

Councillor SUTTON: Thank you, Madam Acting Chair. I move: that the LORD MAYOR reaffirms his support for the Council motion passed unanimously on 20 May 2008 for a neighbourhood planning process based on the wishes of West End residents to determine the density of new development in their suburb, and he retracts his peremptory announcement of a target of 25,000 additional residents for West End.

Councillor ABRAHAMS: Seconded.

Deputy Chairman: The motion has been moved by Councillor SUTTON, seconded by Councillor ABRAHAMS; is there any debate?

Councillor SUTTON: Thank you, Madam Chair. I have moved this motion today in the hope that LORD MAYOR Campbell NEWMAN will retract his statement made to this Council that he will be squeezing 25,000 additional people into West End. I have moved this motion in the hope that the LORD MAYOR will recommit to his own neighbourhood planning process centred on consultation with local residents.

On 10 March this year, during the debate on a new water pipe for West End, the LORD MAYOR said a new water pipeline to West End would, 'allow us to put an extra 25,000 people in that part of town.' That is what he said. He can try to expunge it from the Council Minutes if he likes, but the fact is on 10 March he said that he was seeking to put an extra 25,000 people in that part of town. They will say today, the members of the LNP opposite, will say today that this motion is a beat-up. They will say that it is not true. They will try all the untruths, all the trickery and all the spin to try to get out of what the LORD MAYOR said.

Deputy Chairman: Councillor SUTTON, I would ask you to withdraw that comment that they will try untruths. You are suggesting something that is really not acceptable. I ask you to withdraw that comment.

Councillor SUTTON: On your direction, I will withdraw it, but I have no doubt that they will try to be extremely misleading in their debate today; they will try all the trickery and spin to say that that is not what the LORD MAYOR meant. But the statement is there in the Minutes, in black and white. The fact is this: the LORD MAYOR has not walked away from these comments. He has not said it was a mistake. He has not sought to clarify his comments. He has not said his comments were a slip of the tongue. He has not said he got it wrong.

He will not, because in that one comment, he revealed his vision for West End. It is consistent with his previously stated position that he reckons, 'I reckon 25 to 30-story buildings easily; if not, maybe a little bit higher.' That is what he said previously on this issue. So, by making that statement on 10 March, all he was simply doing was reconfirming by accident or not that that is his vision for West End and that peninsula. He wants to see an additional 25,000 people in that part of town.

The LORD MAYOR's announcement that he will be trying to squeeze 25,000 more people into West End makes an absolutely mockery of Council's neighbourhood planning process and the West End Woolloongabba Local Plan. Remember neighbourhood planning, where local residents were supposed to be empowered by the neighbourhood planning process to determine the densities in our own suburbs? Who told us that, Madam Chair? Who told us that that is what they were going to be

empowered to do? Well, Marcia Hines and the Hooley Dooleys told us that. That is who told us that. Well, it is as good as coming from Marcia Hines and the Hooley Dooleys, because that is all that is left of the LORD MAYOR's principle of neighbourhood planning.

Now we see the LNP are once again showing their neighbourhood planning process is not worth the paper it is printed on. The LORD MAYOR has previously committed to only increasing building heights and densities in West End where they were subject to good design, demonstrated sustainability and community benefit, and a fast-tracked neighbourhood planning process, a position that was supported by all Brisbane City Councillors on 20 May 2008. That was the unanimous position—you will remember the context of that Council meeting, of course. Councillor COOPER lodged some strange motion in the Council Chamber, and all that it would do was going to cause more confusion and more anxiety for the residents of West End. What happened on 20 May? Labor brought an amendment to Councillor COOPER's flawed motion into this Council Chamber and we said if they wanted to increase heights, if they wanted to increase densities, they needed to make sure that they were subject to good design, demonstrated sustainability and community benefit, and they had to make sure they fitted those criteria by making sure there was a fast track neighbourhood planning process in position.

That was a Labor Party amendment in this place. It was brought on by Labor Councillors to protect the residents of West End against the LORD MAYOR's arbitrary and peremptory statement about what he wanted to see in the West End peninsula.

*Councillor McLACHLAN interjecting:*

Councillor SUTTON: That is exactly right. I take the injection from Councillor McLACHLAN, because I notice that Councillor QUIRKE is also laughing. They are laughing about my use of the word 'peremptory', because clearly, as Councillor—

*Councillor MATIC interjecting:*

Councillor SUTTON: Oh, pardon, what was that, Councillor MATIC? Do you want to stand up and make a point of order on that? They are worried about what I am saying. Well, let me just acquaint the members of the Liberal National Party with the word 'peremptory' by quoting from my Australian Little Oxford Dictionary, Councillor MATIC.

*Councillors interjecting:*

*Deputy Chairman:* Order!

Councillor SUTTON: What does peremptory mean? It means insisting on obedience; law not open to appeal or challenge. It means leaving no opportunity for denial or refusal. It is imperious and dictatorial, arbitrary, dogmatic and domineering. So, Councillor QUIRKE, I might have stolen a bit of your speech; I know you were desperate to say that it was a typo; well, it is not a typo. We absolutely know what the word means, and that is what you have been on this occasion. You have been dictatorial, arbitrary, dogmatic and domineering. You are insisting on obedience, and you are not allowing any opportunity to appeal or challenge what you want to do in West End.

You can put all the smokes and mirrors up; you can do whatever it is you want to do to try to convince people that you are listening through the neighbourhood planning process, but it is clear the LORD MAYOR has a clear vision for West End. It is a vision of buildings 20 to 30 storeys, if not higher, and that he will be squeezing 25,000 people into that suburb, and he is doing that regardless of what local residents think. He is determined to do that regardless of what the neighbourhood planning process reveals, regardless of what the residents of West End want to see.

