

- 12. Unreconciled bank receipts and deposits in transit are overstated due to reconciliation variances at the end of the period. These transactions have since been reconciled.
- 13. Surplus funds are invested daily with approved counterparties.
- 14. The Committee noted the report and the Chairman thanked the Chief Financial Officer for attending the meeting.
- 15. The Bank and Investment Reports for May 2012 are tabled for noting by Council.

16. **RECOMMENDATION:**

THAT THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THE REPORT BE TABLED AND NOTED.

ADOPTED

C BUSHLAND PRESERVATION LEVY REPORT FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 2012
173/695/586/3

110/2012-13

- 17. The Financial Management Manager, Corporate Finance, Organisational Services Division, and the Chief Financial Officer, Organisational Services Division, presented a report to the Committee on expenditure for bushland purposes for the financial year ended June 2012.
- 18. The Bushland Preservation Levy Report is prepared on a quarterly basis in order to show the balance of funds held for environmental bushland purposes along with details of environmental bushland expenditure.
- 19. The Committee noted the information contained in the report submitted and that the balance of the funds held for environmental bushland purposes for the year ended June 2012 is -\$118,335.

20. **RECOMMENDATION:**

THAT COUNCIL NOTE THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THE REPORT, SUBMITTED ON FILE AND TABLED.

ADOPTED

B.C.C. Monte Carlo Caravan Park

CONSIDERATION OF NOTIFIED MOTION:

(Notified motions are printed as supplied and are not edited)

Debate

111/2012-13

The Chairman of Council (Councillor Margaret de WIT) then drew the Councillors' attention to the notified motion listed on the agenda, and called on the Leader of the Opposition, Councillor Milton DICK to move the motion. Accordingly, Councillor DICK moved, seconded by Councillor SUTTON, that—

That this Council affirms it will not sell the part of the land owned by Council and occupied by the Monte Carlo Caravan Park, and continues to support the current area classification to ensure residents are not kicked-out to make way for higher density property development.

Councillor ADAMS: Point of order.

Chairman: —the motion has been moved. Yes, Councillor ADAMS.

Councillor ADAMS: Point of order, Madam Chair. I would like to ask you to consider ruling this motion as incompetent for two reasons. Firstly, there has been an E&C resolution pertaining to this lease from 1996 that was mentioned in the Chamber

last week. That E&C firstly states that Council affirms—the motion says that Council affirms it will not sell the part of the land owned by Council and occupied by the Monte Carlo Caravan Park. That is impossible because the E&C in 1996 resolved to offer the State Government the opportunity to purchase the land up until 2017. Therefore, Council cannot pass a motion that is inconsistent with a previous resolution.

Secondly, Labor want us to continue to support the current area classification to ensure residents are not kicked out. Madam Chair, the current area classification for the Brisbane City Council portion of this land is actually parkland, which does not support residential development. So this motion is calling us to keep an area classification that could actually force us to remove the residents from their sites. I have the E&C and the parkland zoning, Madam Chair, to table for you if you like.

Chairman: Okay, yes. If you can table it, please, yes. Councillor ADAMS—this is the entire submission? Can you quickly point out to me—it's saying the purpose of the submission is to formalise Council's in principle agreement of 1992 to lease Council land for use.

Councillor ADAMS: Thank you. Yes, Madam Chair. In the background in the E&C, it clearly says here that the deed of option on the lease has been signed so that Queensland Housing Commission (QHC) has the option to purchase the land at any time up until 2017 for its value determined on that basis.

Chairman: Okay, thanks.

Councillor SUTTON: Point of order, Madam Chair.

Chairman: Yes, Councillor SUTTON. Councillor SUTTON, I've got to deal with one at a time, I'm sorry.

Councillor SUTTON: It was a question about the documentation that Councillor ADAMS has provided.

Chairman: Yes.

Councillor SUTTON: I note that she's provided the E&C, but perhaps the more relevant documentation should be the lease. If the lease is available for tabling—

Chairman: Well, Councillor SUTTON, I'm trying to address Councillor ADAMS' request that this—or belief that this is not a competent motion. That's why I'm trying to read through this. If you can just give me a moment. Right. This will be tabled. But it says the deed of option and lease have now been signed by the Queensland Housing Commission for the department. The lease is on a peppercorn basis, \$1 per annum, with the lessor meeting all outgoings. The deed of option enables the Queensland Housing Commission to purchase the land at any time up until 2017 for its value determined on the basis that the land is part of a caravan park and all improvements are excluded from the valuation. The improvements were constructed by QHC, which would be Queensland Housing Commission.

