanted to say to the petitioners, I want to assure you that it is correct, that through the Mitchelton Centre neighbourhood planning process, Gaythorne and Mitchelton were assessed, not once but twice, to determine what was traditional character buildings and what was in reality a pre-1946 house and therefore we are confident that the coverage that we have at the moment is accurate.

I would also like to discuss the item in H regarding a specific item of the Grange area local plan, item 3.7, which provides specific protections for these streets in Newmarket called the Lindley neighbourhood. In them, it is a series of properties and streets that have these character protections and I want to assure the petitioners that although strictly speaking 3.7 is not itemised like that in City Plan 2014 the protections inside the Grange local area plan that were outlined through section 3.7 and in through the Grange area local plan are included inside City Plan 2014. So those protections remain in that area.

So to both sets of petitioners I would like to say that the protections through the traditional character overlay were strengthened through City Plan 2014 and this Administration, Graham QUIRK's Administration, are committed to protection of tin and timber character in our suburbs and the pre-1946 homes. I would also like to also say to those petitioners that if they feel that a specific property is not included and they believe that it is, please contact me in my office and we will endeavour to address those concerns.

Chairman:

Further debate? Councillor ABRAHAMS.

Councillor ABRAHAMS:

Thank you, Madam Chair. Madam Chair, I wish to just comment on a number of the items on this agenda and I will first of all comment on item A, E, F and G.

My colleague, Councillor DICK, commented on how disappointed he was that these did not come to a standard Council meeting for approval but they are for information only. But, Madam Chair, there was another whole tier that I am disappointed in and that is these petitions are coming when the development applications have not been assessed so that the petitioners who are seeking Council's position on these applications and wishing them to be debated in this Chamber may not do that as many of them may not warrant as developments to come to the Council Chamber in any other way except a petition.

So this is a really slay of hand [sic] way of responding to a petition which really says to those petitioners we will consider everything when we assess the application and gives them no direct response to their concerns. Madam Chair, I think that is not at all within the spirit of why the petitioners went to all that trouble and effort to get signatures.

Madam Chair, I now speak to item A. The history of Latrobe Terrace and Paddington predated 1991—it was part of the election when the former lord mayor, Jim Soorley, was elected. The 12 months before that was a time when there was absolute revolt from the shop owners in Latrobe and Gibbon Terrace who were operating illegally at the time. It was an issue that was part of that campaign and it was a hotly contested part of the campaign.

The issue was that there would be a local plan, the first Labor local plan, which did what the LNP's neighbourhood plan promised to do. Every property on the Terraces, from the ice works right up to Fernberg Road, was assessed for its merits for retail activity, considered as what its contribution would be in terms of mixed use and determined in that local plan.

So this community has fought very strongly for what now is probably one of the longest most dynamic strip shopping centres that I have seen. This mixed use development is out of scale, it is large, it will have impacts and that community is, as they did so long ago, fighting to retain what is unique in our city. Latrobe Terrace was a goat track that is now a real economic hub of our city and it should remain as such.

Madam Chair, item B, Labor Councillors will not be voting for item B because while I listened carefully to Councillor WINES, the residents are asking, as we understand, for increased controls for protection of their character buildings. While there has been two surveys to determine what is accurate, they are actually seeking more controls on all of the properties and I am not surprised by that because we know the one thing, if you ask residents, do they want character houses protected, the answer is always an extremely consistent, loud yes.

Madam Chair, the item C, I acknowledge the history given by Councillor DICK that this was the initiative of Councillor Hinchliffe. He went out on a limb and did a huge amount of consultation so that this first designated special entertainment precinct would be created. It was him responding and understanding what was there that had grown organically in the Valley and how it needed to be protected and well done for Councillor Hinchliffe for achieving that outcome.

We do believe that precinct does, in fact, offer protection to other precincts because there is, if you want to hold an entertainment business that is a 24-hour business that is part of the dynamic 24/7 city, that is the location. Labor councillors will support this recommendation which is to protect the integrity of that area.

Madam Chair, when it comes to the Belmont shooting range, Labor Councillors will not be supporting this because the petitioners clearly wanted a statutory protection. What they are not getting is statutory protection. What they are being told is that the neighbourhood plan is not the appropriate instrument and we will look for other non-statutory ways to protect the Belmont shooting complex from complaints from the residential community which is growing and encroaching in their area.

Well, Madam Chair, there is a precedent for a statutory approach to this. In the South Brisbane Riverside plan, there is clearly stated that businesses have to take into account the impact of the noise in terms of the industry on the ACI site, now the OI site, and the Parmalat site. So it is very much something that can protect a noisy business that had pre-existing rights and adds benefit to the city which is exactly what the members of the Belmont shooting complex are asking for and requiring. I was very clear to hear that their benefits to the community was acknowledged on the other side.

Finally, Madam Chair, on item H, it is our understanding on the item H that the properties that wish to be in the precinct of 3.7, in fact do have a traditional character protection on their buildings currently. Whilst it is not in a precinct specifically, they have protection and that protection is one that covers their need for those tin and timber houses to be protected.

So, Madam Chair, we will be voting in favour of that response.

Chairman:

Further debate? Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON:

Yes, Madam Chairman. I believe that items C, D and H are being taken together for voting purposes.

Chairman:

Yes.

Seriatim - Clause A and B

Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON requested that Clause A, PETITION – REQUESTING THAT COUNCIL REFUSE THE APPLICATION FOR A MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT AT 2 LATROBE TERRACE,

PADDINGTON, and Clause B, PETITION – REQUESTING THE IDENTIFICATION AND PROTECTION OF TRADITIONAL HOUSING CHARACTER AND HERITAGE IN THE GAYTHORNE AREA AND SURROUNDS be taken seriatim for voting purposes.

Chairman:

Thank you. Further debate? Councillor COOPER.

Councillor COOPER:

Thank you very much, Madam Chair. So, Madam Chair, we had debate on a number of items. Councillor DICK said that these items have been done in secret. That seems to be his refrain for the day, in fact, his refrain pretty much in perpetuity, Madam Chair. It would be nice if he came up with something original.

This was done by E&C in recess. This process of E&C dealing with matters in recess has been a longstanding practice. There is nothing unusual about this, Madam Chair, as everyone in this Chamber is well aware. So this sort of nonsense, perpetuated by Councillor DICK, is clearly just that, absolute nonsense.

He then also goes on to say that Council should not be even considering developments on these sites. Well, perhaps he could have talked to his previous colleagues, the former state Labor government, when they were drafting the Sustainable Planning Act because it is under these state planning regulations that does not allow Council to reject an application. Every application properly made to Council must be considered, Madam Chair.

I would suggest, Madam Chair, they know that. They know that good and well. They just choose to go out and tell the community something that serves their own political purposes, which is quite disgraceful. I also note that Councillor DICK said that he attended a public meeting. Well, that is a little bit disingenuous, Madam Chair, because I believe—I have got a copy—that he actually held the public meeting so it is not a public meeting that he just miraculously rolled up to, Madam Chair.

If he is going out there and telling the community about applications and actually holding public meetings, I would also suggest, and I have got a copy here of the information request about Chapman Place, Oxley, he should provide accurate information to his residents because if we look, the second paragraph, a single line, response by Council officers say, it is recommended that the applicant withdraw this application.

So Council officers are clearly saying to the applicant that they have concerns about what is being proposed. But Councillor DICK, what does he do? No, he goes out and he tells the community this is probably going to be approved by Council. That is what I would suggest is probably a part of the discussion. I was not there but that may be, from the way that things have been reported to me, that seems to be the way things are going.

Instead of being clear to people that Council has very significant issues, that it is put on the table. So that is pretty disappointing from Councillor DICK. I note also—

Chairman:

Order!

Councillor COOPER:

I note that Councillor ABRAHAMS argued that petitions should be delayed. She feels that petitions should not come through in a timely way. She wants them to wait until the decision is being made or has been made. Well, I would suggest to Councillor ABRAHAMS, if we just sat on petitions and I think it was the case in Public and Active Transport when the incoming Council found that Councillor NEWTON had been sitting on a petition for quite a lengthy period of time, and that was—

Chairman:

Order!

Councillor COOPER:

Councillor ABRAHAMS is the one that is suggesting that we should delay these matters, Madam Chair. So I think, and Councillor ABRAHAMS, I know

that you love to have that continual discussion with me about your views on everything, but it is an opportunity—so anyway, the stream of consciousness from Councillor ABRAHAMS continues.

Chairman:

Order!

Councillor COOPER:

Perhaps it could be correct though, Madam Chair. We deal with these matters and we bring them forward and it certainly means that Council officers can consider the issues that are raised as part of those petitions when they are assessing the applications.

Councillor ABRAHAMS talked about a slay of hand. I do not really know what she is talking about. Again, with this continual, this continual trying to suggest that people are not dealing with things properly. I would suggest if you have any allegations of any slay of hand—perhaps you mean sleight of hand—if you have any allegations that things are being improperly dealt with, then you should be a responsible local councillor and take those matters forward appropriately.

Then Councillor ABRAHAMS, she argued that the existing local plan she was referring to the petition about the mixed use development at Latrobe Terrace, she suggested that the existing local plan is dynamic and she felt it was very responsive. Well, interestingly when we went through—

Councillor ABRAHAMS:

Point of order, Madam Chair.

Chairman:

Point of order, Councillor COOPER. Yes, Councillor ABRAHAMS.

Councillor ABRAHAMS:

I absolutely have to claim being misrepresented on that.

Chairman:

Thank you. Councillor COOPER.

Councillor COOPER:

Well, thank you very much, Madam Chair. Well, it was clear from Councillor ABRAHAMS' comments that she felt that this local plan was very reflective of what the community's expectations were when in fact if we look at City Plan, the submissions that we received, were many submissions asking for a new neighbourhood plan for that particular area.

She also suggested with the particular petition relating to Belmont shooting complex, that is item D, Madam Chair, suggested that we had refused a statutory plan. Well, that is not the case. If Councillor ABRAHAMS would actually read the information, we say very clearly in our response to the applicant, we say that identification of complex planning issues within the neighbourhood plan may assist in recognition value for the venue and establish the desired future land use intent. However, a neighbourhood plan may not be the most appropriate way to regulate noise amenity issues as it would be limited to new development and suggests that Council may consider other ways to respond to these issues.

So again a nonsense from Councillor ABRAHAMS. I note, Madam Chair, that there are a number of petitions. I thank the Council officers for carefully considering them. I thank Councillor WINES for his comments. They are absolutely correct. We certainly are keen to protect character in this city and the provisions in place clearly do so. In fact, City Plan 2014 in fact delivers a greater outcome in terms of protection.

So disappointing commentary from the Australian Labor Party but unfortunately that is what we have come to expect in this Chamber and the nonsense about suggesting that these have been dealt with in any way, shape or form other than properly as they should be by Council officers is utterly rejected by this side of the Chamber. Thank you.

Chairman:

Councillor ABRAHAMS, misrepresentation.

Councillor ABRAHAMS:

Thank you, Madam Chair. Madam Chair, I heard Councillor COOPER saying that the local plan was dynamic. I did not say that. I said there was a dynamic process for the creation of the first Labor local plan after former lord mayor Soorley was elected.

Chairman: Thank you. I will put the motion for item A.

Clause A put

Upon being submitted to the meeting the motion for the adoption of Clause A of the report of the Neighbourhood Planning and Development Assessment Committee was declared **carried** on the voices.

Thereupon, Councillors Milton DICK and Helen ABRAHAMS immediately rose and called for a division, which resulted in the motion being declared **carried**.

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 16 - DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER, and Councillors Krista ADAMS, Matthew BOURKE, Amanda COOPER, Margaret de WIT, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Fiona KING, Geraldine KNAPP, Kim MARX, Peter MATIC, Ian McKENZIE, David McLACHLAN, Angela OWEN-TAYLOR, Julian SIMMONDS and Andrew WINES.

NOES: 7 - The Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Milton DICK, and Councillors Helen ABRAHAMS, Peter CUMMING, Kim FLESSER, Victoria NEWTON, Shayne SUTTON and Nicole JOHNSTON.

Chairman: I put the motion for item B.

Clause B put

Upon being submitted to the meeting the motion for the adoption of Clause B of the report of the Neighbourhood Planning and Development Assessment Committee was declared **carried** on the voices.

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

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 17 - DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER, and Councillors Krista ADAMS, Matthew BOURKE, Amanda COOPER, Margaret de WIT, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Fiona KING, Geraldine KNAPP, Kim MARX, Peter MATIC, Ian McKENZIE, David McLACHLAN, Angela OWEN-TAYLOR, Julian SIMMONDS, Andrew WINES and Nicole JOHNSTON.

NOES: 6 - The Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Milton DICK, and Councillors Helen ABRAHAMS, Peter CUMMING, Kim FLESSER, Victoria NEWTON, and Shayne SUTTON.

Chairman: I will put the motion for items C, D and H.

Clauses C, D and H put

Upon being submitted to the meeting the motion for the adoption of Clauses C, D and H of the report of the Neighbourhood Planning and Development Assessment Committee was declared **carried** on the voices.

Chairman: I will put the motion for items E, F and G.

Clauses E, F and G put

Upon being submitted to the meeting the motion for the adoption of Clauses E, F and G of the report of the Neighbourhood Planning and Development Assessment Committee was declared **carried** on the voices.

Thereupon, Councillors Milton DICK and Helen ABRAHAMS immediately rose and called for a division,

which resulted in the motion being declared **carried**.

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 16 - DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER, and Councillors Krista ADAMS, Matthew BOURKE, Amanda COOPER, Margaret de WIT, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Fiona KING, Geraldine KNAPP, Kim MARX, Peter MATIC, Ian McKENZIE, David McLACHLAN, Angela OWEN-TAYLOR, Julian SIMMONDS and Andrew WINES.

NOES: 7 - The Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Milton DICK, and Councillors Helen ABRAHAMS, Peter CUMMING, Kim FLESSER, Victoria NEWTON, Shayne SUTTON and Nicole JOHNSTON.

The report as follows—

A PETITION – REQUESTING THAT COUNCIL REFUSE THE APPLICATION FOR A MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT AT 2 LATROBE TERRACE, PADDINGTON

CA14/600974

176/2014-15

1. A petition from residents of Brisbane, Queensland and other states across the country, requesting that Council refuse the application for a mixed-use development at 2 Latrobe Terrace, Paddington, was received during the Winter Recess 2014.
2. The Divisional Manager, City Planning and Sustainability, supplied the following information.
3. The ePetition which contains 386 signatures requests that Council refuse the development application at 2 Latrobe Terrace, Paddington, based on non-compliance with the planning scheme and the identified potential impacts in the area, which include:
 - the building size, bulk and gross floor area, which are outside the acceptable solutions of the Latrobe and Given Terraces Local Plan, do not complement existing ridge-line contours
 - the loss of a pre-1946 character house
 - the inappropriate height, bulk and design for the character of Paddington and a prominent site.
4. The development application for demolition, centre activities, shop, multi-unit dwelling (48 units), short-term accommodation (17 units) and indoor sport and recreation, was properly-made on 20 August 2013.
5. An information request was sent to the applicant on 27 September 2013 that raised the following issues:
 - building bulk and design
 - height
 - setbacks
 - demolition of a pre-1946 house
 - car parking
 - refuse collection
 - landscaping
 - hours of operation
 - noise for non-residential activities
6. The applicant responded to the information request on 26 March 2014 and included some

changes to the design including, a reduction in the height for some parts of the building fronting Given Terrace and Mort Street, the removal of some roof structures and the number of units (45 units).

7. The application triggered an impact-assessable application, which required advertising in accordance with the requirements of the *Sustainable Planning Act 2009* (SPA). The notification period was from 24 April 2014 until 16 May 2014. This petition was received outside the notification period, however, it is acknowledged that the head petitioner is a formal submitter to the application.
8. Council has received 91 properly made submissions regarding the proposal (19 supporting, 72 opposing).
9. The application is now in the decision period under the provisions of SPA, and is currently being assessed by the Council Assessment Team, in conjunction with the issues raised by the submitters.