Madam Chair, the LORD MAYOR is pursuing his own agenda for the West End area, and in pursuing that agenda, he is riding roughshod over the wishes of the local community. It is clear by his statement that he has no intention of listening to local residents who have not yet had their say on the appropriate level of growth for their area. That is why I am asking the LORD MAYOR today to reaffirm his support for the Council motion passed unanimously on 20 May 2008 for a neighbourhood planning process based on the wishes of the West End residents to determine the density of the new development in their suburb that is based on good design, demonstrated sustainability and community benefits through a fast-tracked neighbourhood planning process.

West End residents need to know that the LORD MAYOR is prepared to listen, and they need to know that the LORD MAYOR is sorry for the insensitive and arrogant comments, peremptory comments, made two weeks ago which show just how out of touch he is with that local community.

Deputy Chairman:

Further debate; Councillor COOPER.

Councillor COOPER:

Thank you, Madam Chairman. I rise to speak to the motion proposed here today. I would just like to say that this motion, of course we are seeing the Councillors on the other side of the Chamber trying to put their spin on what we supported on 20 May 2008. They are trying to be very creative and trying to express a number of concerns that particularly Councillor ABRAHAMS has clearly been dealing with through the petitions that she has brought forward, all those sorts of proposals that she has brought forward.

In relation to what we on this side of the Chamber believe, we believe that it is important to actually outline our positive direction and the priorities that we have in relation to this area. Our view is that this area is an important area to manage the growth that we are experiencing as a city. This is certainly in line with the LGMS strategy worked on so diligently by Councillor HINCHLIFFE when he was the Chair for Urban Planning and Economic Development, so that is no surprise, and has largely been agreed by all the members of this Chamber.

In relation to this, as we of course experience growth, we need to provide infrastructure. This is something—it is not just about managing growth; it is also about providing that infrastructure such as public transport, sewer, water—all those other sorts of requirements, including park infrastructure, to manage that growth. Councillor ABRAHAMS herself has always talked about needing infrastructure to support growth in this area. But now, all of a sudden, she does not support that principle. For example, her speech on the West End Riverside Infrastructure Planning Scheme, where she

verballed the LORD MAYOR, saying that he had promised infrastructure that new residents had required. She went on to say that Labor Councillors were simply—

*Councillors interjecting:*

*Deputy Chairman:* Order!

Councillor COOPER: —trying to make sure that we build a community and provide basic infrastructure. Clearly, what we have put forward, with what we are proposing to make sensible use, to make practical use of the Hale Street link, shows that we are committed to delivering the infrastructure that we need to make sure that we manage appropriately for growth that we will experience as a city.

We also note that Councillor ABRAHAMS seemingly in total contradiction to her position supports very ad hoc development at South Bank, in fact, on public parklands. She seems to feel that this is appropriate, and the issue of infrastructure—not a mention. Not a mention about the impact on the existing infrastructure.

*Councillors interjecting:*

*Deputy Chairman:* Order!

Councillor COOPER: So, it is quite clear that they have a very, very different position when it comes to a suburb adjacent to the beloved West End of Councillor ABRAHAMS. So, we would have to assume that she then also supports South Bank not having to pay for or provide infrastructure to support development in this important area for all Brisbane residents. This is even more relevant, given her arguments about needs for increased parkland to support growth in this area.

It is also relevant to see what Councillor HINCHLIFFE had to say about heights in the area and infrastructure. Well, Madam Chairman, back at the end of 2005, Councillor HINCHLIFFE, on ABC Radio, made no guarantees that heights would not go above 10 storeys. He went on to say, ‘We do an analysis of the infrastructure’—let me repeat—‘an analysis of the infrastructure, the traffic, the sewerage and water supply, et cetera, to see what can be accommodated in that area.’ Well, Madam Chair, we are being a bit more proactive. We are putting in the infrastructure to accommodate increases as per the Council report.

The new water pipe, and I am sure that it was clarified very well by Councillor McLACHLAN, the new water pipe provides capacity—and let us make it very clear—that means capacity, that means potential to deliver water services of an additional 25,000 people. Some 25,000 people is quite different from 25,000 residents. However, of course there are opportunities—

*Councillors interjecting:*

*Deputy Chairman:* Order!

*Councillor ABRAHAMS interjecting:*

*Deputy Chairman:* Councillor ABRAHAMS!

Councillor COOPER: There are opportunities for people to use that area as a work place as well as to reside in that area. So, the definition is important in this context.

Since the time this Council has embarked on the fast-tracked neighbourhood plan, we have seen Councillor ABRAHAMS continue to try to mislead and undermine the process. I would just like to say that consequently we propose an amendment to the amendment proposed by the ALP, and I would like to distribute that now.

Deputy Chairman: Thank you, Councillor COOPER. Yes, keep going.

Councillor COOPER: Pertaining to the original motion, we delete all words after 'suburb' and insert, 'and, (a) acknowledges that Councillor Helen Abrahams has supported the need to build new infrastructure in the South Brisbane riverside precinct to provide for population increases, and (b) recognises that this new water infrastructure will support an additional 25,000 people who might live, work or visit the South Brisbane riverside precinct.'

Councillor McLACHLAN: Seconded, Madam Chair.

Deputy Chairman: The amendment has been moved by Councillor COOPER, seconded by Councillor McLACHLAN, deleting the words after 'suburb' and inserting, '(a) acknowledges that Councillor Helen Abrahams has supported the need to build new infrastructure in the South Brisbane riverside precinct to provide for population increases, and (b) recognises that this new water infrastructure will support an additional 25,000 people who might live, work or visit the South Brisbane riverside precinct.' Debate on the amendment, Councillor COOPER.