Look, I'll table this. I think I probably need some legal advice to just confirm this. It's just not—I'm really not sure. I think can we perhaps have an adjournment for I don't know how long it make. Let's say maximum 15 minutes, earlier if we can resolve it quickly. Thank you.

ADJOURNMENT:

112/2012-13

At that time, 4.53pm, it was resolved on the motion of the LORD MAYOR, seconded by the DEPUTY MAYOR, that the meeting adjourn for a period of up to 15 minutes, to obtain legal advice on the admissibility of the notified motion.

UPON RESUMPTION:

Notified motion ruled out of order

- Chairman: Councillors, thank you for your patience on that. The ruling by Mr Askern is that the motion is incompetent because we can't say—Council is bound by what was determined in 1996 and that is the deed of option and lease that have been signed, which allows the State Government to have the land and they can purchase it at any time up until 2017. So it's not possible for this Chamber to be making any commitment not to sell part of the land because we would have no choice should the State Government decide to.
- The implications of the—I will table this. I just want to try and explain it. The deed of option can be exercised at any time up to 2017 and the valuation would be determined on the basis that the land is appropriately zoned and operated as part of a caravan park and that the only purpose to which the land can be put is as part of a caravan park. I don't have documents here. But you know, Councillor ADAMS has just explained that it is actually zoned as parkland. It is not actually zoned for residential. So on that basis, the motion is incompetent. I'm sorry. Now I'll just table that.
- Councillor SUTTON: Point of order, Madam Chair.
- Chairman: Yes, Councillor SUTTON.
- Councillor SUTTON: Thank you, Madam Chair. Can I ask for a copy of that lease to be tabled so that we can—
- Chairman: Yes. It is being tabled. I just said—not the lease. It's not the lease. It is the decision of the Council. Councillor SUTTON, I just explained.
- Councillor SUTTON: I'm not—
- Chairman: Your motion is incompetent. What I'm tabling there is the Council decision which sort of determined the deed of option that the land could be purchased by the State Government and we would have to sell it to the State Government at any time under the deed that goes to 2017. The lease is a peppercorn lease of \$1, \$1 a year.
- Councillor SUTTON: I respect that, Councillor de WIT.
- Chairman: Councillor SUTTON, if you want to get hold of the lease, you can get the file. It is not relevant to today. The motion is incompetent.
- Councillor SUTTON: Okay. I just was wondering if you could do that.
- Councillor ADAMS: Point of order, Madam Chair.
- Chairman: Yes, Councillor ADAMS.

MOTION FOR SUSPENSION OF RULES OF PROCEDURE:

113/2012-13

At that juncture, Councillor Krista ADAMS moved, seconded by Councillor Ryan MURPHY, that the Rules of Procedure be suspended to allow the moving of the following motion—

That this Council affirms it will not sell the part of the land owned by Council and occupied by the Monte Carlo Caravan Park, other than through the terms agreed to by the previous Labor Civic Cabinet in their resolution of 1996. Further, that Council continues to support affordable housing outcomes on this site.

- Chairman: You have three minutes, Councillor ADAMS.
- Councillor ADAMS: Thank you, Madam Chair. I would like to stand to explain that this motion is urgent because those opposite are yet again attempting to exploit a vulnerable community for their petty, political purposes. In the blundering incompetence that we have seen this afternoon, we have had a motion that is moved that actually makes it harder for residents to remain in affordable accommodation. They seem to be totally unaware of what their former colleagues, including Councillor John CAMPBELL, got up to when he was in charge, nor what the classification for this area is.

It is critical that it is corrected straightaway, as people's homes are on the line. This administration is committed to getting it right so that residents will have some certainty about what Council is going to do about its share of this site. We want to make it clear that we will continue to support affordable housing outcomes on this site before this process goes any further.

Chairman: I will put the motion. This is to suspend rules of procedure.

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

Consideration of motion under suspension of Rules of Procedure – Council land at Monte Carlo caravan park

114/2012-13

Councillor Krista ADAMS moved, seconded by Councillor Ryan MURPHY:—

That this Council affirms it will not sell the part of the land owned by Council and occupied by the Monte Carlo Caravan Park, other than through the terms agreed to by the previous Labor Civic Cabinet in their resolution of 1996. Further, that Council continues to support affordable housing outcomes on this site.

Chairman: Councillor ADAMS, debate.

Councillor ADAMS: Thank you, Madam Chair. We go from one debacle to another for the Australian Labor Party this afternoon. All they have succeeded in doing is scaring local residents and making it harder for them to feel secure in their homes. This was a sweetheart deal, struck by a Labor administration with a then Goss government. As the Deputy Mayor, the former local councillor had his fingers all over this deal.