Consultation

10. Councillor Peter Matic, Councillor for Toowong Ward, has been consulted and supports the decision below.
11. The Divisional Manager recommended as follows and the Committee agreed at its meeting held on 7 October 2014.
12. **DECISION:**

THAT THE HEAD PETITIONER BE ADVISED THAT

THIS DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION IS STILL BEING ASSESSED BY THE DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT TEAM AGAINST THE RELEVANT PROVISIONS OF *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2000* AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE *SUSTAINABLE PLANNING ACT 2009* (SPA). This petition was received outside the notification period, however, the concerns raised will be taken into account during the assessment of this application.

In the interim, submitters may wish to track the progress of the development application online by visiting www.brisbane.qld.gov.au/pdonline. The application reference number is A003678251.

NOTED

B PETITION – REQUESTING THE IDENTIFICATION AND PROTECTION OF TRADITIONAL HOUSING CHARACTER AND HERITAGE IN THE GAYTHORNE AREA AND SURROUNDS

CA13/860231

177/2014-15

13. A petition from residents of Brisbane, requesting the identification and protection of traditional housing character and heritage in the Gaythorne area and surrounds, was received during the Summer Recess 2013-14.
14. The Divisional Manager, City Planning and Sustainability, supplied the following information.
15. A petition which contains 16 signatures requests that Council:

- review the extent of traditional housing character and the demolition protection in the low-medium density residential area;
 - restrict further demolition to avoid the area becoming predominantly occupied by flats and apartments
 - heritage list homes, particularly in the Prospect Street, Duke Street, Burdekin Street and Bellevue Avenue area, as they contain original local features such as roof tiles from the Ferny Grove works.
16. Council undertook a detailed character and heritage survey of Gaythorne as part of the Mitchelton Centre Neighbourhood Plan (Neighbourhood Plan). The Neighbourhood Plan was adopted by Council on 26 February 2013. The study area for this particular Neighbourhood Plan incorporated substantial portions of the suburbs of Mitchelton and Gaythorne and included all of the residential streets specifically mentioned in the petition for potential character house protection.
17. The planning process incorporated a detailed field survey undertaken to identify and map the extent of character housing in the area and identify any potential heritage places on not one, but two, occasions. As a result of these two character surveys, there was ultimately a net increase in the number of individual properties included in Demolition Control Precincts (DCPs) across the study area including additional houses located in Bellevue Avenue. The extent of existing DCPs in Duke and Burdekin Streets remained unaltered. These controls have been translated into *Brisbane City Plan 2014*.
18. Given that a detailed study of character housing was undertaken, along with extensive community consultation regarding that study has taken place recently, Council will not be revisiting the character protection aspects of the Neighbourhood Plan in the immediate future.
19. Similarly the future planning aspects of the Neighbourhood Plan study area have also been carefully formulated and rigorously reviewed in direct consultation with the local community to determine the most appropriate locations for greater residential density, commercial activity, public open space or other elements of urban development situated in and around the Mitchelton Centre.

Consultation

20. Councillor Andrew Wines, Councillor for Enoggera Ward, was consulted on 16 September 2014 and supports the decision below.
21. The Divisional Manager recommended as follows and the Committee agreed at its meeting held on 7 October 2014.
22. **DECISION:**

THAT THE HEAD PETITIONER BE ADVISED AS PER THE DRAFT RESPONSE SET OUT IN ATTACHMENT A, BELOW.

ATTACHMENT A Draft Response

Petition Reference: CA13/860231

Thank you for submitting a petition regarding traditional character and heritage houses in the Gaythorne area. Council has considered the petition and can advise the petitioners of the information below:

The Mitchelton Centre Neighbourhood Plan (Neighbourhood Plan) was adopted by Council on 26

February 2013. The Neighbourhood Plan incorporates most of the suburbs of Mitchelton and Gaythorne including all of the residential streets that are specifically mentioned in the petition.

The neighbourhood planning process featured two separate detailed field surveys undertaken to identify and map the extent of character housing in the area and identify any potential heritage places. These investigations resulted in a net increase in the number of individual properties included in the Traditional Building Character overlay included in *Brisbane City Plan 2014*. Additional houses were identified in Bellevue Avenue while the extent of existing identified character houses in Duke and Burdekin Streets remained unaltered.

NOTED

C PETITION - REQUESTING THAT ROBERTSON STREET, FORTITUDE VALLEY, BE REMOVED FROM THE SPECIAL ENTERTAINMENT PRECINCT BUFFER AREA, AND FOR ANY LICENSED PREMISES TO BE REQUIRED TO FINISH THEIR ACTIVITIES AT A REASONABLE HOUR IN ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE EXTENT OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT IN ROBERTSON STREET AND SURROUNDS

CA14/719576

178/2014-15

23. A petition requesting that Council remove Robertson Street, Fortitude Valley from the Special entertainment precinct buffer area, was presented to the meeting of Council held on 26 August 2014, by Councillor Vicki Howard, and received.
24. The Divisional Manager, City Planning and Sustainability, supplied the following information.
25. The petition, containing 84 signatures, requests that Council:
 - remove Robertson Street, Fortitude Valley, from the Special Entertainment Precinct buffer area; and
 - any licensed premises to finish their activities at a reasonable hour (such as midnight) in acknowledgement of the extent of residential development in Robertson Street and surrounds.
26. On 1 July 2006, Council created Australia's first designated Special Entertainment Precinct in Fortitude Valley (the Valley). Its creation was one of the first steps towards achieving the aims of the Valley Music Harmony Plan, with the goal of ensuring the long-term future of the music-based entertainment industry in the Valley without exposing residents or businesses to unreasonable levels of amplified-music noise. *Brisbane City Plan 2014* (the City Plan) maps both the Special Entertainment Precinct (core) and an associated buffer area, the Special Entertainment Precinct (buffer).
27. Responsibility for regulating amplified music noise from venues in the Special Entertainment Precinct (core) has been transferred from the Queensland Office of Liquor and Gaming Regulation (OLGR) to Council. In the Special Entertainment Precinct (core), the City Plan sets amplified-music noise requirements for entertainment venues. In this core area, entertainment venues are exempt from the amplified-music noise requirements of the Queensland Government's liquor licensing laws.
28. However, responsibility for regulating amplified music noise from venues in the Special Entertainment Precinct (buffer) remains with the OLGR. The City Plan does not set requirements for amplified noise, nor does it set operating hours for entertainment venues in the buffer area.
29. The Special Entertainment area Precinct (buffer) was set up as a transition area between the

Special Entertainment area Precinct (core) and surrounding residential areas. In the buffer area, new development is required to incorporate extensive noise insulation and the buffer area itself forms a transition between the busier retail, business and entertainment-oriented core precincts and the predominantly residential area closer to New Farm. Venues operating within this area are required to comply with the Queensland Government's liquor licensing provisions, including hours of operation.

Consultation

30. Councillor Vicki Howard, Councillor for Central Ward, was consulted on 24 September 2014 and supports the decision below.
31. The Divisional Manager recommended as follows and the Committee agreed at its meeting held on 13 October 2014.
32. **DECISION:**

THAT THE PRINCIPAL PETITIONER BE ADVISED AS PER THE DRAFT RESPONSE SET OUT IN ATTACHMENT A, BELOW.

**ATTACHMENT A
Draft Response**

Petition Reference: CA14/719576

Thank you for submitting a petition requesting the removal of Robertson Street, Fortitude Valley, from the Special Entertainment Precinct buffer area and for any licensed premises to finish their activities at a reasonable hour (such as midnight) in acknowledgement of the extent of residential development in Robertson Street and surrounds.

Council has considered the petition and can advise the petitioners of the information below:

Noise levels and operating hours for music venues located in the Special Entertainment Precinct buffer area are not regulated by Council. They are licensed and approved by the Queensland Office of Liquor and Gaming Regulation (OLGR) under the Liquor Act and its Regulation. The OLGR has issued the Pig-n-Whistle venue in Brunswick Street with a liquor licence which contains operating hours and allowable noise levels.

The function of the Special Entertainment Precinct (buffer) is to ensure new residential development in the vicinity of the Special Entertainment Precinct (core) incorporates adequate noise insulation.

Removal of the Special Entertainment Precinct (buffer) will have no influence on the noise levels or operating hours of an entertainment venue in the vicinity of Robertson Street.

Concerns about noise and operating hours for venues located in the Special Entertainment Precinct (buffer) should be referred to the Office of Liquor and Gaming Regulation (OLGR), in context of the requirements under the *Liquor Act 1992* and associated regulations. Further information on how to do this can be found at <http://www.justice.qld.gov.au/corporate/about-us/liquor-gaming/contact-us/complaints>.

NOTED

**D PETITION – REQUESTING THE PREPARATION OF A
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN TO PROTECT THE ONGOING OPERATIONS
OF THE BELMONT SHOOTING COMPLEX**
CA13/828702

179/2014-15

33. A petition requesting the preparation of a neighbourhood plan to protect the ongoing operations of the Belmont Shooting Complex, was presented to the meeting of Council held on 26 November 2013, by the Deputy Mayor, Councillor Adrian Schrinner, and received.
34. The Divisional Manager, City Planning and Sustainability, supplied the following information.
35. The petition from the Sporting Shooters Association (SSA), containing 1,327 signatures, requests that Council:
- acknowledge the Belmont Shooting Complex and surrounding neighbourhood as part of a precinct that is noise affected
 - investigate and implement planning instruments that manage the impacts of noise upon residents and businesses without compromising the viability of the Belmont Shooting Complex
 - conduct the relevant consultation with key stakeholders with regard to the development of a plan that serves to establish a precinct
 - formally establish the precinct area in a 'Belmont Chandler local area plan'.
36. The Belmont Shooting Complex has been in existence since 1916 and since this time, low density residential development has occurred in the surrounding area. The venue is home to a number of shooting clubs and usage includes rifles, shotguns, pistols, air rifles and archery. The venue is used to host national and international competitions and has facilitated the training of Olympic athletes. The venue is also used by various clubs up to seven days a week from 8.30am to 5pm.
37. In 2012 Council amended the zoning of the site to more clearly reflect existing development and achieve a better balance between the shooting related activities on the site. These zoning changes were reflected in *Brisbane City Plan 2014*, which commenced on 30 June 2014.
38. Firearm noise has the potential to cause nuisance for distances of up to three kilometres. There are several residential areas surrounding the venue that are exposed to noise levels, which may cause noise nuisance. The most affected residents are within 200 metres of firearm discharge areas. Outdoor shooting ranges are regulated under section 440ZC of the *Environmental Protection Act 1994* (EP Act).
39. Council is currently investigating the most appropriate strategy to address the issues raised by both the subject petitioners and the community generally. However, a statutory planning response may not be the most appropriate way to address noise amenity concerns as Council cannot retrospectively apply new provisions to lawfully established development in the surrounding area. As such, it is recommended that the petitioners be advised that Council acknowledges the historic use of the Belmont Shooting Complex but it has no plans at this time to prepare a neighbourhood plan for the Belmont Chandler area.
40. Council officers will meet with the SSA to discuss their concerns and possible options. Council will also advise the Queensland Government of the SSA's concerns for their consideration in planning upgrades of the facility for the 2018 Commonwealth Games.

Consultation

41. Councillor Adrian Schrinner, Councillor for Chandler Ward, was consulted on

1 October 2014 and supports the decision below.

42. The Divisional Manager recommended as follows and the Committee agreed at its meeting held on 13 October 2014.

43. **DECISION:**

THAT THE PRINCIPAL PETITIONER BE ADVISED AS PER THE DRAFT RESPONSE SET OUT IN ATTACHMENT A, BELOW.

ATTACHMENT A
Draft Response

Petition Reference: CA13/828702

I refer to your petition requesting the development of a precinct within a new Belmont Chandler neighbourhood plan that acknowledges the Belmont Shooting Complex and in particular, ensures development in the surrounding neighbourhood is designed to address noise impacts associated with the complex.

Council has considered the petition and can advise the petitioners of the information below:

The identification of the complex within a neighbourhood plan may assist in recognition value for the venue and establish the desired future land use intent. However, a neighbourhood plan may not be the most appropriate way to regulate noise amenity issues as it would be limited to new development. Council is not lawfully able to retrospectively apply new regulations to existing development.

Investigations will continue as to the best way to address this issue. Council officers would be pleased to meet with representatives of the Sporting Shooters Association to discuss your concerns in further detail. Please contact the Urban Planner, City Plan Operations Team, in Council's City Planning and Sustainability Division, on (07) 3403 8888 to arrange a meeting at a mutually convenient time.

Your comments have also been referred to the Queensland Government to consider in planning upgrades as part of preparations for the 2018 Commonwealth Games.

NOTED

E PETITION – REQUESTING THAT COUNCIL OPPOSE A DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION FOR RESIDENTIAL USE AT 48 GOVERNMENT ROAD, RICHLANDS

CA14/666290

180/2014-15

44. A petition from residents of Richlands, Inala and surrounding suburbs requesting that Council oppose a development application for residential use at 48 Government Road, Richlands, was presented to the meeting of Council held on 12 August 2014, by Councillor Milton Dick, and received.
45. The Divisional Manager, City Planning and Sustainability, supplied the following information.
46. The petition contains 27 signatures.
47. The petitioners have requested that Council oppose the residential development (A003810266) of land at 48 Government Road, Richlands, due to increased traffic on residential streets and severe impacts on significant vegetation areas in the existing bushland

corridor.

48. The Richlands Bus Depot was opened in 1997 to service the west and south-west regions of Brisbane. The depot formed an integral part of Brisbane Transport's bus services until its closure on 13 October 2013, with the opening of new depots at Willawong, Sherwood and Eagle Farm. Since 2005, the South Western SES Group has also utilised part of the site and will relocate to a nearby site within Richlands.
49. An application to subdivide the site to create two allotments (eastern and western) was approved on 22 November 2013 (reference number A003728859). The eastern portion contains a Queensland Urban Utilities Inala water reservoir and parkland. The western portion of the site, an area of 5.197 hectares, contains the former Richlands Bus Depot.
50. The subject site has road frontage to Government Road and Rudyard Street, and is included within a Community Use (CU8 – Utility Installation) area and the Richlands Wacol Corridor Neighbourhood Plan (Richlands Central Precinct).
51. A development application for a preliminary approval, pursuant to section 242 of the Sustainable Planning Act 2009 (SPA) to vary the effect of Brisbane City Plan 2000 (City Plan) was lodged with Council on 12 February 2014 and was declared properly made on 20 February 2014. The applicant requested to change the development uses on the western portion of the site to allow for medium-density residential development of a similar scale and density permitted on land to the north of the site. The land to the north, on the opposite side of Government Road, is also included within the Richlands Central Precinct.
52. The eastern area on the subject site, which contains most of the vegetation, is to be dedicated as parkland. A 30-metre wide landscape buffer is proposed along the south of the site, which would retain much of the existing vegetation on the western side of the site.
53. An information request was issued to the applicant by Council on 19 March 2014, requesting that issues relating to the structure plan of the development, building heights, buffering, interface to the adjoining residential properties and the protection of ecological features on site, be addressed.
54. The applicant provided a response to these issues on 14 May 2014 and, following an assessment of this response, additional information was sought on 30 July 2014. The requested information related specifically to amending the plan to realign the subdivision boundary with the proposed land uses, provision of a local cycle pathway through the site and an accurate dimensioned plan for the proposed land uses. A response was received on 1 September 2014 and is currently being assessed.
55. Public advertising, in accordance with the provisions of SPA, was carried out between 20 May 2014 and 1 July 2014. There were no submissions, either formal or informal, received.

Consultation

56. Councillor Milton Dick, Councillor for Richlands Ward, has been consulted and does not support the decision below.
57. The Divisional Manager recommended as follows and the Committee agreed at its meeting held on 13 October 2014.
58. **DECISION:**

THAT THE PRINCIPAL PETITIONER BE ADVISED THE FOLLOWING:

- (a) **THE APPLICATION IS CURRENTLY BEING ASSESSED AGAINST THE REQUIREMENTS OF *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2000* AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE *SUSTAINABLE PLANNING ACT 2009* (SPA).**
- (b) Public advertising, in accordance with the provisions of SPA, was carried out between 20 May 2014 and 1 July 2014. There were no submissions, either formal or informal, received.
- (c) The concerns raised in the petition will be taken into consideration during the assessment of the application.
- (d) Petitioners can track the progress of the development application online by visiting www.brisbane.qld.gov.au/pdonline. The application reference number is A003896356.