Councillor COOPER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. We propose an amendment that clarifies the position of this side of the Chamber. In fact, it just makes it very, very obvious to all that we are committed to delivering infrastructure to manage the population growth that we anticipate across the city and, most particularly, in this area.

We are working to deliver a fast-tracked neighbourhood plan for South Brisbane riverside, and this is something that has been discussed time and time again in this Council Chamber. Our commitment to delivering a fast-tracked neighbourhood plan in line with the motion of 20 May 2008 remains constant. In fact, opportunities such as this provided by the Hale Street link are exactly what we are committed to delivering on this side of the Chamber, to ensure that, as Councillor ABRAHAMS has repeatedly requested, we provide the infrastructure that is fundamental to ensuring that population growth is properly provided for. I think this is clear that the issues that were raised by this motion are purely those to cause alarm and consternation in the local community instead of clarifying the position that we have, which is infrastructure delivery will be facilitated, and infrastructure delivery is fundamental to making sure that we properly plan for the growth of our city.

In fact, West End, as I noted before, was clearly outlined under the Local Growth Management Strategy, under the firm control at that time of the Chair of Urban Planning, Councillor David HINCHLIFFE. This was clearly identified as a great opportunity in the existing brown field sites—so, those are the old factory areas, the run-down locations that really had no residential development at all—to bring those sorts of large parcels of land forward for redeveloping, for meeting with our requirements under the regional plan, for 156,500 new dwellings—dwellings that have to go somewhere, and I think there are a number of locations that we are clearly planning to make sure that

we manage growth and that we accommodate these proposals under the draft regional plan.

But West End and South Brisbane have some distinct opportunities. There are a number of parcels of land that present good opportunities for managing the impacts of growth, and also providing opportunities for improvements to the existing residents. So there will be improvements to public transport, there will be improvements to the existing sewer network, and there will be clearly an improvement to the water capacity by this proposal to put these pipes under the Hale Street Bridge.

I think it is clear from this side of the Chamber that our commitment is strong to delivering infrastructure to facilitate good outcomes for local communities. I think it is clear that Councillor ABRAHAMS is contradictory in that her position is to continually say that we are not delivering infrastructure and then, when we put forward a proposal which very much does that, which clearly delivers this for the local residents, she in fact does not support this. So, her position is completely contradictory and in fact goes against the needs of her local community.

We have seen that there has been a real failure under the previous administration to deliver infrastructure. Our commitment to deliver infrastructure has then be repudiated by the local Councillor because she thinks that that will mean she will be getting increased numbers of residents into West End. Well, this is not just about West End; this is about making sure we plan for the city's growth, that we provide the infrastructure that is fundamental to allowing that growth to occur in a managed, careful way. It also ensures that, as we go forward as a city, we do not just allow development to happen in a random fashion. It means that we deliver growth that is serviced properly. We do not deliver growth that just sprawls all over the city, impacting on our green space, without those critical pieces of infrastructure to underpin those.

I propose this amendment, and I think this amendment clarifies our position very much so. This is an opportunity to provide water for 25,000 more people in a local area, and it is up to the neighbourhood planning process to determine how and where any density increases will be accommodated. Thank you.

Deputy Chairman:

Further debate on the amendment; Councillor DICK.

Councillor DICK:

Thank you, Madam Chair, and I rise to speak to the amendment and note that it has now been two long weeks until we finally got clarification, and only because Councillor SUTTON raised this issue. If it was not for the Labor Opposition playing a constructive role in this Chamber, and Councillor ABRAHAMS representing with fierce passion her local community, we would not have had this amendment. Why? Because when the LORD MAYOR spoke two weeks ago, he did not say the South Brisbane precinct. He said West End.

Councillor SUTTON in her opening remarks in today's debate said it may have been a slip of the tongue; it may have been a mistake; it may have been an oversight. Listening to Councillor COOPER, we know that it was; that the LORD MAYOR got it wrong when he said that. As a result, this amendment is now clarifying and revoking what the LORD MAYOR said. So, Madam Chair, we welcome this amendment. We welcome that, finally, after two weeks, we have now been able to put to bed the LORD

MAYOR's mistruth that he was saying there would be 25,000 people for West End. Under sustained pressure from Councillor ABRAHAMS and Councillor SUTTON, we are now in this position.

I am disappointed that the people of West End had to go through the angst, had to go through all of this pressure because of the LORD MAYOR's carelessness in the way that he was admitting that 25,000 people would go to West End. All he needed to do was to get up and say 'I got it wrong. I was at fault.' We know that the LORD MAYOR does not like saying that. I would be interested to see if he is going to enter this debate. My challenge is for the LORD MAYOR—

*Councillors interjecting:*

*Deputy Chairman:*

Order!

Councillor DICK:

—to respond to my call to get up and apologise to the people of West End, apologise to Councillor ABRAHAMS, because apparently she is the worst Councillor in the world for actually advocating on behalf of her residents, in actually raising this as an issue. What would have happened if she had not raised this? That is the real question. What would have happened if Councillor SUTTON hadn't put this notion of motion on the paper today?

Well it would have been slipped under the table. It would have been left out there, just like the original motion in May where Labor Councillors had to clean up the Administration's mess by putting in an incompetent and sloppy motion to the Chamber where we're actually able to advocate on behalf of local residents.

We've seen today, because of the pressure of Councillor ABRAHAMS and the Leader of the Opposition, we're finally seeing this administration dealing with this issue. Now it's taken two weeks but I'm glad that the LORD MAYOR has admitted that he's wrong. I'm glad that he's admitted now that he got it wrong by saying, and I quote, that we'll have around 25,000 people for West End.