I was very disappointed to read Lord Mayor Soorley's Council administration had agreed to flog-off local parkland to the Department of Housing and Local Government for the enormous sum of \$1 per year. As a part of the arrangement we see in the E&C, either the Monte Carlo Caravan Park Trust or the Queensland Housing Commission could purchase this site in any time up to 2017. However, Council doesn't even get value for money because the deed of option for this purchase is determined on a basis that all improvements are excluded from the valuation.

The E&C even acknowledges, Madam Chair, that the Council is powerless to stop this site ceasing to be a caravan park once it was sold. In one line in the E&C it says the use of land is restricted to the purposes of a caravan park. Two paragraphs later, it would be possible however for the State Government to exercise its option and subsequently cease the operation of the caravan park. However, this would be a significant breach of good faith inherent in the original agreement. There is no reason to believe this is likely. Here I note the original agreement was just an in principle chat that they had in 1992. We don't see the formalised agreement until four years later.

We have on the table before us a 25-year sweetheart deal based on good faith with the State Government. No steps taken to ensure that they would turn away from a caravan park. Except we do see one little hand-written scrawl on the E&C that says, the land is part of a caravan park and shall remain so, in a little scribble in writing on the E&C that we have here. An embarrassment as an administration for Council. Not even that. They have to admit, and they do admit in the E&C, could save the caravans if the State Government bought the site.

So not only do we have Labor councillors flogging off the Council parkland for a pittance. We now have the situation in the last couple of weeks and months where we are seeing residents of this caravan park being misled, believing that they had a home for life over the last decade. Thanks to this shonky deal, they've now been set up. The State Government can action this option any time in the next five years. Council is powerless to act.

Even four years after this E&C strategy, the ALP had the cheek to hide the arrangement and maintain that the park area classification when they introduced the City Plan in 2000. Parkland classification, for those opposite, does not support residential development.

This Council Administration therefore is locked into a position because of what the Opposition did when they were in power. The questions I have now and would love to hear from those opposite is did they actually know the history and what has happened in this situation? Are they deliberately misleading the local residents for their petty political games? Or are they just simply too careless to look into the history and work to help these people to secure their home sites? Any suffering that the local residents may have they can now squarely lay at the feet of those opposite.

Council's commitment to affordable housing in Brisbane is well known. We will continue to support affordable housing on this site. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Chairman: Further debate. Councillor DICK.

Councillor DICK: Well, thank you, Madam Chair. I'm delighted to get up and support this motion because it has been one month since the LNP State Government announced that they were flogging-off this land. What has this LNP Council done? Nothing. Absolutely nothing. Nothing until the Labor Opposition raised this issue.

I can tell you something. Unless we asked those questions last week, they would have done nothing. They would have sat back and allowed it to happen, holus bolus. In fact, Madam Chair, when I asked the LORD MAYOR questions about this, did he outline these set of circumstances? No. Through you, to Councillor ADAMS, he said, I'm not going to make any decisions about this. I'm not going to make any decisions today. The LNP have misled the community, holus bolus.

I want to deal with the lease issue. Because Councillor ADAMS is claiming that it was a Labor-Labor deal. They were I think her words. Looking at the E&C when that E&C was signed, I noticed when it was signed. It was signed in November 1996. Who was the then State Government? Her own colleagues, the then National Party Liberal Party government. So talk about incompetent.

Chairman: Order.

Councillor DICK: Through you, Madam Chair.

Councillor ADAMS: Point of order, Madam Chair.

Chairman: Point of order. Yes, Councillor ADAMS.

Councillor ADAMS: Claim to be misrepresented.

Chairman: Thank you.

Councillor DICK: Councillor ADAMS is a new person to politics. She doesn't even know the most basics of things of who was in government at the time. It is so embarrassing for you, Councillor ADAMS, that you didn't even know that it was your own party that signed up to this. So let's not have any nonsense from Councillor ADAMS or those opposite that somehow that this was a Labor State Government, their fault.

Now, Madam Chair, the real losers out of this are the residents of Monte Carlo Caravan Park. When the then State Government announced this sell-off, did we hear a word from this Council? No. Did we hear a word publicly from the then LORD MAYOR, from this LORD MAYOR or the local councillor? They sat back and allowed residents to be fearful.

I want to acknowledge the hard work of those local residents that have led the fight to make sure that their homes are protected. I acknowledge that they are in the gallery this evening. People who have been concerned, fearful and worried. Instead of the political games that we've seen once again from this LNP Council.

Madam Chair, I note in Councillor ADAMS' debate, she said it was a bad deal all those years ago and that it was an act of good faith. Yes, it was an act of good faith. For 25 years, those residents have had protection. For 25 years, no

government, either Council or State Government, has even thought about turfing those people out of those homes.