NOTED

F PETITION – REQUESTING THAT COUNCIL OPPOSE A DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AT 242 ENGLEFIELD ROAD, OXLEY

CA14/666329

181/2014-15

- 59. A petition, from residents of Oxley and Jindalee, requesting that Council oppose a development application for residential development on land at 242 Englefield Road, Oxley, was presented to the meeting of Council held on 12 August 2014, by Councillor Milton Dick, and received.
- 60. The Divisional Manager, City Planning and Sustainability, supplied the following information.
- 61. The petition contained 39 signatures.
- 62. The petitioners' concerns are that the development will increase traffic on residential streets and severely impact an existing bushland corridor.
- 63. The subject site has an area of 9.763 hectares and was decommissioned from the Boral Darra Brickworks operation (Lot 1 on SP261547) by way of subdivision (A003447757), which was approved by Council in March 2013. The mining rights were surrendered over the subject site on 27 January 2014.
- 64. An impact assessable development application was lodged on 16 June 2014 and declared properly made on 27 June 2014. The application seeks a preliminary approval under section 242 of the *Sustainable Planning Act 2009* (SPA) for a Material Change of Use to vary the effect of *Brisbane City Plan 2000* (City Plan) by changing the planning provisions that currently apply for extractive industry to low-medium density residential.
- 65. The developer proposes to use 6.11 hectares for residential, 3.25 hectares for parkland and 0.4 hectares to be dedicated for road widening. The applicant also proposes to dedicate the parkland to Council to form part of 'Rikki Bailey Park'.
- 66. There are existing residential uses to the north and south, future industrial uses to the west and a Council-owned park, 'Rikki Bailey Park', adjoining the eastern boundary.
- 67. In addition to the planning assessment report, the application also included assessment reports addressing acoustic impacts, air quality, traffic, land contamination, ecology, waterways, earthworks, hydraulics and infrastructure.

68. An information request was issued on 19 August 2014, which requested that the following matters be addressed:
- how the preliminary approval would override the City Plan
 - the appropriate density for future residential development
 - maintenance of future residential and industrial interface
 - how long-term viability of the ecological features and values on the site can be ensured.
69. The applicant has until 19 February 2015 to respond to this request, unless an extension is agreed, or the application can lapse. Once a response to the information request is received the application is required to undergo public notification.
70. As the application is subject to public notification, in accordance with the SPA, the petitioners will have an opportunity to make submissions regarding the proposed development during the 30 business day public notification period, times for which are not yet known.

Consultation

71. Councillor Milton Dick, Councillor for Richlands Ward, has been consulted and does not support the decision below.
72. The Divisional Manager recommended as follows and the Committee agreed at its meeting held on 13 October 2014.
73. **DECISION:**

THAT THE PRINCIPAL PETITIONER BE ADVISED THAT:

- (a) **THE APPLICATION IS CURRENTLY BEING ASSESSED AGAINST THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2000* AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE *SUSTAINABLE PLANNING ACT 2009*.**
- (b) The application is subject to public notification and petitioners will have an opportunity to lodge a submission.
- (c) The concerns raised in the petition will be taken into consideration during the assessment of the application.
- (d) Petitioners can track the progress of the development application online by visiting www.brisbane.qld.gov.au/pdonline. The application reference number is A003896356.

NOTED

G PETITION – REQUESTING THAT COUNCIL REFUSE A DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION FOR THE RECONFIGURATION OF LAND AT 67 CHAPMAN PLACE, OXLEY
CA14/666360

182/2014-15

74. A petition requesting that Council refuse a development application for the reconfiguration of land at 67 Chapman Place, Oxley, was presented to the meeting of Council held on 12 August 2014, by Councillor Milton Dick, and received.
75. The Divisional Manager, City Planning and Sustainability, supplied the following information.
76. The petition contains 70 signatures.

77. The petitioners seek to protect the site based on the existing environmental, stormwater and bushland values of the site.
78. An impact-assessable development application was lodged on 24 June 2014 and declared properly made on 29 June 2014. The application is being assessed under *Brisbane City Plan 2000* (City Plan).
79. The subject site has an area of 12,480 square metres and is partly included within the low density residential area (approximately 1,050 square metres) and the environmental protection area (approximately 11,430 square metres) of the City Plan.
80. The existing allotment was created as part of the third stage of a residential subdivision development approved in September 2005 (A001520507). A condition of that approval required the creation of a Building Location Envelope to limit future development to the part of the site that is now included within the low density residential area.
81. The subdivision creates 10 residential allotments and a large lot proposed to be dedicated to Council for park and environmental purposes. The proposed residential allotments range in size from 525 square metres to 1,162 square metres, and the lot for parkland and environmental purposes has an area of 3,503 square metres.
82. The applicant proposes to extend Merring Street through the site to Chapman Place and construct a cul-de-sac at the end of Patwin Street. Vehicle access to the proposed residential allotments will be from Chapman Place, Patwin and Merring Streets.
83. An information request was sent to the applicant on 8 August 2014 requesting that the applicant undertake the following:
- Amend the planning report justifying how the development meets the intent for development within the environmental protection area in the City Plan.
 - Amend the subdivision layout to take into account the waterway corridor, habitat, landscape and ecological features of the site.
 - Clarify stormwater infrastructure works proposed on the site including provision of upstream connections.
 - Submit a tree protection plan showing how trees are to be retained.
 - Submit a rehabilitation plan for the identified waterway corridor and environmental areas on site.
 - Submit a bushfire hazard report.
84. In accordance with the *Sustainable Planning Act 2009*, the application is subject to public notification. Therefore, the petitioners will have an opportunity to make submissions regarding the proposed development during the public notification period.

Consultation

85. The Councillor for Richlands Ward, Councillor Milton Dick, has been consulted and does not support the decision below.
86. The Divisional Manager recommended as follows and the Committee agreed at its meeting held on 13 October 2014.
87. **DECISION:**

THAT THE PRINCIPAL PETITIONER BE ADVISED THAT:

- (a) **THE APPLICATION IS CURRENTLY BEING ASSESSED AGAINST THE**

REQUIREMENTS OF THE *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2000* AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE *SUSTAINABLE PLANNING ACT 2009*.

- (b) The application is subject to public notification and petitioners will have an opportunity to lodge submissions.
- (c) The concerns raised in the petition will be taken into consideration during the assessment of the application.
- (d) Petitioners can track the progress of the development application online by visiting www.brisbane.qld.gov.au/pdonline. The application reference number is A003904095.

NOTED

H PETITION – REQUEST TO AMEND THE GRANGE DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN IN THE *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2000*
CA14/315015

183/2014-15

- 88. A petition requesting that properties located in Travill Street, Newmarket, be included in Precinct 3.7 of the Grange District Local Plan, was received during the Autumn Recess 2014.
- 89. The Divisional Manager, City Planning and Sustainability, supplied the following information.
- 90. The petition signed by 13 petitioners, requests that Council apply additional character protection requirements to properties located in Travill Street, Newmarket. Seven petitioners (four properties) are from Travill Street. This constitutes around one quarter of the properties in the street. The properties are in the low-medium density residential area classification and Demolition Control Precinct under *Brisbane City Plan 2000*.
- 91. The petition requests that Travill Street properties be included within Precinct 3.7 of the Grange District Local Plan. Precinct 3.7 applies to nearby properties bounded by Gray Street, Greene Street, Lind Street, and Newmarket Road.
- 92. Under *Brisbane City Plan 2000* properties in both Travill Street and the requested Precinct 3.7 were in a Demolition Control Precinct which was intended to protect ‘timber and tin’ housing constructed in 1946 or earlier. The difference between the properties in Travill Street and the requested Precinct 3.7 is the underlying area classification, with Travill Street properties included in the low-medium density residential area classification while properties in Precinct 3.7 are in the character residential area classification. These controls provided for Travill Street to support some unit-style development, where it could be appropriately integrated with the traditional character of the street. In comparison, Precinct 3.7 was generally intended for single houses only. These controls have been in place since 30 October 2000.
- 93. *Brisbane City Plan 2014* took effect on 30 June 2014, after the petition was lodged. While some terminology has changed since the *Brisbane City Plan 2014* commenced, the zoning and character provisions in Newmarket remain largely unchanged from *Brisbane City Plan 2000*. In this regard, Demolition Control Precincts have been replaced with the Traditional Building Character overlay, which applies to properties in Travill Street and properties in the superseded Precinct 3.7. The intent of the Traditional Building Character Overlay is to protect ‘timber and tin’ housing constructed in 1946 or earlier and to ensure new development is compatible with traditional character. In these areas the Traditional Building Character (demolition) overlay code and Traditional Building Character (design) overlay code apply.
- 94. Furthermore, the Grange District Local Plan under *Brisbane City Plan 2000* has been included in the Ashgrove-Grange District Neighbourhood Plan in *Brisbane City Plan 2014* and Precinct 3.7 has been replaced by an intent statement [7.2.1.4.2(3)(b)], which refers to

maintaining 'Ashgroviaan' housing character, including Lind Street, Gray Street and Greene Street.

95. Under *Brisbane City Plan 2014*, the zoning also remains largely unchanged. Properties bounded by Gray Street, Greene Street, Lind Street, and Newmarket Road are in the Character residential zone which is primarily intended for single houses only. Travill Street properties continue to be in a zone that supports some unit-style development, namely the low-medium density residential zone.

Consultation

96. Councillor Andrew Wines, Councillor for Enoggera Ward, was consulted on 29 August 2014 and supports the decision below.
97. The Divisional Manager recommended as follows and the Committee agreed at its meeting held on 13 October 2014.
98. **DECISION:**

THAT THE PRINCIPAL PETITIONER BE ADVISED THAT COUNCIL IS UNABLE TO INCLUDE PROPERTIES LOCATED IN TRAVILL STREET, NEWMARKET, IN PRECINCT 3.7 OF THE GRANGE DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN BECAUSE PRECINCT 3.7 NO LONGER EXISTS UNDER *BRISBANE CITY PLAN 2014* AND THAT THE SAME ZONING CONTROLS FOR TRAVILL STREET REMAIN IN PLACE SINCE FIRST INTRODUCED IN OCTOBER 2000.

NOTED

BRISBANE LIFESTYLE COMMITTEE

Councillor Krista ADAMS, Chairman of the Brisbane Lifestyle Committee, moved, seconded by Councillor Andrew WINES, that the report setting out the *decisions* of the Establishment and Coordination Committee as delegate of the Council during the Spring Recess 2014, on matters usually considered by Brisbane Lifestyle Committee, be noted.

Chairman: Is there any debate?

Councillor ADAMS: Thank you, Madam Chair, and I would just like to mention a couple of things that have happened during recess very quickly because I know time is of the essence this evening.

First of all, I just want to congratulate our librarians who are doing a fantastic job down at the Coopers Plains Library. We had a lovely morning tea on Saturday morning to name the gnome. I know you all laughed at me about the six foot gnome a few months ago. We had 303 people that put in nominations for names for the gnome and no, Steve did not get up there. I will your interjection, Councillor BOURKE. Cooper was the most popular one, surprise, surprise.

Twenty four nominations for Cooper, a few for Coops and so the winners, the 24 that actually nominated Cooper were the winners. We had a lovely morning tea on Saturday morning, gave them some vouchers for some books and some pictures with the gnome. We did a great group photo around Cooper. It definitely is becoming a community hub within the Coopers Plains area. The library refurbishment is absolutely spectacular. We will talk more about that next week because we did talk about it in committee this morning.

I would also like to draw to the attention of those in the Chamber that we have got information sessions coming up for community groups on the grants programs that we have got out at the moment. So you will be aware we have done this over the last couple of years with our sporting groups when we introduced the new sporting grants programs for clubs for the infrastructure or maybe for their website or for their executive to get training.

This one is really going to be focusing on our community development and capacity building grants, on our men's shed grants and our housing support program grants. But anything else that people might be interested in the grants program, they can come along as well. They are going to be held throughout November. We are going to be having 10 different sessions. They are going to be at Kenmore, Willers Hills Bowls Club, at Chermside Library, Pacifica House, Lota PCYCs, Mt Gravatt Community Centre, New Farm Neighbourhood Centre throughout November.

So that information will be coming out to your ward offices. I would really appreciate if you could let everybody know about that great opportunity for our community groups to do some one on one time with our community development officers and our program officers to talk about the grants and how they might be able to fill in those applications more efficiently, not make it a really big process to get involved in those grants as well.

To the report today, Madam Chair. There are two petitions. One was on the Wynnum Men's Shed which is something that we have spoken about a lot in Chambers here. The response is the same as it has always been. Unfortunately the Men's Shed are not in the position to go back into our heritage building per se. We have been working very closely with them over the last 12 months. We have come up with sites that are suitable for them and we will continue to work with the Wynnum Men's Shed until they decide with their committee about where they would like to locate. I would hope that they would be a group that we would see at these grant programs to talk about the Men's Shed grant and how we can help them further as well.

The second petition was a safety audit petition around Fleet Place and Jolly Lane which has been here again previously. It was similar to one that came through a couple of months ago and I will leave that if there is any other debate in the Chamber. Thank you.

Chairman: Further debate? Councillor MARX.

Councillor MARX: I was just going to move dinner.

Chairman: Sorry. Well, someone has got to move it. Sorry. Councillor CUMMING, I looked over there and there was no movement.

Councillor CUMMING: Sorry, I thought they were going to go up to the head of the debate, Madam Chair.

Serialim - Clause B

Councillor Peter CUMMING requested that Clause B, PETITIONS – REQUESTING THAT COUNCIL ALLOW THE WYNNUM MANLY AND DISTRICT MEN'S SHED INCORPORATED TO REMAIN LOCATED AT THE FORMER WYNNUM CENTRAL STATE SCHOOL SITE, be taken serialim for voting purposes.
--

Councillor CUMMING: Madam Chairman, these petitions were quite substantial petitions. There are 868 signatures in total and I can say the community of Wynnum Manly believes the Men's Shed is a great idea and it is concerned for their continued existence. The Men's Shed started on 6 July 2011 and has 136 members. It is a very successful and hardworking men's shed. They work hard and fundraise through sausage sizzles, at local markets and have around \$40,000 in the bank.

They have good relations with local hardware stores, particularly Masters. They have operated under the old brick school building at the Wynnum Central

School site during their entire existence. Council has actually spent money paying for the closing in of part of the area they occupy. The Men's Shed knew they would have to leave the school when the school site was renovated but they are hopeful they might be able to occupy one of the wooden school buildings. They claim Council staff encouraged them in this belief.

There has still been no official announcement as to what is to happen to the wooden buildings. The other option of a site where a men's shed could be built is the old tennis court area on the Charlotte Street side of the school property near the Wynnum Shopping Centre near Bay Terrace. This is an excellent slab of land which would be a good site for a new shed. Sadly Council has rejected all these options. They fail to give reasons why the Men's Shed could not go on some part of the school site.

The school site has excellent access with bus stops for the local loop service, city services, and also the Wynnum Central train station all within close walking distance. The Men's Shed was offered a site, one site, in Wood Street, Manly as part of the Harman's Reserve. This site adjoined the Wynnum Table Tennis Association hall. I know this hall well as I actually play table tennis. I am currently on the committee.

Sadly the Wynnum Table Tennis Association were not consulted at all by Council before the offer was made to the Men's Shed and it meant that if the Wynnum Table Tennis Association ever wanted to expand they would not have been able to expand because there would have been a Men's Shed there where they could have expanded. So thankfully I let them know what was happening but anyhow the Men's Shed rejected that proposed option.

Meanwhile I received a call from the facilities manager at Iona College advising that they might be able to offer a site for the shed. I quickly passed this on to the Men's Shed president. Negotiations are still continuing with Iona but seem very hopeful. The Men's Shed would be charged only a peppercorn rent and the site would be as close as possible to Lindum railway station. Well done, Iona, a Catholic boy's school with 1,500 pupils and a great reputation as a fine community citizen. No thanks to the Brisbane City Council.

The next large hurdle facing the Men's Shed is the cost of building a new shed. They have been told they may be able to access some federal money, not for a year or two, but I believe state and Council grants as they exist at present will not go very far. When they get quotes for the cost, I will be calling upon the LORD MAYOR to chip in substantial Council funding. It would be the least Council could do. After all, they have come up with \$1.5 million to fund a clubhouse extension at South's United Football Club.