So Councillor COOPER, Labor offers its support for this amendment. We've said, from time to time, we will hold the Administration to account when they get things wrong. Namely, we're going to put 25,000 people to West End. But when you're proven that you've misled and said the wrong things, Labor Councillors will play a constructive role.

We will play an integral role in making sure that our local residents—and I want to commend Councillor ABRAHAMS. Despite the nonsense that we heard from Councillor COOPER, she is a passionate advocate for her community. She is someone who lives and breathes West End and is proud to represent that community.

Madam Chair, it's not good enough for this administration to make throw away lines when we're dealing with the future growth for our city because that's what we're cleaning up today; an offhand remark, a slip of the tongue by the LORD MAYOR and a remark that has now caused considerable grief for local residents.

So I am delighted. I am absolutely delighted that Councillor SUTTON was able to put the pressure once again on this administration, supported by Councillor ABRAHAMS, to make sure that the people of West End have it clarified.

Of course Labor supports new infrastructure to be delivered. That is what we did during the earlier debate and today we are looking at this amendment which recognises that this new water infrastructure will support an additional 25,000 people who might—who might live, work or visit the South Brisbane Riverside Precinct.

I'm also delighted that Councillor COOPER has reaffirmed her support for the Neighbourhood Planning process because that is an essential part of that May motion last year where Labor Councillors gave a guarantee on behalf of the people of West End.

And today, as a result of the LORD MAYOR saying something he shouldn't have said, misleading and telling the wrong thing to the people of West End and that's what we're dealing with today with this amendment. We are dealing with the failings of the LORD MAYOR who gave a throwaway comment, who threw Neighbourhood Planning out the door but as a result of the notice of motion today, we've clarified those remarks.

Labor, in the spirit of cooperation and the Labor Councillors, led by Councillor SUTTON, supported by Councillor ABRAHAMS, support this amendment.

Deputy Chairman: Further debate. Councillor McLACHLAN.

Councillor McLACHLAN: Thank you Madam Chairman. I'm staggered to hear Councillor DICK say that those opposite support the delivery of infrastructure; absolutely staggered. They've been in this place for more than two weeks now arguing against the delivery of this particular project and claiming that it was an additional expense that couldn't be afforded by the citizens of Brisbane.

Councillor SUTTON earlier talked about untruths. Let me refer to what she said in this place on 10 March. She said, and I quote: This is just the latest in a long, long line of requests for additional money for the Hale Street Link Project and the components of this project.

Well that has been proved to be an absolute lie. That is an untruth. That is not the case. This is not additional spending on the Hale Street Bridge Project. This was the Council taking sensible advice of officers to take advantage of the delivery of this critical piece of infrastructure of providing another crossing—

Councillor FLESSER: Point of order Madam Chair.

Deputy Chairman: Point of order against you Councillor McLACHLAN. Councillor FLESSER.

Councillor FLESSER: Madam Chair, are you satisfied that what Councillor McLACHLAN said when he said that Councillor SUTTON told a lie, are you satisfied that that is appropriate language in this chamber?

Deputy Chairman: Yes. I think Councillor McLACHLAN, perhaps be a little bit careful with your—

Councillor SUTTON: Point of order Madam Chair.

Councillor McLACHLAN: I withdraw those words. I withdraw those words and substitute the words bending the truth. What Councillor SUTTON said was that this is the latest in a long, long line of requests for additional money for the Hale Street Link Project and that is not the case.

This is not additional funding for the Hale Street Link Project. This is the provision of water pipe infrastructure from point A to point B, the shortest point across the river as has been discussed on previous occasions in this place.

And I do thank the Labor Opposition for the opportunity to get up on my feet again and talk yet again about the critical piece—this critical piece of infrastructure and providing it for the City. As has previously been pointed out, if this project wasn't delivered for a cost of some \$5 million, there would have been a cost—

Councillor CAMPBELL: Point of order Madam.

Councillor McLACHLAN: —to the Council of some—

Deputy Chairman: Point of order against you Councillor McLACHLAN. Yes Councillor CAMPBELL.

Councillor CAMPBELL: This is a speech in favour of the amendment and Madam Chair, there is nothing in the amendment about the water infrastructure in the amendment at all—

Deputy Chairman: Well, Councillor CAMPBELL—

Councillor CAMPBELL: —about the pipeline.

Deputy Chairman: Councillor CAMPBELL, in terms of the motion and the whole context of it, I think what Councillor McLACHLAN is saying is quite fair. Thank you Councillor McLACHLAN.

Councillor McLACHLAN: I could read off the amendment Madam Chair. To that point says: Recognises that this new water infrastructure will support an additional 25,000 people who might live, work or visit the South Brisbane Riverside Precinct.

It is about the infrastructure for this city. It is about the delivery of the water pipes that are necessary to sustain people. It is about providing and thinking ahead as this LORD MAYOR has done about the infrastructure that is important for this city as the City grows and develops rather than burying our heads in the sand like Labor Opposition want us to do and not getting on with the job of delivering the infrastructure for this city's growth.

We are providing for that important infrastructure and we know that if we hadn't followed this advice to follow the officers' advice to take advantage of the delivery of the Hale Street Bridge Link, to deliver this important water infrastructure, there would have been a cost to Council of providing of an alternative means some \$50 million plus. That was their estimate - \$50 million plus to deliver this important bit of water infrastructure by other means.

What this project does is take a water pipe from the Greenhill water supply zone across the river in the shortest possible distance to the West End, South Brisbane area region as opposed to bringing it some six kilometres from the Tarragindi Reservoir at considerable disruption for the residents of Brisbane.