Why are we in this position now? Why are we even debating this today? Because the former Lord Mayor and now Premier of Queensland decided to sell the land. Just once, Madam Chair, just once I'd like one single LNP councillor to get up and say, my government is wrong. You'll never hear it from those opposite. They will always defend, they will always back up every single decision from their political masters in George Street.

On this side of the Chamber, we stood up to our Labor colleagues. Well, I site, which we've debated today, the City of Brisbane Act, right, where look at the transcript, look at the public comments that I made as then deputy leader and look at what the leader made. We said our government got it wrong. You will never, ever hear those words from those opposite because they support every single decision, including this one.

Madam Chair, we shouldn't be debating this, this evening. We shouldn't be talking about the future of those people living in that caravan park. They are hard-working, decent people that have paid their rates—sorry, paid their taxes and lived and done everything correctly. We are only debating this tonight because your, through you, Madam Chair, your colleagues have been so gutless that they haven't faced up.

Did we see any of this in the lead-up to the election? Did we see the documentation? Did we see any policy fliers? Did the local, now councillor for Doboy Ward go out and say, oh by the way, my colleagues are going to sell your home? Absolutely not, absolutely not. Time and time again, we're seeing the LNP at a State level doing terrible things to this State and this Council backing them up every step of the way.

Madam Chair, let's be clear. We are only in this position because those opposite haven't had the guts to stand up to their LNP state colleagues. Where were the concerns on those opposite? Did any of them get up at the time and say, this is an outrage? We shouldn't be the—the State Government shouldn't be selling it off. I challenge one of them today to get up, Madam Chair, and say this is a wrong decision by the State Government, have the guts to say it, have the guts to say it.

I bet you they won't. I bet you none of them will get up and say, you know what, my colleagues have got it wrong, because they will always, always back their political mates because politics come first for the LNP, always will, always has, absolutely. You may laugh. Out there in the community, that's why you're going backwards in the polls. You may think you're invincible. You may think that you're going to be in government forever. I'd have a good start talking to Queenslanders and I'd look those people in Monte Carlo Caravan Park in the eye and say to them you've let them down.

Chairman:

Further debate.

Councillor ADAMS:

Claim to be misrepresented, Madam Chair.

Chairman

Oh sorry, Councillor ADAMS. Yes.

Councillor ADAMS:

I would for once like Councillor DICK to listen to us on the other side. He claimed that I got it wrong by saying 1996 was our government. What I clearly said was that this E&C was to formalise—and it says it here in the E&C—formalise Council's in principle agreement of 17 Feb, 1992. Goss Government.

Chairman:

Thank you, Councillor ADAMS. Further debate. Councillor SUTTON.

Councillor SUTTON:

Yes, Madam Chair. I note that, as the rules in this Chamber in getting to speak, you usually go from side to side. I—

Chairman:

Councillor SUTTON, if you're going to speak, speak.

Councillor SUTTON:

I am speaking, Madam Chair. I'm just lamenting, as part of my debating point, that at this opportunity normally someone from the LNP would have—