In relation to this petition, I do not support the responses. I believe the Men's Shed could have operated quite well out of one of the wooden buildings were there one to be retained or alternatively they could have built a new shed on the old tennis courts at the Bay Terrace end of the site. I believe Council's lack of assistance has been a disgrace.

The time taken to get funding will likely mean there is no Men's Shed operation in Wynnum Manly for at least six to 12 months. I fear members will drift away. I hope that long term damage is not done to the organisation by the delay that will inevitably occur until a Men's Shed is built on Iona College land. I will be voting against this recommendation as will my colleagues.

Chairman:

Further debate? Councillor ADAMS.

Councillor ADAMS:

Thank you, Madam Chair. I would just like to straighten out some of the furphies that we heard from the Councillor for Wynnum Manly around the Men's Shed. There has been an enormous hold up from the Men's Shed but the reality is we have been talking to the Men's Shed about this for two years. In that two years' time, they have refused on all points to ever consider moving, looking at options, starting to get the money together and face the reality that they were not going to be in big red.

This could really be a long way further along if they had taken and accepted that reality. We have worked through the process of the buildings on the site. We have worked through the process of on the tennis court. The Table Tennis Association is more than happy at Harman's Reserve when they realised the co-location really did benefit them as well as the Men's Shed. But when it comes down to it, Brisbane City Council does not build Men's Shed.

Not one of the many Men's Shed that are so successful across Brisbane have got anything more than the Men's Shed's grants that are available to the Wynnum Manly Men's Shed as well. We have been working very, very hard with the Wynnum Manly Men's Shed. We went through at least 13 different sites. Harman's Reserve is by far the best position at this point of time. I do not believe Iona is going to be as easy as they believe but I am more than happy, as the Council officers have said to them to work with them to make it happen there as well.

We continue to look at sites and we continue to be in discussions with the Wynnum Manly Men's Shed. They would go a long way to helping themselves if they worked with us as well because we are trying to help them and that is the message that I would like to get out there to the Wynnum Men's Shed this evening. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Chairman: I will put the motion for item A.

Clause A put

Upon being submitted to the meeting the motion for the adoption of Clause A of the report of the Brisbane Lifestyle Committee was declared **carried** on the voices.

Chairman: I will put the motion for item B.

Clause B put

Upon being submitted to the meeting the motion for the adoption of Clause B of the report of the Brisbane Lifestyle Committee was declared **carried** on the voices.

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

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 16 - DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER, and Councillors Krista ADAMS, Matthew BOURKE, Amanda COOPER, Margaret de WIT, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Fiona KING, Geraldine KNAPP, Kim MARX, Peter MATIC, Ian McKENZIE, David McLACHLAN, Angela OWEN-TAYLOR, Julian SIMMONDS and Andrew WINES.

NOES: 7 - The Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Milton DICK, and Councillors Helen ABRAHAMS, Peter CUMMING, Kim FLESSER, Victoria NEWTON, Shayne SUTTON and Nicole JOHNSTON.

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

The report read as follows—

A PETITION – REQUESTING THAT COUNCIL IMPROVE PUBLIC SAFETY OF FLEET LANE AND JOLLY PLACE PARK, SOUTH BRISBANE **CA14/620899**

184/2014-15

1. A petition requesting that Council improve public safety of Fleet Lane and

Jolly Place Park, South Brisbane was presented to the meeting of Council held on 29 July 2014, by Councillor Helen Abrahams, and received.

2. The Divisional Manager, Brisbane Lifestyle Division, supplied the following information.
3. The petition contains 105 signatures.
4. The park and laneway are in close proximity to Southbank Campus Apartments and Common Ground Queensland. Southbank Campus Apartments provides accommodation for a large number of international students and Common Ground Queensland provides housing for homeless people who often also experience mental illness and/or drug and alcohol addiction.
5. A lighting inspection of Fleet Lane and Jolly Place Park was conducted on 27 May 2014 by an officer from Council's City Lighting Team, Mr Steve Coyne from Light Naturally and Mr Brian Stokeld from the Riverside Hotel Southbank. Mr Stokeld agreed that Riverside Hotel Southbank would trim and maintain vegetation within their property boundary which is impacting on lighting levels.
6. Council's Community Safety Team and Asset Services Branch have also reviewed Jolly Place Park for lighting and safety improvements, in accordance with Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles. The following improvements have since been implemented:
 - removal of stickers on the existing light nearest the car parking spaces and on the path bollard lights
 - installation of a temporary street light until Energex installs a flood light on the rear of an Energex light in Fleet Lane
 - lifting the canopy of the existing mango tree
 - trimming shrubs according to CPTED guidelines.
7. Future improvements include:
 - removal of the light bollard near Fleet Lane car park
 - installation of two lights along the pathway between Fleet Lane and Grey Street
 - Energex to prepare a design to upgrade the existing lighting from high pressure sodium to metal halide lighting for Grey Street, between Peel Street and William Jolly Bridge.
8. Southbank Campus Apartments and Riverside Hotel Southbank received funding through Council's Suburban Crime Prevention Grant (SCPG) to install CCTV cameras to provide a level of surveillance to Fleet Lane. Riverside Hotel Southbank was also funded by the SCPG to create a mural to respond to safety issues in Fleet Lane.
9. With regard to the request for a pedestrian path to be constructed through Jolly Place Park, it is noted that the park has an existing path from Grey Street to Fleet Lane. Any anti-social behaviour that occurs in the park and laneway should be reported to the Queensland Police Service.

Funding

10. Funding for the lighting design being undertaken by Council's Asset Services is available within Program 1 - Clean, Green and WaterSmart City, Service 1.4.3.1 Parks Maintenance and Enhancement.

Consultation

11. Councillor Helen Abrahams, Councillor for The Gabba Ward, has been consulted and supports the decision below.

12. The Divisional Manager therefore recommended as follows and the Committee agreed at its meeting held on 7 October 2014.

13. **DECISION:**

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

**ATTACHMENT A
Draft Response**

Petition Reference: CA14/620899

Thank you for your petition requesting that Council improve public safety of Fleet Lane and Jolly Place Park, South Brisbane. Council appreciates the concerns raised in your petition about the safety of students, short term visitors, staff and residents of the surrounding buildings.

A lighting inspection of Fleet Lane and Jolly Place Park was conducted on 27 May 2014 by an officer from Council's City Lighting, Mr Steve Coyne of Light Naturally and Mr Brian Stokeld from the Riverside Hotel Southbank. Council's Community Safety Team and Asset Services Branch have also reviewed Jolly Place Park for lighting and safety improvements, in accordance with Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles.

Fleet Lane is classified as a road reserve until it reaches the Riverside Hotel Southbank, where it becomes private property through to Montague Road. The review of the street lighting in Fleet Lane revealed that the lighting levels exceed Australian Standards for this category of road. With that said, Mr Stokeld agreed that Riverside Hotel Southbank would trim and maintain vegetation within their property boundary which is impacting on lighting levels.

To improve the lighting in Jolly Place Park, Council has removed the stickers on the existing light nearest the car parking spaces and on the path bollard light. Council has commissioned a lighting design for the park, and this will include the removal of the light bollard near Fleet Lane carpark and the installation of two lights along the pathway between Fleet Lane and Grey Street. Council has also engaged Energex to install a flood light on the rear of an Energex light in Fleet Lane to illuminate the seating area under the mango tree. While waiting for the delivery of the flood light from the supplier, Energex installed a temporary street light on 8 August 2014.

In relation to Grey Street, Energex has advised that due to the age and the style of the existing poles, they are unable to mount an additional flood light for the eastern side of Jolly Place Park. However, Energex has agreed to prepare a design to upgrade the existing lighting from high-pressure sodium to metal-halide lighting for Grey Street, between Peel Street and William Jolly Bridge.

As you may be aware, the canopy of the mature mango tree has been lifted and the shrubs along the property in Grey Street have been trimmed according to CPTED guidelines. Council's Asset Services Branch will conduct ongoing maintenance of the vegetation in Jolly Place Park.

With regards to your request for the redesign of Jolly Place Park with a redirected pedestrian path to be constructed to encourage regular people traffic through the park, please be aware

the park has an existing path from Grey Street to Fleet Lane. The park provides access for staff who work in neighbouring businesses and who use the car park and Fleet Lane on a daily basis.

Southbank Campus Apartments and Riverside Hotel Southbank in Fleet Lane have received funding from Council's Suburban Crime Prevention Grant (SCPG) to install CCTV cameras on the external façade of their buildings facing Fleet Lane and Hope Street. The Common Ground building also has CCTV cameras that cover the exit into Fleet Lane. The Riverside Hotel, Southbank, received funding through the SCPG to install a large mural in Fleet Lane to reduce graffiti vandalism and improve a sense of ownership and safety of the area. Council's Graffiti Management teams will also continue to inspect and remove graffiti from Fleet Lane regularly.

At this stage, Council's CitySafe CCTV camera network does not extend to South Brisbane and there are no plans to install CCTV cameras in the laneway and park. However, Council's SCPG opened for applications on 21 July 2014 and closes on 20 October 2014. Eligible businesses and community organisations can apply for safety improvements in and around their facilities. If you or surrounding businesses would like more information on the SCPG, please visit Council's website, www.brisbane.qld.gov.au and search for Suburban Crime Prevention Grant.

In relation to anti-social behaviour that occurs in the park and laneway, Council encourages you to refer these incidents to the Queensland Police Service.

NOTED

**B PETITIONS – REQUESTING THAT COUNCIL ALLOW THE WYNNUM
MANLY AND DISTRICT MEN'S SHED INCORPORATED TO REMAIN
LOCATED AT THE FORMER WYNNUM CENTRAL STATE SCHOOL SITE**
CA 14/718007, CA14/731194, CA14/731526, CA14/731828 and CA14/756876

185/2014-15

14. Five petitions requesting that Council allow the Wynnum Manly and District Men's Shed Incorporated (Men's Shed) to remain located at the former Wynnum Central State School site, either in their current location underneath A Block or on the tennis courts at the IGA end of Charlotte Street, Wynnum were presented to the meetings of Council held on 26 August 2014 (CA14/718007), 2 September 2014 (CA14/731194, CA14/731526 and CA14/731828), and 9 September 2014 (CA14/756876) by Councillor Peter Cumming, and received.
15. The Divisional Manager, Brisbane Lifestyle, supplied the following information.
16. The petitions contain a total of 868 signatures.
17. The Men's Shed currently lease some of the ground-floor space in A Block, which is a heritage-listed building. As part of the redevelopment of the former Wynnum Central State School, A Block will be renovated into a new community facility.
18. The existing community leases have been upheld by Council on a temporary month-by-month basis, with the knowledge that the site would be redeveloped in the future. As renovations are due to begin in late 2014, all community groups who are currently leasing space in A Block have been asked to vacate the premises by 31 October 2014.
19. When the redevelopment is completed, Council will hold an expression of interest process for community groups to apply for space in the new community facility. Each community group

will be assessed on its merits in relation to a set of criteria for suitability in the new centre. The Men's Shed is not seen as a suitable use for the refurbished community facility.

20. Council has been working closely with the Men's Shed since 2013 to help them find a suitable site in the local area for relocation. Council has offered to set up a lease arrangement on another site in Manly with more long-term tenure security for the group, however, the Men's Shed have since declined the offer.
21. Council will continue to support the Men's Shed and is currently investigating several other sites, including potential partnerships with other community organisations in the area.

Consultation:

22. Councillor Peter Cumming, Councillor for Wynnum Manly Ward, has been consulted and does not support the decision below.
23. The Divisional Manager therefore recommended as follows and the Committee agreed at its meeting held on 13 October 2014.
24. **DECISION:**

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

**ATTACHMENT A
Draft Response**

Petition Reference: CA 14/718007, CA14/731194, CA14/731526, CA14/731828 and CA14/756876

Thank you for your petition requesting Council allow the Wynnum Manly and District Men's Shed Incorporated (Men's Shed) to remain located at the former Wynnum Central State School site, either in their current location underneath A Block or on the tennis courts at the IGA end of Charlotte Street, Wynnum.

The existing community leases at the former Wynnum Central State School have been upheld by Council on a temporary month-by-month basis, with the knowledge that the site would be redeveloped in the future. As renovations are due to begin in late 2014, all community groups who are currently leasing space in A Block have been asked to vacate the premises by 31 October 2014.

When the redevelopment is completed, Council will hold an expression of interest process for community groups to apply for space in the new community facility. Each community group will be assessed on its merits in relation to a set of criteria for suitability in the new facility. The Men's Shed is not seen as a suitable use for the refurbished community facility.

Council has been working closely with the Men's Shed since 2013 to help them find a suitable site for relocation in the local area. Council has offered to set up a lease arrangement on another site in Manly with more long-term tenure security for the group; however, the Men's Shed have since declined the offer.

Council values the contribution the Men's Shed makes to the local community and will continue to support them to identify suitable alternative locations.

Thank you for bringing your concerns to Council's attention.

NOTED

ADJOURNMENT:

186/2014-15

At that time, 7.13pm, it was resolved on the motion of Councillor Kim MARX, seconded by Councillor Fiona KING, that the meeting adjourn for a period of one hour, to commence only when all councillors had vacated the Chamber and the doors have been locked.

Council stood adjourned at 7.15pm.

UPON RESUMPTION:

CONSIDERATION OF NOTIFIED MOTION – Infrastructure Agreements:

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

187/2014-15

The Chairman of Council (Councillor Margaret de WIT) then drew the Councillors' attention to the notified motion listed on the agenda, and called on Councillor Shayne SUTTON to move the motion. Accordingly, Councillor SUTTON moved, seconded by Councillor Helen ABRAHAMS, that—

This Council:

- *Condemns the decision to cover up an Infrastructure Agreement signed by Brisbane City Council with a land owner for a significant site at Upper Kedron.*
- *Acknowledges that keeping this Infrastructure Agreement secret from residents has created doubt about the transparency and fairness of Brisbane City Council's development assessment process.*
- *Asks the Lord Mayor to direct the Chief Executive Officer to make the necessary changes to Council's development assessment policies and procedures, to ensure Infrastructure Agreements relevant to particular parcels of land in Brisbane are included in the information uploaded onto PD Online for any development application lodged for that land and this is done as soon as the Infrastructure Agreement has been signed or, in the case of pre-existing Infrastructure Agreements, as soon as the Development Application is deemed property made.*

Chairman:

Is there any debate?

Councillor SUTTON:

Yes, Madam Chair. I think it's clear to everybody in this Council that this relates to the land at Mount Nebo Road, Upper Kedron, which is the Cedar Woods development that has been the subject of considerable debate in this Chamber for a number of weeks. I guess the first point that I want to address is obviously the first point of the motion. I believe there has been an active decision made by this current LNP Administration to cover up the existence of the infrastructure agreement signed between Brisbane City Council and the landowner for this particular land.

That is what I believe based on everything that I have seen on this development application and this development to date. Myself, Councillor DICK, Councillor ABRAHAMS have asked several questions to the LORD MAYOR about this development application. We have brought a previous motion to debate in this Council about it. In that debate, I referenced the provisions of the previous City Plan and the Upper Kedron local plan. I asked Councillor COOPER at the neighbourhood planning and development assessment meeting in the presence of the two local councillors that cover that area or are in close proximity to that area.

Not one of them, at any time, disclosed the existence of this infrastructure agreement. Not even in the height of the debate, when I was calling for this application to be sent out to independent assessment did they—and when I was referencing the maps in the local area plan, did any of them stand up and say, actually, it won't be assessed under that provision. It will be assessed according to the provisions of the infrastructure agreement.

That, in my view, is lying by omission. That is my view. You may not agree with it, but in my opinion, that is an active decision made by the LNP councillors in this place to not disclose this information. To me, that is the equivalent of lying by omission to the residents concerned about this development and lying to this Chamber. They are serious allegations, Councillor BOURKE. You know what? You might want to ooh and aah over there, but you know what? I wouldn't say it if I didn't believe it wholeheartedly.