That's what this project has been about. Those on that side have attempted - railed against the delivery of this infrastructure. They tried it again this morning—sorry, this afternoon earlier in debate about the Hale Street Bridge Project. All they've done is prove they're opposed to the delivery of infrastructure in this city.

It's time that they got on. It's time that they showed their true colours in the support of the necessary provision of infrastructure and Madam Chair, I move the motion—I ask that the motion now be put.

Councillor ADAMS:               Seconded.

Deputy Chairman:               It has been moved by Councillor McLACHLAN, seconded by Councillor ADAMS—

Councillor HINCHLIFFE:       Madam Chair, you have—Madam Chair, a point of order.

Deputy Chairman:               Yes Councillor.

Councillor HINCHLIFFE:       You have the ability as the Chair to determine whether you believe it's appropriate for a motion like that.

Deputy Chairman:               I don't need to be told my job. Thank you Councillor HINCHLIFFE.

Councillor HINCHLIFFE:       Well do you think that it's appropriate?

Deputy Chairman:               I think there can be another speaker certainly on the amendment if there is another speaker.

Councillor ABRAHAMS:       Certainly.

Deputy Chairman:               Councillor ABRAHAMS.

Councillor ABRAHAMS:       Thank you very much. Thank you Madam Chair for giving me the opportunity to speak to this amendment. Let's be quite clear what this amendment does. It takes the original motion and takes the area it considers from West End and extends it to South Brisbane and West End. It also takes the residents - the new 25,000 new residents—and they have been changed into people, not residents. I'm sure the residents of West End would like to hear that differentiation. And those people are visitors, workers who are living and working and visiting the whole area.

Let us be quite clear that this amendment is a change from what we had proposed by the LORD MAYOR in the Chamber just two weeks ago. And what he said and I have it before me: This afternoon will allow us to put an extra 25,000 people in that part of town. Okay, I'm sure that'll upset Councillor ABRAHAMS - and then much of the debate from that point, as Councillor COOPER has today, focuses on me and what I think and completely ignores that the residents of West End, the residents of this city, are in fact the ones whose opinion we need to heed, not mine unless it is that I am reflecting the opinion of those residents.

Now what you have seen in this amendment and those two changes is in fact a correction of Campbell NEWMAN's errors.

Deputy Chairman:               Please Councillor ABRAHAMS, I would ask you to refer to the LORD MAYOR correctly, thank you.

Councillor ABRAHAMS:       Well I'm sorry - LORD MAYOR Campbell NEWMAN. It still doesn't take away from the issue that we are talking about the corrections of Campbell NEWMAN. I would call them Campbell's corrections because that is what this motion says and the reason why it's so clear that if you followed the transcript last week, two weeks ago, the LORD MAYOR then starts talking about having to bottle in the water to the residents in the apartment buildings. He was not talking about trucking in bottled water to people who

were visiting South Bank. He was not talking about people who were working in the precinct. He was clearly, as everyone in this chamber understood, was talking about 25,000 new residents in West End.

So let us be quite clear, this is a correction of a slip of the tongue from the LORD MAYOR who thought that with the election and the success that we might not remember the detail of the comment he said and let it go.

That is the analysis or if not, the other analysis is that Councillor COOPER actually understood the error and that she has been working very hard to make sure what looked like a cut across her bow, a cut that ignores the whole Neighbourhood Planning process in fact doesn't remain but in fact she has asked the LORD MAYOR to move so she has some room herself to deliver a Neighbourhood Planning process.

Because Councillor COOPER, you have the poison chalice. I would not wish to be in your shoes, having been in this chamber for at least six times saying Neighbourhood Planning processes can engage with the community, listen to the community and take on board the community's wishes because that is the principle of Neighbourhood Planning.

Well I do have, as you do too Councillor COOPER, the knowledge of the wishes of the community because we have both seen the feedback from the first—the main only face to face integration interface with residents of West End and that was at the West End markets.

And I was there with the Council officers and we looked at all of the sticky papers and said, Let us condense what these major issues that the community wishes are and what were they? More and improved public parks overwhelmingly. Better and improved public transport, affordable housing and five to seven storeys residential development.

So I have no problem, when talking to this amended motion, to actually support the area of new infrastructure because those four points are the infrastructure that I know the community supports.

So I have no hesitation on supporting section A. Where it comes to section B, recognising the new water infrastructure, we'll support an additional 25,000 who might live, work and visit South Bank. I would say this is—

*Councillor interjecting*

Councillor ABRAHAMS: South Brisbane Riverside Precinct, thank you. I would say that this is still a pre-emptory statement. We do not know what the community has said in terms of this area. We know that the potential capacity has been enabled through this infrastructure but I do not accept and will not ever accept that this means I am supporting 25,000 people in this area because the community must have a say through the Neighbourhood Planning process.

What we are doing through section D is giving a potential capacity with a nominal figure around it. That capacity may be overcapacity if in fact, when the voices of the people are heard, when the Neighbourhood Planning process, if it is true to what the LORD MAYOR brought to this chamber as Neighbourhood Planning, we may have more capacity than is actually required and then there'll be a challenge to how best to use that capacity.

Can I say it again? That in supporting this motion, the recognition that it will support, is only a potential of what it supports. It is a potential that has to be supported by the community in a Neighbourhood Planning process for it to become a reality.

And that is why the most important part of the amended motion is in fact the first three lines, that the LORD MAYOR affirms his commitment to engage with, to listen to and to heed and put into the Neighbourhood Plan the wishes of the community.

Deputy Chairman: Councillor ABRAHAMS, we're talking about the amendment, not the motion.

Councillor ABRAHAMS: I'm sorry, the amended motion—

Deputy Chairman: It's the amendment that has been moved and is being debated at the moment. After the amendment we will have the amended motion. I believe that was just put there for ease of understanding of everyone. It's the amendment we're debating.

Councillor ABRAHAMS: Thank you. I acknowledge your ruling. I'm delighted that the final way of presentation gave me the opportunity to reinforce what the total motion looked like but I heed your direction and I will not focus on that area anymore.

But let me say that the amendment A and the amendment B clearly relate to a Neighbourhood Planning process and that is the principle of which A and B relate to and that is what Labor Councillors have always stood for on this side of the Chamber and it is what we continue to stand for.

In view of the community having a say on density and infrastructure, which to date they have not had because they have only had a say on the vision for this area, on Saturday I am holding a workshop where the community—it's a public workshop—can go from—

Deputy Chairman: Councillor ABRAHAMS, that's really not relevant to the amendment.

Councillor ABRAHAMS: Oh but it is.

Deputy Chairman: Councillor ABRAHAMS, I've just said it's not.

Councillor ABRAHAMS: Okay. Madam Chair, may I explain to you that the infrastructure that is section A is the whole core of what the workshop is on Saturday. Because I am asking the community with Councillor COOPER and Councillor NEWMAN who have all been invited and in spite of a phone call every day for the last four days, I still haven't had my questions answered.

But that workshop is to look at the infrastructure - to look at public transport - to look at improved parklands - to look at affordable housing locations - to look at design - to look at the sustainability features which were in the original Labor Councillors' amendment.

And therefore Councillor COOPER, for you to deliver an appropriate Neighbourhood Planning process, you need to engage with my community. I have delivered the opportunity for you and Councillor NEWMAN. I urge you attend so that they will understand just how important the infrastructure that this motion is putting in place is because believe me, I believe they do know how important it is and they would love the opportunity for you to hear what they have to say.

Deputy Chairman: Further debate. LORD MAYOR on the amendment.

LORD MAYOR: Madam Chairman, in relation to the amendment, I'm just particularly going to refer to some of the things that Councillor DICK said. He somehow suggested that there was some need for clarification there'd been an omission.

Well I've gone back to the minutes of the 10th of March and I'll just read a through things. I started off my introducing the item and then I very quickly, within basically two paras—you know third para of that part of it—I reminded people about the debate of the 20th of May 2008 when this Council, quote: This Council resolved unanimously—unanimously—to support increased heights and densities in Fortitude Valley, South Brisbane, Kurilpa, West End and Woolloongabba. We voted to do that and today we are voting to allow infrastructure to be put in place.

It's a wonderful opportunity Madam Chairman. So I said it then, then I go down a bit further. Another para: Well Madam Chairman, the Labor Party always used to say, You can't put more density in West End and South Brisbane because there's not the infrastructure.

Well, if you're still not convinced Madam Chairman, a bit further on I say: Okay, I'm sure that will upset Councillor ABRAHAMS but she did vote for increased density in West End, Woolloongabba, South Brisbane and Kurilpa. She voted for it. Councillor ABRAHAMS voted for it. So I hope she'll support the necessary water.

Now Councillor DICK comes into this place, puffs out his chest, what a massive sort of display we've seen of bravado but it's simply not true. The record is very clear what was said when the motion was introduced on the 10th of March for this infrastructure. Clearly it was to support more than just West End. I couldn't have made it clearer.

So I deal with that. The other point I make in relation to this whole debate and Councillor ABRAHAMS' comments is that Councillor ABRAHAMS has been all around the world on this. On 20 May last year, Councillor ABRAHAMS did vote for increased density and that is something I hope that she will reflect to her community on the weekend when she has the public meeting. I certainly will be—

Councillor ABRAHAMS: Would Councillor NEWMAN take a question?

Deputy Chairman: LORD MAYOR, will you take a question?

LORD MAYOR: No but she can ask a question next week.

Deputy Chairman: Resume your seat Councillor ABRAHAMS.

*Councillors interjecting*

LORD MAYOR: Well that's what question time is for—

Deputy Chairman: Order.

LORD MAYOR: —you brave people. Madam Chairman, Councillor ABRAHAMS I hope will convey faithfully and openly and honestly her position—

Deputy Chairman: Order.

LORD MAYOR: —to increase density. And I say today that when people to write to me, as I know they will because already I've seen the flier for this public meeting already suggesting that nobody has been asked for an opinion which is untrue, absolutely untrue. But when they

write to me, we'll make sure that we send all the documentation to let people know, as indeed I had great pleasure in letting people know about her stance with her uranium shares the other day. I was quite happy to contact Drew Hutton and Mr Ronan Lee.

Deputy Chairman: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: Oh sorry Madam Chairman, I digress. But I do just want to talk about this issue about the infrastructure a little bit more because here we go back to 14 December 2005—14 December 2005 in *The Courier-Mail*, what did Councillor HINCHLIFFE say at the time? Well, apparently on that occasion, Councillor ABRAHAMS crossed the floor and didn't vote for increased density so we can see that Councillor ABRAHAMS has changed the position a fair few times.

So DEPUTY MAYOR David HINCHLIFFE said he understood Councillor ABRAHAMS' decision that the approved plan was designed to achieve a balance between requests for 12-storey buildings and the community's desire for a 5-storey maximum.

But Councillor HINCHLIFFE said he could not rule out increasing the maximum allowable height of residential buildings in the future which was currently capped at 10-storeys in Brisbane's City Plan. Quote: It's something that would be considered but we'd have to look at infrastructure in the area first—unquote.