If you want to contest it, my challenge to you is to enter the debate and get up and challenge it. You explain to the people of Brisbane, if none of your counterparts will, why you made the decision to keep that infrastructure agreement secret. Why the local residents living over there have found it, stumbled across it, when it was uploaded on some obscure federal government website. Let's be frank about this. That is the only reason why—a chance Google search in the middle of the night by a resident that is passionate about representing the area is what brought to light the existence of this infrastructure agreement.

That is not good enough and our city demands higher standards in our development processes. I have said from day one, when it came to this application, this is a question of integrity in our planning system. To me, this Administration has got no integrity left when it comes to assessing this development application. The fact that they have kept this infrastructure agreement secret has created doubt about the transparency and about the fairness of Brisbane City Council's development assessment process.

That is before we start factoring in the knowledge that we know now that is on the public record that Ian Macallister has donated extensively to the LNP Team Quirk Forward Brisbane Leadership Fund, as has Joy Macallister, as has Institutional Investments Proprietary Limited. So then when you factor that in, and then when you factor in the significant increase in the value of Mr Macallister's land after that infrastructure agreement was signed, I think most reasonable people would start to form a view that there was some back story here that isn't being told.

That is my concern and that is the concern of the residents living in the local area. Now, I invite members of the LNP Council here tonight to stand up and have a debate about those facts, because that's what they are. I'm not making it up. I'm not alleging this. These are facts, as have been reported in the media; as have been publicly disclosed through the laws that govern this state in terms of political donations. But when you add all of things together, they do raise concerns for most reasonable people and on behalf of those reasonable people, many of them who are living out there in The Gap, who haven't got a voice on this issue at the moment they are asking those questions.

Those questions deserve answers and I am raising those here in this Chamber on their behalf, because their local councillor is refusing to do so. Then when you take it a step further and consider the information that came to light today about the new protocols that Brisbane City Council has shepherded in about not putting sensitive information up on PD Online, rather instead just flagging that there might be sensitive information and encouraging officers to have a verbal conversation, so that there is no record of the conversation and that there is no record of what that sensitive information is.

Again, this comes to the integrity of our development assessment process. I can get all the looks and the huffing and puffing as much as you like, but this is about the integrity of the system and this is about being upfront and honest with

the residents of Brisbane about how their development applications in their suburbs and in their streets are being decided. That has implications not just for the Cedar Woods development, not just for Upper Kedron, but for every home in every street in every suburb in this city.

Because I do not want to see a situation where in this town if you pay, you get. I have the view and I am concerned that this is the start of a slippery slope. I am asking. I am begging the LORD MAYOR to come out and put those concerns to rest. I am asking him to release all the information, voluntarily. Don't wait for the RTI. If you've nothing to hide, voluntarily release it. Voluntarily release the emails between your staff, the emails between Councillor COOPER's staff, between Council offices, between representatives of Institutional Investments, between representatives of Cedar Woods.

I have the letter. I have the letter addressed to the directors of Cedar Woods signed by Ian Macallister, attaching the infrastructure agreement, which was actively being discussed as the sale was going on. This letter is a letter signed by Ian Macallister sending the information about the information request to Cedar Woods Properties. He was waiting, waiting with baited breath for this infrastructure agreement to be signed, so he could offload this property for a handsome sum.

I need to ask questions about that. In fact, public standards of integrity and process demand that we ask questions about that. Councillor QUIRK issued me a challenge today about referring the matters to the appropriate authorities. Well, this is your chance to get up and defend and to provide the information. Otherwise, that referral will happen, because questions need to be asked. If you won't take the questions from the—

- Chairman: Councillor SUTTON. Your—
- Councillor SUTTON: —opposition and the residents—
- Chairman: Councillor SUTTON, your time has expired.
- Councillor SUTTON: —somebody else has to investigate.
- Chairman: Resume your seat. Further debate, DEPUTY MAYOR.
- DEPUTY MAYOR: Yes, Madam Chair. Thank you for the opportunity to speak on this motion. Now, Madam Chairman, when a motion like this comes through and all councillors have a look at the wording of it, it is quite clear from the way this is worded that there is a single, very clear intent from putting this motion forward. It is a highly political motion. It is a motion that's full of innuendo, full of, I guess, an effort to smear the creditability of Council, and even the Council officers involved in the process.
- What I wanted to do is just go through and have a look at how the motion is written and exact words that are—
- Councillor JOHNSTON: A point of order, Madam Chairman.
- Chairman: Yes. A point of order against—yes. Councillor JOHNSTON.
- Councillor JOHNSTON: Madam Chairman, Councillor SUTTON has moved this motion before us today. It in no way implies that there is some smear by Councillor SUTTON with respect to the actions of Council officers. The DEPUTY MAYOR's statements are absolutely an inappropriate character attack or reflection on her motives under the rules. I would ask, Madam Chairman, that you direct him to withdraw that comment, because I can't see anything like that in here at all. She certainly didn't say anything like that.
- Chairman: Councillor JOHNSTON—order. Councillor JOHNSTON, I do not uphold your point of order. You sat there in silence while Councillor SUTTON said the things that she said and from what I read of this motion, I agree entirely with what the DEPUTY MAYOR said. DEPUTY MAYOR.
- Councillor JOHNSTON: A point of order, Madam Chairman.

Chairman: Yes, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Madam Chairman, under the rules of procedure, I have asked you to make a ruling on whether or not—

Chairman: I did. I don't uphold your point of order.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Thank you. You just said you agreed with the DEPUTY MAYOR:

Chairman: No. I said—

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes.

Chairman: If you had listened—

Councillor JOHNSTON: Yes.

Chairman: —I said I do not uphold your point of order. You sat there for 10 minutes, yes, and let Councillor SUTTON say what she said and make the accusations that she has made. You said nothing. But the moment the DEPUTY MAYOR got up—

Councillor JOHNSTON: Because, Madam Chair, he's—

Chairman: —you start making accusations.

Councillor JOHNSTON: I didn't make—

Chairman: Resume your—you are on warning. Resume your seat.

Councillor JOHNSTON: What accusations did I make?

Chairman: Resume your seat.

Councillor JOHNSTON: I simply asked for something to be withdrawn under the rules of procedure.

Chairman: And I have said I do not uphold your point of order and you have challenged that. DEPUTY MAYOR.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Thank you, Madam Chairman. If there's any doubt about the intent of this motion, I draw you towards point 2, which talks about the transparency and fairness of Brisbane City Council's development assessment process, which is run by officers. This is not a motion saying about the transparency and fairness of the QUIRK Administration. This is talking about the development process. Councillor SUTTON got up and said that this question—it raises questions about the integrity of the whole process.

That is clearly making a suggestion that is highly inappropriate about the Council officers involved in this process and the assessment process that we use for every development application. That's what's happening here. But let's have a look at the way the motion is written. Point 1, this Council condemns the decision to cover up an infrastructure agreement. The words in here are important. First of all, there's the implication that there was a decision, some kind of decision made. Secondly, that there was a decision to cover up something, specifically the infrastructure agreement.

Now, as a member of Civic Cabinet and a senior member of this Administration, if there was a decision made about this, I would be aware of it. If there was a decision specifically to cover up an infrastructure agreement, I would be aware of it. So I thought, well, as soon as I saw this motion, I thought, maybe it came through Cabinet. Maybe it was a Cabinet decision. Maybe it came through Council. Where was the decision? No infrastructure agreement came through Cabinet. No decision was made, but more importantly, no cover up was made.

Councillor SUTTON essentially admitted that in her comments, where she said a resident stumbled across the infrastructure agreement. If this document is so secret, how come you can Google it? Why can you Google it? If this document is so secret, why can you go into the Council and ask for a copy of it?

Chairman: Order. Councillor NEWTON.

DEPUTY MAYOR: Right.

Chairman:

Order.

DEPUTY MAYOR:

This is the infrastructure agreement here. Let's actually go into some detail about what this infrastructure agreement does, because the way Labor is painting this matter is suggesting that somehow this infrastructure agreement gives development rights. Anyone who has been listening to what Labor has to say would imply, there's some kind of deal being done to give the developer rights. I'll tell you what this infrastructure agreement says and what it does. That is, it takes away development rights. If you read it, and I'll read out the sections here, it does a couple of things.

It makes it clear that this is separate to a development application. This is not a development application. It says on page 2, right in the front, the applicant may in the future make a development application in respect of the development land. It's very clear right up front this is not a development application. This is not a development approval. It goes on to say that this agreement applies only to community purpose infrastructure and is not intended to apply to any other infrastructure, such as transport infrastructure, that may be required as part of the development of the land.

So, really, and Labor won't talk about this, but what this does, and the map attached with the infrastructure agreement clearly points it out, this actually rules out land for development and it rules out approximately 40 per cent of the site that we're talking about. What it says is that if you lodge a development application, you must immediately give us 40 per cent of the land. That's what it says. That's essentially what it's doing. That's 90 hectares of land which come across the Council. So it is taking away development rights on 90 hectares of land, even before any development application is lodged.

So let's be very clear. This is not giving some kind of development rights to anyone. This is taking away rights and this is grabbing 90 hectares of land for the ratepayers of Brisbane, for the Brisbane environment, so that all ratepayers benefit from anything that might happen on this land in the future. We know that Labor opened up this land for development. We know that was their plan. What we've done is we've come in here and even before any development application has been lodged, saved 90 hectares for the people of Brisbane.

How much did that 90 hectares cost Council? Not a cent. Not a cent. That land, because of this development infrastructure agreement is coming across to Council at no cost. So you can make any kind of suggestion, throw the mud, but the reality is let's talk about the facts here and this infrastructure agreement is good for the city and it takes away development rights. That's the important thing. Now, Labor's motion continually refers to this as being secret. As I said before, the document's online. Someone found it very easily, and as I said, you can go into the Council and ask for a copy of this.

Anyone can do that. So there's nothing secret about this document and have you noticed that Labor hasn't actually asked questions about the contents of the document? They're just trying to suggest that it's something dodgy. They haven't actually taken the time to go through it and have a look at it, what it means, what the implications are. They're not interested in that. They're just interested in throwing mud, making political statements and we know why that is. This is all part of the Labor campaign in the Premier's electorate.

It's all about the Premier. We know that's what it's all about—and Kate Jones. So it is disappointing that the Labor party would seek to try and tarnish reputations in this place for political gain, for their desperation to win the seat of Ashgrove and scaring residents, making absolutely outrageous claims and suggestions about the process that we assess development applications; about the process that involves Council officers, who are non-political, who are professional and there to a job; who are qualified to do that job. I think it's just wrong. The whole intent of this is wrong.

It's part of an ongoing campaign. We saw it in question time. We saw every question being full of innuendo, every question part of their campaign. It's quite

clear now that in the lead up to the state election and then subsequently the Council election, what we will get from Labor is more speal, more innuendo, more throwing of mud in this kind of way, but no evidence. No real evidence of any inappropriate action. No evidence that they could come to the CMC or the CCC, depending on what you call it.

The reality is this is exactly like the lead up to the last state election, where the Labor party ran a series of highly negative personal attack ads on the Premier and his family. When they were asked by journalists in the lead up to the election, well, do you have any proof? The Premier, Anna Bligh, at the time admitted, no. We don't have any proof. We saw what happened—

Chairman: Order.

DEPUTY MAYOR: We saw what happened. The people of Queensland—

Chairman: Councillor—

DEPUTY MAYOR: —told Labor what they thought about their negative smear tactics and I am afraid, if you continue down that path, they will do the same thing again. By going down this path in Ashgrove, I think you will guarantee that you will lose that seat, because people can see through this rubbish and for what it really is, which is an attempt to smear good people, such as the Council officers who work in our development assessment team. So this Administration will not be voting in support of this motion and we condemn Labor for putting it up in the first place.

Chairman: Further debate, Councillor ABRAHAMMS.

Councillor ABRAHAMMS: Thank you, Madam Chair. Madam Chair, I wish to respond to the comments from the DEPUTY MAYOR and I will start off where he finished off. Madam Chair, this motion is about transparency, honesty and integrity of the existing Administration and it has failed miserably. It has not got anything, except indirectly, to do with Labor and what is happening with Labour out there. It is our role as opposition to highlight what is totally inappropriate in terms of decisions that have been made regarding this site.

Now, Madam Chair, I know when I speak in this Chamber I am talking about policy and I am talking politically. I make no apology for that. So why would the DEPUTY MAYOR start by saying this is political? Well, I hope it is. That's what the Chamber is about. That's what we're here for. The next thing the DEPUTY MAYOR said was that Councillor SUTTON was passing smear on the Council officers. Well, Madam Chairman, those that have been in a chairperson's role in Council knows that it is not the Council officers that have the smear, but the chairperson themselves and the Cabinet, because they have to be aware of the decisions of officers.

Even if they don't, they still take responsibility of it and make sure there is due process. So let us be quite clear when we are raising concerns about the transparency of this decision, we are talking directly with Civic Cabinet. It has got nothing to do with Council officers. The next—not true? I'm sorry. You need to look at some of the issues where it comes to accountability in local government. The next issue that was raised by Councillor SCHRINNER was that there was no decision. Now, I just found that overwhelmingly. We have an agreement that is signed by Council and is signed by a landowner and yet that is not a decision? Give me a break.

What are we talking about here? The next issue was that that decision could not possibly be a cover up, because it didn't come to Cabinet. Well, nothing gets worse than there has been a decision made, signed by someone representing Council, with a proper owner, and Civic Cabinet doesn't know about it, so that means either the LORD MAYOR is acting by himself or someone in Civic Cabinet is not even doing what is the basic accountability, because they're all accountable. Civic Cabinet is accountable. The LORD MAYOR's accountable.

So for them to say nothing came to Civic Cabinet, therefore it didn't exist, means Civic Cabinet has been kept in the dark. Then the next issue Councillor SCHRINNER came up with was the real corker. Because it was found on a website, that means it's open to the public and everyone knows about it. I'm sorry. Was that website a Council website? Was that website a Council development website?

Was that a website that anyone who's thinking about even trying to understand what's going on this site would go to to see whether they could inform themselves, because they're not going to be given proactive information by that administration. No. It wasn't. It was tucked away on a federal government website and I'm still shaking my head to try and work out what the federal government has actually got to do in this site. But that is really not the issue.

Then Councillor SCHRINNER says we haven't asked questions about what is inside this agreement. Inherently he said we're going to have an agreement. It means nothing.

Well, nothing could be further from the truth. Madam Chair, I would like every councillor on the other side of the Chamber to have a look at what I show before you. You can see pink for emerging area and green for the environmental values. The no-grow areas. That is in the local plan for this site. That is what has been a transparent process with the community. That is what they expect on the site. You can see the site is here with all of that green. May I show you what the equivalent plan in the agreement gives you.

Now, I would suggest, if it's 40 per cent of green space, I will have to accept that. But that means that must have been 60 per cent green space was to be delivered by the neighbourhood plan and so Council has given, through an agreement that is in the ether, which no one in Civic Cabinet knows about, Council has given the developer significant increase in the footprint of the development on this site. Not only that. I haven't looked through the agreement in full, but I did go out to a public meeting.

At that public meeting, it was clear enough to see that in the local plan, even within that pink area, some of the sites on the high slopes were such that they were 2,000 square metres and a building envelope, so that the rising steep vegetated area behind the building would be protected. Look at this. Not only have you got a footprint without a solid area, those fingers of green space will just become weed invested corridors, because you have a fringe area of at least 10 metres. But as well as that, in those sites that were once 2,000 square metres, they are now down to 800 and 1,000 square metres.

So the allotments have decreased. Do you know what that means? That means higher density. Do you know what that means? The community that understood through the ward or any neighbourhood planning process actually thought they knew what was intended in this site. But unknown to them and apparently unknown to Civic Cabinet, there is a binding, legal agreement on this site, which will be used when a development application is presented.

The final thing that the DEPUTY MAYOR said is that it is separate from the development application. The agreement isn't the development application. The agreement isn't the development approval. Well, we actually understand that on this side of the Chamber, but we certainly know when you're a developer and you've got a legal document that gives you higher density and a greater footprint than what the local plan comes in, guess what will be the first paragraph of their development application? Consistent with the agreement signed on this day, we are going for this higher density, high increase and the community has no say.