Ah ha! Madam Chairman, these people have been all around the world on this. We know they tell developers that they want to see higher buildings there but they tell the community something differently. They cuddle up to people in election times and tell them one thing. After elections they do something else.

When they have the numbers—when they have the numbers in the Chamber—

*Councillors interjecting*

*Deputy Chairman:* Order.

LORD MAYOR: When they have the numbers in the Chamber—

*Councillors interjecting*

*Deputy Chairman:* Order!

LORD MAYOR: Well they were heard—

Deputy Chairman: Councillor SUTTON!

LORD MAYOR: They were heard in silence before as they spouted their nonsense. They're quite happy to have different positions when they've got the numbers, when they hold the Urban Planning position and they hold the majority in Council. But when they're the Opposition, that's what they're into Madam Chairman. Absolutely they're the Opposition.

So anybody in the media who wants to cover this story, please come and talk to me. There's a great big wad of contradictory statements from the Labor Party on these matters. We look forward to this debate because, as Councillor COOPER was saying earlier on, the State Government's Regional Plan does require this Council to put a whole lot more in the way of dwellings here.

It was no secret—it was not secret in terms of the last election, again, that the suggestion of a lack of consultation is spurious because at the last election I note that Councillor ABRAHAMS clearly campaigned telling her local community that if I was re-elected, that I would be putting higher buildings into the area.

And I've had a look at the results in the State High booth Councillor ABRAHAMS' vote dropped from 43.83 per cent to 36.78 per cent. At West End Vulture Street, 43.8—

Deputy Chairman: LORD MAYOR.

LORD MAYOR: 40.16.

Deputy Chairman: LORD MAYOR, I think that's a little bit—

LORD MAYOR: Well it's to the issue of consultation Madam Chairman; very important. The community knew because Councillor ABRAHAMS told them—

*Councillors interjecting*

*Deputy Chairman:* Order.

LORD MAYOR: —what our position was and we are faithfully and honestly and openly delivering the State Government's Regional Plan. I move that the motion be put.

Deputy Chairman: It has been moved by the LORD MAYOR, seconded by Councillor ADAMS that the amendment be put. All those in favour say aye.

*Councillors say aye*

*Deputy Chairman:* To the contrary, no. The ayes have it. Councillor COOPER.

Councillor COOPER: Thank you Madam Chairman. I think that the LORD MAYOR has really summed it up quite clearly. From this side of the Chamber, we think that we have got all sorts of considerations of infrastructure already well in hand. We will be talking to the community using the Neighbourhood Planning process. They will be part of the discussion and of course, Neighbourhood Planning includes a careful consideration of infrastructure capacity and making sure that we plan for future infrastructure delivery to accommodate growth.

So we have a process in place. We have strong support for that process. It's totally in alignment with the CityShape model which we've had 60,000 residents support. This is no surprise. This is a carefully and well managed process where we are talking to the community. We are going out using a number of different approaches. And I think it's always encouraging to see that people accept, when we are a growing city, that if we provide infrastructure then we can manage the growth appropriately and manage impacts on local residents.

But if we don't provide infrastructure, all it does is cause a massive degree of consternation in the local community. So this is showing forward thinking. This is showing an intelligent way to respond to the growth demands that we have got under the draft Regional Plan and we are keen to see this amendment proceed. Thank you.

Deputy Chairman: I will put the amendment. All those in favour say aye.

*Councillors say aye*

*Deputy Chairman:* To the contrary, no. The ayes have it. Further debate on the amended motion. Councillor ABRAHAMMS.

Councillor ABRAHAMMS: Thank you Madam Chair. Yes, I rise to talk to the now substantive motion, a substantive motion that clearly has the Neighbourhood Planning process as central to how we are going to determine the density for the South Brisbane Riverside Neighbourhood Plan. A neighbourhood process that is the flagship of the LORD MAYOR. A neighbourhood process where the community has a say and for that principle has won an award.

It did not win an award because it was a marketing exercise where the community are engaged to in the early stages and then their wishes are ignored at the final stages. And yet we have the potential, with the pre-emptory nature in which we are looking at the infrastructure, are determining the level of infrastructure of then going back to the community and saying it's too late, we are not going to heed your wishes.

And I need to go on the record very clearly. I always have and I always will represent the wishes of my community. And I am in an extremely fortunate position because—

*Councillors interjecting*

*Deputy Chairman:* Order.

Councillor ABRAHAMMS: —West End contains—

Deputy Chairman: Order. There's too much noise.

Councillor ABRAHAMMS: Thank you Madam Chair for protecting me. West End contains a number of very sophisticated community groups, political groups and planners who are actually interested in the wellbeing of this inner city area. So I am never in doubt of what the community actually wishes for this area.

And the LORD MAYOR referred to me being all over the place. LORD MAYOR, nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, what I have done is represented the wishes of the community. When the West End Woolloongabba Plan came in and there were 7-storeys proposed in what we now know as Riverside South, my community objected most strongly to that level and for that reason I crossed the floor and did not vote for that proposal.

And everyone can remember the number of people in the Chamber who were pleased that I did that because I was representing their wishes. I stand here today talking about—

*Councillors interjecting*

*Deputy Chairman:* Order.

Councillor ABRAHAMMS: —potential development knowing that I have heard a number of residents and what they feel about the South Brisbane Riverside Plan and I am continuing to give them the opportunity to let me know and I am sure that Councillor NEWMAN and Councillor COOPER will not be there on Saturday.

They have turned their back on a community that they are saying to them, you must take more than your equitable amount of density under the Regional Growth Strategy purely for the instance that we have put the Hale Street Bridge in.

Well everyone in this room knows that the people of West End did not support the Hale Street Bridge for just this reason and that is why we need to be very careful on this neighbourhood process and truly listen to what is being said.