The community has been locked out of this process. The community has been kept in the dark through silence. Now, DEPUTY MAYOR, you use silence just as well in your speech. You concentrated on information that actually wasn't specifically relevant to this agreement; that didn't tell the whole story. So what you have done to the community, you are now trying to do in the Chamber and it is totally inappropriate. This agreement has locked Council, signed by someone

unknown, according to the DEPUTY MAYOR, into a legal agreement that they cannot get away from. The community has been locked out.

This is shameful. For this to happen can only ask one question. Why didn't anyone know about it? Why was it just by absolutely opportunism that the public found and can reveal this highly non-integrity situation? Why would we even believe, for one minute, that something that no one knew about could possibly be good? If it were good, you should be telling us. If you hide it, we know there is more detail that we probably will only find out when the development comes in. Whenever people are seeing a process that is not transparent in the world of politics, in the level of government where land deals are most likely, people only ask the question, is this smelly?

If it looks smelly, it probably is smelly. That's our allegation.

Chairman:

Further debate, Councillor COOPER.

Councillor COOPER:

Thank you very much, Madam Chair. I rise to enter the debate. This is the second go-round for the Australian Labor Party on this particular matter. It's something that apparently they're not interested in the facts and I think it is always important to actually look at the facts of the matter. So it was actually the South East Queensland Regional Plan that created an opportunity to see development on that land.

Chairman:

Order.

Councillor COOPER:

We note Councillor ABRAHAMS is querying that. Well, the fact of the matter is that there was a Regional Plan. There was a Regional Plan in 2005 that zoned the site into two sites. The eastern precinct in the urban footprint, while the western precinct is not and was zoned rural production and regional landscape values. Then, in April 2009, the state government, the then Australian Labor Party state government received a submission from the landowner asking for the whole of the site to be put into the urban footprint. Then, only three months later, Madam Chairman, what should appear in the new document?

Yes. The state government places the whole of the site into the urban footprint. I quote the state government saying in that document, quote, although Brisbane's broad hectare land supplies are becoming exhausted, new areas are located at Rochedale, Lower Oxley Creek and Upper Kedron. Developing these areas will deliver approximately 30,000 dwellings in the short and medium term.

So that was a fact, Madam Chair, of the outcome. I also note we had Premier Anna Bligh, so there was no secret about the state government's intentions.

Chairman:

Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor COOPER:

There was no doubt about the state government's intentions over this block, because on 4 June 2008, then Premier Anna Bligh tells the Queensland state parliament, and I'm quoting, when I was Treasurer and Minister for Infrastructure last year, I commissioned a review of greenfield area within the urban footprint that could be brought to market faster. The review found that there were 12 sites that we believe should be market ready. They are Maroochydore and Meridian Plains on the Sunshine Coast, Market Drive and North Lakes in Moreton Bay, Upper Kedron and Rochedale in Brisbane.

Fact 2008. That was the decision of the then premier, Anna Bligh. She specifically nominated this site for further development. So there's no secret that it was the state Labor government who created an opportunity here, Madam Chair. Very, very apparent. So, in fact, there was a development application that was lodged on 26 June this year to master plan the whole site.

Councillor JOHNSTON:

A point of order, Madam Chairman.

Councillor COOPER:

That was lodged—

Chairman:

A point of order, Councillor COOPER. Yes, Councillor JOHNSTON.

Councillor JOHNSTON: Madam Chairman, I appreciate the history lesson from Councillor COOPER, but this motion is about the infrastructure agreement. It is about making sure that there are changes to Council policy to provide for some transparency in the way they've dealt with. It's not this is what Anna Bligh did 10 years ago versus whatever happened. It's about the infrastructure agreement. I would appreciate it if you could draw Councillor COOPER to the motion before us.

Chairman: Councillor JOHNSTON, I believe what Councillor COOPER is saying is very relevant to the motion in front of us and I do not uphold your point of order. Thank you, Councillor COOPER.

Councillor COOPER: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. Because, Madam Chair, this motion is all founded on a principle suggesting there is a secret deal. There is no secrecy. There is absolute transparency and there was clearly a commitment made by the previous state Labor government to see this site be redeveloped in some way, shape or form. So Council actually received an application on 30 June 2013 to master plan the area. That was made under the Australian Labor Party's own City Plan. The application was put on to PD Online. That system was implemented by the Administration.

The then Lord Mayor Campbell Newman implemented that on 31 March 2007, where they implemented a specific measure to allow for transparency and accountability for these things, so that people can access them 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Under the Labor Party, Madam Chair, you had to come in. You had to come in and manually go through the files, as you would well recall, Madam Chair. You had to search and search for information. It was not accessible sitting in your PJs at 3am perusing the files of Brisbane City Council.

So it's clear that the process itself is fundamentally transparent and accountable. Indeed, in terms of the infrastructure agreement, it specifically says on the Council website that if you want a copy of an infrastructure agreement, you can purchase it at the Regional Business Centres. A CD of the agreement will be posted within 48 hours and is subject to a fee per agreement. Now, Councillor SUTTON herself is well aware of these facts, because there was an infrastructure agreement prepared for the Seven Hills TAFE site in her own ward. That was made before the application was decided.

She indeed asked for a copy of that infrastructure agreement and we had a briefing for her as a local councillor would have in relation to that matter. I, myself, provided a copy to the councillor. I've got an email from her thanking me for providing her with a copy of that particular matter. So this is nothing new, Madam Chair, and we have seen—

Chairman: Councillor SUTTON.

Councillor COOPER: —we have seen executed agreements both in relation to an application at Acacia Ridge in I believe Councillor Milton DICK's ward and we have seen the Seven Hills site in Councillor SUTTON's ward were these infrastructure agreements have been put in place very specifically.

Both Councillor SUTTON and Councillor ABRAHAMS are on the Neighbourhood Planning and Development Assessment Committee, so they will play a role in reviewing and voting on this matter.

They have, and I would expect, should actually understand the process of infrastructure agreements, which has been put in place for many, many years and in fact pre-dated this Administration, Madam Chair. So there's nothing new about this process, and in fact they have never raised any objection to this process in previous matters.

So it was very clear and it was well pointed out by the DEPUTY MAYOR that this agreement is a completely separate process from the development application. It's available to anyone who asks to get a copy, so their fundamental principles are fundamentally flawed which is not unusual.

So under SPA, under the state government's—the previous state government's own legislation an IA can be signed at any time. It can be lodged before a development application is lodged, during an application or post an application.

Madam Chair, it's interesting that there's so much confected outrage about this matter, but not one single member of the Australian Labor Party has actually even sought a copy of the infrastructure agreement. Indeed, Councillor ABRAHAMS said that she was—

Councillors interjecting.

Chairman: Order.

Councillor COOPER: —Councillor ABRAHAMS made a comment saying that she wasn't—what have I got here—she said that she hasn't looked at the agreement in detail. I would suggest she probably hasn't even looked at it at all, Madam Chair, from the quality of her debate here this afternoon.

Councillor ABRAHAMS: Point of order, Madam Chair?

Chairman: Point of order against you Councillor COOPER.

Councillor ABRAHAMS: Claim to be misrepresented.

Chairman: I don't see how from what Councillor COOPER has said, but you'd better explain later. Councillor COOPER?

Councillor COOPER: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. So there is absolutely no substance to the comments that have been made in this Chamber. There is no evidence because if there was evidence I would suggest that they should bring it forward and make it very, very clear what that evidence is.

This is absolutely pure conjecture on the part of the Labor Party. All they want to do is create a political football. They want to kick it around; they want to particularly continue to make these unproven baseless allegations that are fundamentally on a principle of saying that an infrastructure agreement is allowing development when it clearly does not.

Madam Chair, there is no evidence to support these points that have been brought forward by the Labor Party. If they had any evidence we would have heard it well and truly. We should have heard it absolutely here this evening.

We have got clear evidence that the infrastructure agreement itself rules out 40 per cent of the site for development, saying that it actually is a restricting legal agreement that sits over that site, and then there is a development application process that must be gone through.

Councillor SUTTON—sorry Councillor ABRAHAMS suggested that there was no opportunity for the community to make comment. Well I think the community certainly have had an opportunity. There have been many submissions made on this matter, and I think it is clear that there is a clear and transparent process that we'll be going through.

It will go to committee, it will come to full Council, everyone will have an opportunity to understand it.

188/2014-15

Motion be now put

It was moved by Councillor Amanda COOPER, seconded by the DEPUTY MAYOR, that the motion be now put. Upon being submitted to the Chamber, the motion, that the motion be now put, was declared **carried** on the voices.

Councillors interjecting.

Councillor JOHNSTON: There's more debate, Madam Chair.

Chairman: It has been moved by—

Councillor JOHNSTON: There's more debate please.
Chairman: It has been moved by—
Councillor JOHNSTON: Don't gag this, it's too important.
Chairman: DEPUTY MAYOR can I have a motion for the suspension of Councillor JOHNSTON for eight days please.

Motion for suspension of Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON:

189/2014-15

The DEPUTY MAYOR moved, seconded by Councillor Angela OWEN-TAYLOR, that Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON be suspended from the service of Council for a period of 8 days.

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

Councillor JOHNSTON: Division, Madam Chairman, and I'd appreciate a seconder please.
Chairman: Councillor JOHNSTON please leave the meeting place. You are suspended from this meeting and all meeting places for a period of eight days.
I was in the middle of going through the suspension. There is no division, please leave the Chamber.
Councillor JOHNSTON: There is a division. I called a division and it's been seconded by Councillor SUTTON, Madam Chairman.
Chairman: I was in the middle of calling the motion—
Councillor JOHNSTON: I immediately called a division and it's been seconded.
Chairman: Leave the Chamber.
Councillor JOHNSTON: That is the standard process, Madam Chairman. I have called a division.
Chairman: You were warned and warned. You were formally warned and you were warned a number of times after that. Leave the Chamber. Leave the Chamber.
Councillor JOHNSTON: I am not saying I won't leave, I'm saying I called a division, Madam Chairman.
Chairman: Leave the Chamber.
Councillor JOHNSTON: I've called a division and it's been seconded. Why are you refusing to allow me to vote on my expulsion here today? I have called a division in line with the Rules of Procedures, it has been seconded by another councillor in this place, Madam Chairman, and you must allow the division to proceed under the Rules of Procedure.
Chairman: Leave the Chamber.
Councillor JOHNSTON: There must be a division. You must recognise the call for a division in the Meetings Subordinate Local Law and to fail to do so is ejecting me without exercising the proper rights under the Rules of Procedure in this place. Will you allow the division to proceed because I have called for one and it has been seconded?
Chairman: You were calling out in the middle of my making—explaining that motion. That is against the rules Councillor JOHNSTON. It's handy how you use the rules to your advantage, but you forget about them when it suits you.
When the Chairman speaks you don't speak. You should know that rule. Now your division does not count.
Councillor JOHNSTON: Madam Chairman, I called for a division which is the process after you called for—
Chairman: You were in the middle—I was in the middle of speaking, leave the Chamber.

Councillor JOHNSTON: I called for a division. Just one question then seeing I can't debate, Madam Chairman, but if it's so true that Councillor SCHRINNER said this is good for Brisbane, why on earth—why on earth did he not announce it at the time.

Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON then exited the Chamber.

Councillor ABRAHAMS: Misrepresentation, Madam—

Chairman: Yes Councillor ABRAHAMS?

Councillor ABRAHAMS: Thank you, Madam Chair. Councillor COOPER said that she alleged that I did not read the agreement. I was very clear; I said I hadn't read it in detail, but I certainly read the plans and I certainly read the density. So, Madam Chair, Councillor COOPER was deliberately misleading the Chamber and misrepresenting me—

Chairman: Oh Councillor ABRAHAMS I think that's going a bit far. I'd ask you to withdraw that. Councillor COOPER was not deliberately misleading the Chamber. Councillor ABRAHAMS I object to that comment.

Councillor ABRAHAMS: Well of course, Madam Chair, I do respect your position.

Chairman: Thank you.

Councillor ABRAHAMS: But if I'm told I haven't read something and I have read something and I wish to get up and redress that, I think I am entitled to say—

Chairman: You are quite entitled to. You were given that opportunity, and you were correcting what Councillor COOPER said, but I think to make an accusation such as you had made is not acceptable.

Councillor ABRAHAMS: I understand that—

Chairman: Thank you.

Councillor ABRAHAMS: —but it may be—me to wonder why Councillor COOPER thought she knew what I meant—

Chairman: Look you can wonder all you like Councillor ABRAHAMS. You have made your point of misrepresentation, it is in the record and we'll move on. Councillor SUTTON would you like to sum up?

Councillor SUTTON: Madam Chair, Councillor COOPER moved that the motion be put. I was seeking to move a division on that motion, but we were sidelined with Councillor JOHNSTON's expulsion. With your indulgence, I would still like to move a motion—I would still like to move that—sorry, I would still like to call a division on that motion to put the motion on Councillor COOPER's—

Chairman: Alright, alright, in the circumstances I will allow it because I could not hear what you were saying.

Councillor SUTTON: Thank you for your indulgence. Yes.

Chairman: So this is the motion—that the motion be put. It has been voted on and the ayes have it.

Councillor SUTTON: I would like to move a division.

Chairman: You're calling a division.

Councillor SUTTON: Call a division sorry.

Chairman: Okay.

Thereupon, Councillors Shayne SUTTON and Helen ABRAHAMS rose and called for a division, which resulted in the motion being declared **carried**.

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 15 - DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER, and Councillors Krista ADAMS, Matthew BOURKE, Amanda COOPER, Margaret de WIT, Vicki HOWARD, Fiona KING, Geraldine KNAPP, Kim MARX, Peter MATIC, Ian McKENZIE, David McLACHLAN, Angela OWEN-TAYLOR, Julian SIMMONDS and Andrew WINES.

NOES: 5 - Councillors Helen ABRAHAMS, Peter CUMMING, Kim FLESSER, Victoria NEWTON and Shayne SUTTON.

Resolution to continue the meeting after the automatic seven hour adjournment

190/2014-15

The Chairman then advised the Chamber that as it was nearing 9pm, the meeting would automatically stand adjourned unless it was agreed to continue the sitting. She put the question of whether it was the will of Council that the meeting continue past 9pm, and the meeting voted in favour of the continuation of the meeting until all business had been completed.

Chairman: Councillor SUTTON would you like to sum up?

Councillor SUTTON: Yes, Madam Chair, I'd like to sum up on this motion and respond to a number of the points made by the DEPUTY MAYOR and Councillor COOPER during the debate.

There are a couple of things that I want to focus on in particular, and I have to say and listening to both of them I have to tell them in my view you need to stop drinking the Cool Aid because when you were speaking the *Eagles* song *Desperado* came to mind, because that is the level of debate that was offered up here, particularly by the DEPUTY MAYOR tonight.

The DEPUTY MAYOR spoke about the development process quote, "being run by officers". I accept that for a lot of development applications the process is run by officers. However, I am asking him right now to get up and do a general business speech and put on the public record that at no time—at no time—in his career in this Council has he ever participated in any discussion about any development application or the general direction about any development application in this city.

That Councillor COOPER never meets with her planning officers to discuss the direction of development applications; that there has never been a planning guidance-style meeting that members of the Civic Cabinet have participated under this Administration, because we know that happens.

We know that Councillor COOPER meets with her officers and talks about high level strategic development applications and expresses a view and a preference about how those development applications will go.

They also have the tools, the levers of government, at their disposal to set policy and parameters, like the new City Plan, like the new policy, that has just recently been implemented about keeping sensitive information off the file. They have the ability to implement such policies that govern the way in which Council officers work.

So to say that the development process is not political in any way, shape or form is nothing but desperate spin by the DEPUTY MAYOR, who knows—they have their back up against a wall with this development application. He knows they've been found out and he is trying to do everything possible to blow smoke in another direction.

That brings me to the spurious arguments of Councillor COOPER and the LORD MAYOR earlier today where they seek to lay the blame for this fairly and squarely at the feet of the former state Labor Government. That good old whipping horse that they bring out every single time they need to find somebody else to blame.

But Councillor COOPER just said Anna Bligh stood up in Parliament in 2008 and made a speech that identified Upper Kedron as an area to go within the urban footprint. That was six years ago, six years ago, Madam Chair.

Now my question to Councillor COOPER and the LORD MAYOR and the DEPUTY MAYOR is this: what have you done to look at this site in an open and transparent way with rigorous community engagement and consultation, maybe via a neighbourhood plan, to deal with the future of this site?

What have you done? When have you allocated the resources for a neighbourhood plan? Oh, what? What? Someone might say do a neighbourhood plan for The Gap, some might say. What? What? No one's ever raised that proposal surely? Oh no wait they did. The residents campaigned for a neighbourhood plan for the Gap and what did this Administration do? They said no. They said no!

Don't you point your pen at me Councillor KNAPP, through you, Madam Chair, you said no. That would have been the ideal opportunity to deal with this land parcel, to respond to Premier Anna Bligh's comments. That would have been—

Councillor COOPER: Point of order, Madam Chair?

Chairman: Point of order against you Councillor SUTTON. Yes, Councillor COOPER?

Councillor COOPER: I just wanted to clarify that that is not the case. We actually did agree to do a neighbourhood plan for that—

Chairman: Thank you Councillor COOPER. Thank you.

Councillor SUTTON: When? Dragged kicking and screaming, kicking and screaming—

Councillors interjecting.

Chairman: Order.

Councillor SUTTON: You said you'd consider doing it—

Chairman: Order.

Councillor SUTTON: There is no commitment. There is no commitment. There is a 'we will think about it after the next election-style commitment'. After Councillor KNAPP has sailed off into the sunset into whatever retirement village she chooses to buy a unit in after the next Council election. That is what you have committed to.

The residents of The Gap have been campaigning for a neighbourhood plan which would have been the ideal way to deal with this site in an open transparent manner, and no, rather than—

Councillors interjecting.

Councillor SUTTON: —rather than take any action, rather than deal with it in an open and transparent—

Chairman: Order. Councillor SUTTON—

Councillors interjecting.

Chairman: Councillor KNAPP. Councillor KNAPP withdraw that comment. Turn your microphone on and withdraw the comment.

Councillor KNAPP: At your direction, Madam Chair.

Chairman: Thank you, Councillor KNAPP. Now could we have just a little bit of decorum in this place. Councillor SUTTON?

Councillor SUTTON: Well, Madam Chair, for them to have the gall to try to blame the former state Labor Government for this is symptomatic of this Administration that is clearly believing its own spin.

Chairman: Councillor SUTTON your time has expired. I will put the motion.

Upon being submitted to the Chamber by the Chairman, the motion was declared **lost** on the voices.

Thereupon, Councillors Peter CUMMING and Helen ABRAHAMS immediately rose and called for a division, which resulted in the motion being declared **lost**.

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 5 - Councillors Helen ABRAHAMS, Peter CUMMING, Kim FLESSER, Victoria NEWTON and Shayne SUTTON.

NOES: 16 - DEPUTY MAYOR, Councillor Adrian SCHRINNER, and Councillors Krista ADAMS, Matthew BOURKE, Amanda COOPER, Margaret de WIT, Vicki HOWARD, Steven HUANG, Fiona KING, Geraldine KNAPP, Kim MARX, Peter MATIC, Ian MCKENZIE, David McLACHLAN, Angela OWEN-TAYLOR, Julian SIMMONDS and Andrew WINES.

PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS:

Chairman: Councillors are there any petitions? Councillor SUTTON?

Councillor SUTTON: Thank you, Madam Chair. I have two petitions to present; one is calling for the construction of a roundabout at the intersection of Molloy Road and Richmond Road, Morningside, and the second one is further petitions requesting Council to install a skate facility in Balmoral.

Chairman: Further petitions? Councillor ABRAHAMS?

Councillor ABRAHAMS: Thank you, Madam Chair. I have a significant petition from residents of West End in the vicinity of Victoria Street and I have almost 1,600 signatures on a petition requesting more time for community input in the Kurilpa Master Plan. Thank you.

Chairman: Further petitions? Councillor WINES?

Councillor WINES: Madam Chairman, I have a report that was provided—a petition from residents of Enoggera about a traffic concern. It was provided electronically and this is a printout. Do you want the original or is the printout fine?

Chairman: The original or printout? So it's a written petition as well as being an ePetition?

Councillor WINES: Yes. For all purposes it is a full petition except that it's a printout.

Chairman: Okay.

Councillor WINES: I can get the original.

Chairman: If you can sign it and endorse it please, yes, thanks.

Any further petitions? Councillor MARX?

191/2014-15

It was resolved on the motion of Councillor Ryan MURPHY, seconded by Councillor Victoria NEWTON, 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
CA14/875282	Shayne Sutton	Requesting that Council fund the construction of a roundabout at the intersection of Molloy and Richmond Roads, Morningside
CA14/875696	Shayne Sutton	Requesting that Council install a skate facility in parkland located on Thynne Road, Balmoral, between the Balmoral Ambulance Station and the Bulimba Bowls Club

CA14/875889	Helen Abrahams	Requesting that Council support the petitioners request calling on the Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning, to extend the consultation period for the Kurilpa Riverfront Renewal Draft Master Plan to the end of June 2015
CA14/875982	Helen Abrahams	Requesting that Council install traffic measures to improve safety for pedestrians when crossing Montague Road, in the vicinity of Victoria Street, West End
CA14/876069	Andrew Wines	Requesting that Council address issues of rat-running through Laruma Street, Enoggera, and corner-cutting of both Laruma and Chathams Post Street, Enoggera

GENERAL BUSINESS:

Chairman: Councillors are there any matters of general business? Councillor ABRAHAMMS?

Councillor ABRAHAMMS: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm going to—

Chairman: Your microphone. You have the floor.

Councillor ABRAHAMMS: Madam Chair, I hear complaints of people against my getting up and having a say, but this is the only forum—it is the only forum—

Chairman: You have the floor, ignore them.

Councillor ABRAHAMMS: Thank you. I will be very brief but I want to make some fairly succinct points on the draft Kurilpa master plan.

This was a master plan which the community was given six weeks to comment on allegedly because other planning documents served for the consultation. I would have to say the other strategies weren't well known within the community, specifically the River Edge Strategy and the City Centre Master Plan yet this was a reason why only six weeks was given for the consultation process of the last remaining inner-city Riverbank and the redevelopment of that.

This 25 hectares along the river is probably some of the most prime real estate because it has a north-east aspect, a northerly aspect to the river. The reason Council is going through this process is because the development industry is very clearly wanting to redevelop this site.

Essentially that process is for 11,000 residents, 8,000 workers in an area of 25 hectares. There is an existing parkland that is approximately 60 metres wide along the river and it will be augmented by two small parks of 0.3 hectare and one hectare in size; a small 0.5 hectare area under the rail viaduct for recreational purposes; two small public venues, one within an existing park and the transport that is proposed is to create two new additional bus stations, a re-routing of an existing bus service, and private water taxi pontoons.

Madam Chair, that infrastructure for 11,000 people where the current City Plan proposes 6,000 people is inadequate by any criteria. I argue very strongly that this site is such a one-off site, it is such a unique purpose, that it should have, as South Bank did and as the urban renewal in Teneriffe New Farm—it should have government investment at a state government and a federal government, so that the development is not involved in all of the land value capture. There is a need for public sector investment into this area so that the existing industry can be relocated within Brisbane with that government support, as has been demonstrated before.

In arguing that I actually quote from *Smart Growth Unlocking Smart Growth in Australian Capital Cities* undertaken for the Council of Capital City Lord Mayors, and that work was undertaken by Urbis.

Madam Chair, that public funding is the most crucial thing that we need for the development on the Kurilpa site. We have had it in previous areas.

South Bank is renowned of being one of the best urban community cultural parkland areas in the city, and yet right next door when there is an opportunity 20 years later to do the next generation of South Bank, instead of which we have 40 storey tower buildings giving us a mono-culture, a homogeneous culture, of dormitory buildings with no infrastructure. This is absolutely not appropriate and should not proceed.

There are examples even in our city where we have delivered in Teneriffe, in a similar area where there has been a total of 7,000 additional people, but within that area five hectares of parkland have been delivered, not 1.3.

Madam Chair, the only way this Administration is selling the draft Kurilpa master plan is through new parkland, 1.3 hectares of parkland, but why that is so insulting to the community is our City Plan has criteria. It has performance criteria of population and parkland and if that is applied to this site, there should be 19 hectares of parkland in the suburb of South Brisbane just to accommodate the density, the new density, that is proposed in the Kurilpa master plan and the existing increasing population under the current development applications. Nineteen hectares, Madam Chair. We have currently got well less than 50 per cent of that in the South Brisbane suburb.

If we then look at that same standard which is 1.2 hectares per 1000 people and apply it to the 25 hectares of the Kurilpa master plan, there should be in that area a total of 3.6 hectares of—no, 12.3 hectares of parkland, Madam Chair. 12.3 hectares of parkland; instead of which we get 1.3 using Council's criteria.

Madam Chair, it's even worse than that, because that criteria is only for recreational space. It doesn't include sport land. I think that would be excessive so I'm not using that criteria.

Finally, the State Government also has criteria under the South-East Queensland Regional Plan that Councillor COOPER has referred to many times today as if it were the Bible. Well that document in fact also sets implementation guidelines for community infrastructure, and if we look at the population that's proposed in the Kurilpa master plan of the 11,000 people, that would need two primary schools in that 25 hectares.

It would mean just under one high school. It means one kindergarten, one multi-purpose community centre and three neighbourhood centres in that area. Madam Chair, what have we got? One community centre—oh sorry, and maybe a cultural centre, not a community centre.

So, Madam Chair, at every parameter that you can look at to guide smart development, new world city development even, this proposal falls over badly. The architects have spoken out against it; the traffic people have spoken out against it; the development industry is speaking more subtly and quietly but they certainly are not supporting it. This is something that we as a city must be able to say, it was ill-conceived and we must start again.

The final issue—Madam Chair, I know you face it day by day and that's the issue of transport, how you leave your suburb and travel into the city. It will be exactly the same for this area even though it is within walking distance to many areas of our city, because there is—it will be the same problem, it will be the same intensity, and the reason—oh I love the humour—

Councillors interjecting.

Councillor ABRAHAMS:

This is not a long bow; this is the reality of people trying to travel without infrastructure, because my point to you, as I know well, is you would desperately wish more infrastructure. As soon as their community is being built that need for infrastructure will be exactly the same, because that relocated CityGlider that is the only proposal for mass transit for the 11,000 people is going to be driven on the same width of road that is currently between the Go Between Bridge and the Victoria Bridge.

Madam Chair, what is very clear is that we need a designated public transit lane. I'm not predicting because I think we don't need in 15 years what sort of transport would on that, but we need the space for a designated lane and that is not proposed.

In answer to the interaction, it's not more roads, it's more effective use of the existing road—

Chairman: Councillor ABRAHAMS your time has expired.

Councillor ABRAHAMS: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Chairman: Further 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 Victoria Newton (received on 16 October 2014)

- Q1.** Please advise what was the total amount spent by Council on matters considered by the Planning and Environment Court in 2013/14
- Q2.** Please advise what was the total amount spent by Council on matters considered by the Planning and Environment Court in 2012/13
- Q3.** Please advise what was the total amount spent by Council on matters considered by the Planning and Environment Court in 2011/12
- Q4.** Please advise what amount has been budgeted in the 2014/15 financial year to allow Council to deal with matters before the Planning and Environment Court?
- Q5.** Please advise what was the total number of matters determined by the Planning and Environment Court in which Brisbane City Council had an interest in 2013/14
- Q6.** Please advise what was the total number of matters determined by the Planning and Environment Court in which Brisbane City Council had an interest in 2012/13
What was the total number of matters determined by the Planning and Environment Court in which Brisbane City Council had an interest in 2011/12
- Q7.** With regard to the total number of matters determined by the Planning and Environment Court in which Brisbane City Council had an interest in 2013/14, please advise how many were resolved in Council's favour?
- Q8.** Please advise what regard to the total number of matters determined by the Planning and Environment Court in which Brisbane City Council had an interest in 2012/13, how many were resolved in Council's favour?
- Q9.** With regard to the total number of matters determined by the Planning and Environment Court in which Brisbane City Council had an interest in 2012/11, please advise how many were resolved in Council's favour?
- Q10.** Please provide a detailed breakdown of the \$360,739,000 in "capital subsidies and grants" received by Council in the Moving Brisbane Program for the financial year ended 30 June 2014 as noted in the annual financial statements be provided including source (eg state government, federal government etc), program and dollar amount.
- Q11.** Please provide a detailed breakdown of the \$174,791,000 in "Other Income" received by Council in the Moving Brisbane Program for the financial year ended 30 June 2014 as per the annual financial statements be provided including source (eg state government, federal government etc), program and dollar amount.
- Q12.** Can you please advise the number of times and length of time PDOnline has experienced 'systems issues' since 1 January 2014.
- Q13.** Can you please advise the top five system issues with PDOnline since 1 January 2014.
- Q14.** Can you please advise the number of complaints made to Brisbane City Council about PDOnline in:

- 2010/2011
- 2011/2012
- 2012/2013
- 2013/2014
- 2014/2015

Q15. Can you please advise the type of complaint made about PDOnline in

- 2010/2011
- 2011/2012
- 2012/2013
- 2013/2014
- 2014/2015

Q15. Can you please advise the number of times and length of time PDOnline has been taken down for

- scheduled maintenance in
 - 2010/2011
 - 2011/2012
 - 2012/2013
 - 2013/2014
 - 2014/2015
- unscheduled maintenance
 - 2010/2011
 - 2011/2012
 - 2012/2013
 - 2013/2014
 - 2014/2015

Q16. Can you please advise the street address and market value of any lots of land transferred from Brisbane City Council to the City of Brisbane Investment Corporation in:

- 2010/2011
- 2011/2012
- 2012/2013
- 2013/2014
- 2014/2015

Q17. Of the 213 events held in King George Square last financial year, please advise how many bookings were i) Commercial/Corporate; ii) Charitable/Community

Q18. Please advise what was the total hire revenue earned by Brisbane City Council from bookings for events in King George Square last financial year?

Q19. Please provide a list of the top ten individual booking for King George Square in terms of total hire cost and a list of who (which events/ organisations/ businesses) these bookings were for.

Q20. Could you please provide the current approximate amounts of debt carried by:-

- a. Brisbane City Council
- b. Queensland Urban Utilities
- c. Any other Brisbane City Council owned entities?

Q21. In relation to the Legacy Way Tunnel, could you please advise:-

- a. The current expected completion cost (including capitalised interest)
- b. The total cost of all variations since the tunnel construction contract was let
- c. The expected final debt owed by Council for the project
- d. The expected annual toll revenue from the tunnel
- e. The expected initial toll amounts for passenger vehicles
- f. Who are the current owners of the tolling rights for the tunnel?

Submitted by Councillor Nicole Johnston (received on 16 October 2014)

Q1. Would the Deputy Mayor and Chairman of the Infrastructure Committee please provide a list advising the number and (street and suburb) location of pedestrian refuge facilities identified by Council for future construction but not yet funded?

Q2. Would the Deputy Mayor and Chairman of the Infrastructure Committee please provide a list including the (street and suburb) location and date of request for all pedestrian refugees identified as eligible for construction but not yet funded in Tennyson Ward?

- Q3.** Would the Deputy Mayor and Chairman of the Infrastructure Committee please provide the total number of pedestrian and traffic movements for each of the pedestrian refuges funded schedule 2.3.2.2 in the 2014-15 Council budget by location (street and suburb).

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 Victoria Newton (from meeting on 9 September 2014)

- Q1.** Please provide a breakdown of the projects and locations for the 'Restoration for Recreation' \$2.173m capital expenditure under 'Service 1.8.2.1 Closed Landfill Management' in the 2014/2015 Council Budget

PROJECT LOCATION	DETAILS	AMOUNT

A1.

PROJECT LOCATION	DETAILS	AMOUNT
Karawatha Reserve, Karawatha	Capping, leachate connection to sewer, cut-off wall	\$1,450,000
Elanora Park, Wynnum	Foreshore erosion and safety improvements	\$386,000
Purtell Park, Bardon	Connection to sewer	\$250,000
Jack Cook Memorial Park, Taringa	Design and geotech	\$150,000
Jack Cook Memorial Park, Taringa	Construction	\$700,000

- Q2.** Please provide a breakdown of the projects and locations for the 'Stormwater Harvesting' \$6.332m capital expenditure under 'Service 1.5.1.1 Water Smart' in the 2014/2015 Council Budget?