It is interesting that apart from the Hale Street Bridge, there has been no justification for the increased density in this particular part of my ward. But the attack that has come to me has only ever concerned the ABC Building, a building of 4-storeys in an area where there is existing major public transport parkland with more and improved parkland coming—

Deputy Chairman: Order. There's too much—just a minute Councillor ABRAHAMS. There is too much talking in this chamber. If you want to have a conversation, take it outside and that goes for both sides.

Councillor ABRAHAMS: Councillor COOPER also said that I had never considered or discussed the infrastructure when talking about that 4-storey commercial building. Councillor COOPER, you're wrong. If you go to the letter to the editor, my crucial point was compared to the impact on infrastructure that the South Brisbane Riverside Neighbourhood Plan and the Hale Street would do, the 4-storey ABC Building was irrelevant.

I urge all of the Councillors on the other side to recall the most important part of the motion we are now voting on is a Neighbourhood Planning process where the wishes of the community of West End should be heard. Every opportunity should be made to hear what they have to say and those wishes needed to be heeded.

The final thing I would like to remind the Chamber is that when we actually put the precinct area for the South Brisbane Riverside Neighbourhood Plan, Labor moved an amendment which was to delete the area south of Davies Park, the area known as Riverside South.

That is in fact mainly the major area that is actually in the suburb of West End and it was rejected by the Liberal Councillors. If that had been heeded then there would have been much more support within this community.

I have said and I continue to say, I will support density in South Brisbane in the Kurilpa area if it's subject to good design, if it is subject to the consultation of the community, if it shows sustainability. I have never ever walked away from that which is why I can support the part A of this motion.

Part B is a potential where we have pre-emptorily decided that 25,000 people are the planning target for this area. I reject that unless it is supported by the community through a Neighbourhood Planning process.

Deputy Chairman: Further debate on the amended motion. Councillor DICK.

Councillor DICK: Thank you Madam Chair and I too rise to now support the amended motion and want to echo what Councillor ABRAHAMS would say about the importance of public and community consultation.

Madam Chair, I listened carefully to what the LORD MAYOR said and his accusations and his claims about what I said and what Councillor ABRAHAMS said. But what he didn't of course address and of course those opposite have not addressed today is of course this quote last week of—of two weeks ago of when they were talking about a new water pipeline to West End it would, quote: Allow us to put an extra 25,000 people in that part of town.

So that is the core of why we're actually standing here today debating now an amended motion that Labor Councillors support. Echoing what Councillor ABRAHAMS has said and I think listening to Councillor COOPER and trying to make sense of the LORD MAYOR, apparently she's once again in trouble for listening to her community, holding a public meeting.

Of course what we didn't hear Madam Chair is the fact that this is of considerable concern to local residents and that the LORD MAYOR and Councillor COOPER have an obligation to go and sit down, look residents in the eye and hear firsthand—and hear firsthand their concerns.

Now Madam Chair, Councillor ABRAHAMS has made it easy for them. They can do that this Saturday. They can turn up and actually listen—listen to what the community is saying. So I commend Councillor ABRAHAMS for giving the LORD MAYOR and Councillor COOPER that opportunity. I think it would be the practical and sensible thing to do given the community concern, given the community debate that's occurring in West End.

There is no argument that that area in Brisbane is a special and unique place. There is no argument that we know that there will be future growth in that area. Councillor ABRAHAMS recognises that there will be future growth. She is at one with the community who are saying to this administration, please let's sit down with the decision makers of this city and listen to what they've got to say.

So the amended motion does have Labor's support and I tell you why it has Labor's support—because it is as a result of Councillor SUTTON's leadership in actually bringing this issue to the table that this Council chamber can actually deal with this.

We hear a lot from Councillor QUIRK I think it is who says, Where are Labor plans and Labor's ideas? Well here they are Councillor QUIRK. Here they are, front and centre, of actually holding the Administration to account. Not dealing with comments like, allow us to put an extra 25,000 people in that part of town.

It's actually the Labor Opposition, through this notice of motion, that we're actually moving forward; that we're actually looking to the future. Rather than throw away remarks or idle comments that gives uncertainty to the community, we've now seen a step forward just like we did last year when we dealt with this issue and the Labor Opposition amended the notice of motion. We're now playing a constructive role to ensure that local residents—and that's the key here. It's not about Councillor ABRAHAMS or the LORD MAYOR or Councillor COOPER—actually about local residents who are concerned about the future for their suburb.

Madam Chair, Labor Councillors play a constructive role when it comes to development in West End and across the whole of the City. We support this amendment.

Deputy Chairman: Further debate. I will put the motion. This is the amended motion. All those in favour say aye.

*Councillors say aye*

*Deputy Chairman:* To the contrary, no. The ayes have it.

Councillor QUIRK: Division, Madam Chairman.

Deputy Chairman: A division has been called by Councillor QUIRK and Councillor ADAMS. Ayes to the right, noes to the left.

DIVISION

Clerk: Madam Chairman, the voting is as follows. The ayes, yourself as Chair, LORD MAYOR Campbell NEWMAN, DEPUTY MAYOR Graham QUIRK and Councillors ADAMS, BOURKE, COOPER, JOHNSTON, KING, KNAPP, MATIC, McKENZIE, McLACHLAN, OWEN-TAYLOR, PRENTICE, SCHRINNER, WINES, WYNDHAM, the Leader of the Opposition Councillor SUTTON and Councillors ABRAHAMS, CAMPBELL, CUMMING, DICK, FLESSER, GRIFFITHS, HINCHLIFFE, MacPHERSON, NEWTON.

The ayes have it, the voting being 27 to nil.