PROJECT LOCATION	DETAILS	AMOUNT

A2.

PROJECT LOCATION	DETAILS	AMOUNT
Ekibin Park, Greenslopes	Design and construction of stormwater harvesting system	\$1,711,705
CB Mott Park, Holland Park	Design and construction of stormwater harvesting system	\$922,520
Whites Hill Reserve, Camp Hill	Design and construction of stormwater harvesting system	\$427,778
Langlands Park, Coorparoo	Design and construction of stormwater harvesting system	\$759,230
Sexton Street Park, Tarragindi	Design and construction of stormwater harvesting system	\$754,667
Norman Park sports precinct, Norman Park	Design and construction of stormwater harvesting system	\$1,398,020

PROJECT LOCATION	DETAILS	AMOUNT
Downey Park sports precinct, Windsor	Design of stormwater harvesting system	\$4,536

- Q3.** Please provide a breakdown of the projects and locations for the 'Metropolitan and District Playgrounds' \$1.016m capital expenditure under 'Service 1.4.3.1 Parks Maintenance and Enhancement' in the 2014/2015 Council Budget?

PROJECT LOCATION	DETAILS	AMOUNT

A3.

PROJECT LOCATION	DETAILS	AMOUNT
Bill Brown Sports Reserve, Fitzgibbon	Playground expansion	\$350,000
Whites Hill Reserve, Camp Hill	Playground expansion	\$470,000
Sandgate Foreshores Park, Sandgate	Lower Moora Park improvements to address erosion issues	\$100,000
Colmslie Beach Reserve, Murarrie	Replacement of timber retaining wall sleepers	\$88,000
Rocks Riverside Park, Seventeen Mile Rocks	Replacement of undersurfacing to playground and equipment replacement	\$400,000
Bacton Road Park, Chandler	Rehabilitation works ahead of playground development	\$150,000
Various Parks	Forward planning	\$89,000

- Q4.** Please provide a breakdown of the projects and locations for the 'Key City Park Upgrades' \$10.436m capital expenditure under 'Service 1.4.2.1 Park Development and Planning' in the 2014/2015 Council Budget?

PROJECT LOCATION	DETAILS	AMOUNT

A4.

PROJECT LOCATION	DETAILS	AMOUNT
Anzac Square	Commence staged refurbishment of the Anzac Square Shrine	\$6,817,000
Rocks Riverside Park	Continue staged development of master plan	\$962,000
City Botanic Gardens	Stage 3 & 4 of 4 stages: Continued upgrade and replacement of underground wiring and conduits for all lighting infrastructure within City Botanic Gardens precinct	\$1,900,000
Cathedral Square	Stages 1 & 2 include all major landscape beds, entry structures and surface finishes (tiles)	\$877,000
Various Parks Central Region	Activation and partnership development projects in key city parks including continuation of existing Chairs 2 Share and Park Bites, projects	\$194,000
Wickham Park, King Edward Park and Observatory Park	Develop Master Plan for Wickham Park, King Edward Park and Observatory Park	\$300,000
City Botanic Gardens	Complete the City Botanic Gardens master	\$90,000

	plan following community consultation	
Victoria Park	Complete master plan following community consultation	\$50,000

- Q5.** Please provide a breakdown of the projects and locations for Clubs and Community Centres Asbestos Management in the 2014/15 Council Budget (4.5.2.1)?

PROJECT LOCATION	DETAILS	AMOUNT

- A5.** *Note: Amounts relating to some projects have not yet been confirmed as scope has not yet been finalised. Additional works may yet be scheduled for this financial year.*

PROJECT LOCATION	DETAILS	AMOUNT
Wynnum State School	Remove asbestos in preparation for refurbishment to occur later in the year	\$150,000
Stephens Croquet Club	Remove asbestos	Scope of works not yet finalised
Te Kohanga Ote Whenua Hou Association, Geebung	Remove asbestos and replace with non-asbestos material	\$30,000
Woodturners Society of Queensland, Greenslopes	Remove asbestos and replace with non-asbestos material	\$30,000
Inala Service Centre – Utility room	Remove asbestos and replace with non-asbestos material	\$20,000
Bellbowrie Kindergarten and Pre-School	Remove asbestos and replace with non-asbestos material	Scope of works not yet finalised
Bardon Community Kindergarten and Pre-School	Remove asbestos and replace with non-asbestos material	\$30,000
Carina Kindergarten and Pre-School	Remove asbestos and replace with non-asbestos material	\$50,000
Cannon Hill Kindergarten and Community Pre-School	Remove asbestos and replace with non-asbestos material	\$80,000
Acacia Ridge Kindergarten and Pre-School	Remove asbestos and replace with non-asbestos material	\$80,000

- Q6.** Please provide a breakdown of the projects and locations for Clubs and Community Centres Compliance Works in the 2014/15 Council Budget (4.5.2.1)?

PROJECT LOCATION	DETAILS	AMOUNT

- A6.** *Funding under this budget item is allocated towards undertaking electrical compliance audits on licensed club and community sites. Works identified from the audits will be undertaken from this budget, however a specific list of works is not available.*

- Q7.** Please provide a breakdown of the projects and locations for Clubs and Community Structural Repairs in the 2014/15 Council Budget (4.5.2.1)?

PROJECT LOCATION	DETAILS	AMOUNT

- A7.**

PROJECT LOCATION	DETAILS	AMOUNT
Balmoral Bowls Club	Ceiling works, floor tiles other maintenance works as part of overall package	\$51,000
O'Callaghan Park, Zillmere	Replacement of ceiling and other works in conjunction with AFL Queensland	\$137,500
Former Scouts facility Kuraby	Works to be undertaken on building handed back to Council prior to EOI process	\$80,000

PROJECT LOCATION	DETAILS	AMOUNT
Kedron Substation	Roof repairs and renovations.	\$95,000
Chermside Bowls Club	Roof repairs	\$120,000
Federal band building	Roof rebuild	\$60,000
Inala Art Gallery	Modify roof, resheet, gutters and downpipes	\$130,000
Bulimba Girl Guides	Roof and gutter repairs	\$9,500
West's RLFC	Address issues from erosion impacting on stumps causing damage to foundations	\$15,000

- Q8.** Please provide a breakdown of the projects and locations for disability access improvements (including DDA compliance) to Libraries in the 2014/15 Council Budget?

PROJECT LOCATION	DETAILS	AMOUNT

A8.

PROJECT LOCATION	DETAILS	AMOUNT
Mt Ommaney Library	Toilet upgrades, hearing loop in meeting room, accessible meeting room kitchenette	\$55,810
Sunnybank Hills, Indooroopilly and Ashgrove Libraries	Hearing loop in meeting rooms	\$24,000

- Q9.** Please provide a breakdown of the projects and locations Community Hall AV Improvement Program in the 2014/15 Council Budget (4.5.2.1)?

PROJECT LOCATION	DETAILS	AMOUNT

- A9.** *Acacia Ridge, Bracken Ridge, New Inala, Old Inala, Northgate, Toombul, Sunnybank and Zillmere Halls will have the installation of a lectern, small PA system, projector and screen. The budgeted cost for these works is \$282,000, including corporate overheads.*

- Q10.** Please provide a breakdown of the projects and locations for Community Halls Maintenance and Rehabilitation in the 2014/15 Council Budget (4.5.2.1)?

PROJECT LOCATION	DETAILS	AMOUNT

- A10.** *Funds are committed for maintenance and rehabilitation on all community halls, amounts vary on the maintenance required and emergent issues through the year.*

Jagera, Old Inala and Bracken Ridge Hall have already been allocated over \$573,000 at the time of responding to this question.

- Q11.** Please provide a breakdown of the projects and locations for Sports Field and Hard Court Condition Rehabilitation in the 2014/15 Council Budget (4.5.3.2)?

PROJECT LOCATION	DETAILS	AMOUNT

A11.

PROJECT LOCATION	DETAILS	AMOUNT
John Goss Park	Rehabilitation of cricket field	\$50,000
Various locations	Irrigation audits and upgrades	\$170,000
Marchant Park	Rehabilitation of cricket field	\$400,000
Shaw Park	Rehabilitation of cricket and hockey fields	\$170,000
Kitchener Park	Rehabilitation of rugby field	\$20,000
Dunmore Park	Rehabilitation of soccer field	\$70,000
Cubberla Creek Park	Rehabilitation of rugby field	\$230,000
Kianawah Park	Rehabilitation of cricket field	\$90,000
Bill Lamond Park	Rehabilitation of Don Randall Oval	\$180,000
Leopardwood Street	Rehabilitation of cricket field	\$80,000

Wakerley Park (Runcorn)	Rehabilitation of soccer field	\$300,000
-------------------------	--------------------------------	-----------

- Q12.** Please provide a breakdown of the projects and locations for the Brisbane Access and Inclusion Plan Implementation in the 2014/15 Council Budget (4.4.1.3)?

PROJECT LOCATION	DETAILS	AMOUNT

- A12.** *A full list cannot be provided as funding through this program includes grants for the 2014/15 financial year which have not yet been awarded. The projects listed below are either completed or approved to proceed with funding from this program.*

PROJECT LOCATION	DETAILS	AMOUNT
Bellbowrie Pool	Level concourse between pools	\$186,000
Jindalee Pool	Improvement to disability parking bay and changing places toilet and hoist	\$47,890
Newmarket Pool	Changing places toilet and hoist, ambulant toilets, levelling concrete concourse, mobile lift chair, carpark adjustments	\$292,800
Yeronga Pool	Changing places toilet and more accessible male and female toilets	\$143,140
Wynnum Hall	Entry works	\$55,000
Qld Blind Cricket Association, Yeronga	Access upgrade	\$132,000
Carina Senior Citizens	Access upgrade	\$403,200
Kingfisher Adult Learning, Geebung	Access upgrade	\$80,400
Hand Learning and Leisure Centre, Wilston	Access Upgrade	\$174,000
Multicap, Kuraby	Access Upgrade	\$86,400
Zillmere AFL Club	New entrance ramp and accessible toilet	\$100,000
George Clayton Band Stand, Wynnum	Ramp access to stage, access improvement to toilets and disability accessible parking bay	\$45,100
Mt. Gravatt Lookout	Improvement to the car parking and viewing area	\$40,000
Sorry sites	Making sorry sites accessible	\$20,000
The Lake parklands, Forest Lake	DDA audit of pathways and implementation of recommendations.	To be determined following audit completion.
Karawatha Forest, Karawatha	Accessible forest trail for Ironbark Circuit	\$200,000

- Q13.** Please provide a complete list of all projects funded with Parks Infrastructure Charges revenue received in the 2013/2014 year including the park, project value and project description and park

PROJECT LOCATION	DETAILS	AMOUNT

- A13.**

PROJECT LOCATION	DETAILS	AMOUNT
Primmer St, Coorparoo	Acquisition of land for future Coorparoo Creek Park	\$540,000
Waterford Rd, Ellen Grove	Acquisition of land for future Ellen Grove District Sports Park	\$1,510,000
Carl Street Park, Woolloongabba	Park embellishments and investigation for future land acquisition	\$64,000
Tryon Street, Upper Mt Gravatt	Acquisition of land for future Mt Gravatt Urban Common	\$1,565,000
Manning St, Milton	Investigations into future acquisition of land for Urban Common	\$5,000

PROJECT LOCATION	DETAILS	AMOUNT
Darien St Park, Bridgeman Downs	Continue upgrade of existing park to District Sporting standard	\$300,000
Boolarra Street Park, Hemmant	Design and construction of new parkland	\$1,400,000
Manly Road, Wakerley	Planning for delivery of future District Sports Park	\$55,000
Hurworth Street Park, Bowen Hills	Local park embellishments	\$13,000
Calamvale District Park, Calamvale	Embellishments to complete District Informal Park	\$375,000
Doolandella District Sports Park	Pre-planning investigations	\$78,000
Bill Brown Sports Reserve south	Additional embellishments to District Informal Park	\$475,000
Bill Brown Sports Reserve north	Pre-planning investigations	\$50,000
Coora Street Park, Wishart	Compensation payment relating to prior land acquisition, and delivery of park embellishments	\$471,000
Ken Fletcher Park, Tennyson	Park construction	\$614,000
Rosedale Sthn District Sports Park	Site clearance and establishment post acquisition	\$147,000
Mt Coot-tha Reserve (Gap Creek)	Upgrade Park visitor facilities	\$264,000
Ducie Street Park, Darra	Embellishments to upgrade Informal Park to District level	\$193,000
Curlew Park, Sandgate	Upgrade park to district standard	\$70,000
Ellen Grove District Informal Park	Site clean-up and establishment post acquisition	\$78,000
Fig Tree Pocket	Infrastructure Agreement	\$185,000

Q14. Please provide a complete list of all projects funded with Parks Infrastructure Charges revenue received in the 2012/2013 year including the park, project value and project description and park

PROJECT LOCATION	DETAILS	AMOUNT

A14.

PROJECT LOCATION	DETAILS	AMOUNT
Presidents Close, Carseldine	Acquisition and embellishment of land to expand and improve existing Cowie Rd Park	\$435,000
Levitt Rd, Upper Kedron	Infrastructure Agreement for future District Sports park	\$306,000
Darien St Park, Bridgeman Downs	Acquisition of land to extend existing sports park	\$282,000
Old Cleveland Road, Coorparoo	Acquisition of land for future Coorparoo Creek Park	\$3,416,000
Calamvale District Park, Calamvale	Construction and Development of District Park	\$831,000
Ducie Street Park, Darra	Embellishments to upgrade Informal Park to District level	\$29,000
Doolandella District Sports Park	Pre-planning investigations	\$27,000
Boolarra St Park, Hemmant	Land remediation and park development	\$470,000
Wakerley	Infrastructure Agreement for various parkland contributions	\$100,000
Mt Coot-tha Reserve (Gap Creek)	Planning and Design for upgrade of Park visitor facilities	\$30,000
Frew Park, Milton	Development of new District Park	\$628,000
23 Bedser St, Macgregor	Acquisition of land for future Park	\$548,000
Richlands District Sports Park	Costs associated with land acquisition for Richlands District Sports Park	\$119,000
Rosedale Southern District	Land acquisition and site clean-up for future	\$7,446,000

PROJECT LOCATION	DETAILS	AMOUNT
Sports Park	district sports park	
Lemke Rd, Taigum	Compensation for prior land acquisition	\$3,214,000
Ken Fletcher Park, Tennyson	Progress contract payment for new park construction	\$1,533,000
Manly Road, Wakerley	Pre planning and investigations for Wakerley District Sports park	\$13,000
West End	Investigations into future land acquisition, West End Urban Common	\$11,000
Coora Street, Wishart	Land Acquisition & Embellishment	\$360,000
Carl Street Park, Woolloongabba	Costs associated with land acquisition for Carl St Park	\$31,000
Fitzgibbon Parklands	Fitzgibbon Parklands Masterplan Implementation	\$48,000

Q15. Please advise what was the total amount of funds spent on Roads maintenance in the following financial years:

- 2012/2013
- 2013/2014
- 2014/2015 (budgeted amount):

A15.

- 2012/2013 65.98 million
- 2013/2014 71.65 million\
- 2014/2015 (budgeted amount): The budget for road resurfacing is listed in the Council budget which is publically available. In addition, reactive road maintenance works are also undertaken based on the road conditions and number of requests Council may receive during the year. This amount varies from year to year, often based on seasonal conditions such as wet weather periods.

Q16. Please advise the top ten suburbs where complaints from residents about rats have been lodged in the 2013/14 year, including information on how many complaints per suburb.

A16.

Inala	25
Sunnybank Hills	25
Moorooka	24
Brighton	20
Bracken Ridge	19
Eight Mile Plains	19
The Gap	18
Wavell Heights	17
Ashgrove	15
Brisbane City	15
Clayfield	15
Paddington	15
Tarragindi	15

RISING OF COUNCIL:

9.24pm.

PRESENTED:

and CONFIRMED

CHAIRMAN

Council officers in attendance:

James Withers (Senior Council and Committee Officer)

Jo Camamile (Council and Committee Officer)

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