- Chairman: Either get onto the motion or resume your seat instead of commenting on the operation of this Chamber.
- Councillor SUTTON: Sure, Madam Chair. I'm happy to speak on this motion because I will speak on behalf of the residents of the Monte Carlo Caravan Park, given that their local councillor refused to do so yet again when he has his first available opportunity to do so.
- Madam Chair, I am pleased that we have forced the LNP councillors in this place to take a position on this today and to flush them out as to where they are going to go with this particular piece of land.
- Chairman: Councillor MURPHY.
- Councillor SUTTON: Councillor MURPHY, when you've been around for more than six minutes, I'll take your interjection. Councillor MURPHY. Councillor MURPHY, there's a reason why the *South-East Advertiser* says today that you've got a long way to go before you pass the test.
- Chairman: Councillor SUTTON, are you going to talk to the motion or not?
- Councillor SUTTON: I'm just taking interjections, Madam Chair. But I am going to talk. I am going to talk to this motion here today because we don't have to worry about Councillor ADAMS being 50 shades of crimson over there, because there are no grey areas when it comes to this plan, this particular piece of land.
- This lease and the lease agreement that was signed back there had very clearly and explicitly says in it that this is a goodwill gesture that we will keep, that the operation of the caravan park will remain on this site. The lease was up for renewal in 2017. There was never any expectation that, prior to the State election, that they would—that the LNP administration on being elected government, State government, would then seek to sell this land.
- This land, there was no reason for any residents to believe that this, that the Monte Carlo Caravan Park would not continue to operate as it has for the last 25 years, prior to the Newman State Government announcing that it was going to sell the land.
- Madam Chair, this—I would love to see the terms of agreement of that lease. I would like to see the detail of that lease. That is why, Councillor ADAMS, I asked to see a copy of that lease. I have called the file on that lease. It's interesting that you got a copy of it.
- Chairman: Through the chair—
- Councillor SUTTON: Through you, Madam Chair, sorry, through you, that you got a copy of that lease. Guess what? I happen to know that Councillor MURPHY has a copy of that lease. But has Councillor MURPHY, trotted down to the Monte Carlo Caravan Park?
- Chairman: Councillor SUTTON, are you going to talk about the content of this motion or not?
- Councillor SUTTON: I am talking about the lease. I am talking about the lease document. This motion clearly and specifically talks about the provisions, the terms agreed to under the Labor civic cabinet in their resolution of 1996. It quotes—and it talks about the lease, as Councillor ADAMS has talked about the provisions of the lease. You yourself ruled our previous motion out of order because of the conditions of the lease. What I am saying—and Councillor—
- Chairman: Councillor SUTTON, let's just get it right. I did not rule it out of order because of the conditions of the lease. I made that very clear. It was ruled out of order because of the content of the agreement that the Council made with the State Government. It is not the lease. Please get it right.
- Councillor SUTTON: So the lease doesn't have those provisions in it.
- Chairman: I don't know. But I'm telling you—I've explained to you at the time why the legal advice from Mr Askern was that the motion was incompetent. I said it was

- not about the lease. It is a deed of option that has been agreed to between the Council and the State Government.
- Councillor SUTTON: Well I would like to speak about the lease, Madam Chair, because the lease—
- Chairman: Well no. Do you want to talk about the motion or don't you? It's not about the lease.
- Councillor SUTTON: Well, Madam Chair—
- Chairman: The lease is a peppercorn lease of \$1. You're not talking to the content of what this motion is about.
- Councillor SUTTON: Well, Councillor de WIT, I appreciate the fact that I've only got 10 minutes.
- DEPUTY MAYOR: Point of order, Madam Chairman.
- Chairman: I am the Chairman, thank you, Councillor SUTTON. Yes, DEPUTY MAYOR.
- DEPUTY MAYOR: Councillor SUTTON is clearly debating the Chair.
- Chairman: Yes. Thank you, DEPUTY MAYOR.
- Councillor SUTTON: Well I'm just—I'm not debating the Chair. I'm trying to clarify what the Chair will and will not allow me to speak on, Councillor SCHRINNER.
- Chairman: I'll allow you to speak on what's relevant to the motion in front of us. What is relevant is the agreement that was made between the Council, the document that has been tabled that you could have had a look at that explains the whole process that went through in 1996 that has led to this motion that you've put forward being declared to be incompetent by the senior legal counsel. It is not to do with the lease. It's to do with the agreement that was made with the State Government. As a result of that agreement, there is then a lease. But that came after. You don't seem to be understanding that.
- Councillor SUTTON: No, I don't.
- Chairman: You're not going to talk about the lease. You can talk about what's in this motion, the content of the motion about not selling the land. You can talk about the resolution that the Labor civic cabinet made in 1996. But there is nothing there about a lease.
- Councillor SUTTON: So, Madam Chair, I understand for your ruling to be that we can talk about every that is important to the LNP councillors in this place, but nothing that is important to the Labor—
- Chairman: Resume your seat. Further debate. LORD MAYOR.
- LORD MAYOR: Madam Chairman, once again, we have seen a Labor group of Opposition councillors put the residents in the middle of an issue, Madam Chair.
- Chairman: Just a moment, LORD MAYOR. Councillor SUTTON, withdraw that comment.
- Councillor SUTTON: I'm happy to go because can I tell you the residents of Monte Carlo Caravan Park—
- Chairman: I will warn you—
- Councillor SUTTON: —are sitting out there and they deserve better from this administration—
- Chairman: Councillor SUTTON.
- Councillor SUTTON: For them to be saying what they are saying right here and now is an absolute disgrace, to try and turn this—
- Chairman: Councillor SUTTON.
- Councillor SUTTON: —on the only people that have gone to help them.
- Chairman: Councillor SUTTON, unless you immediately—
- Chairman: —obey my instruction. All I did was ask you—
- Councillor SUTTON: No, I'm leaving. I'm leaving.
- Chairman: I've asked you. No, you're not leaving.

- Councillor SUTTON: I am.
- Chairman: I asked you to withdraw what you just said about the LORD MAYOR, Councillor SUTTON.
- Councillor SUTTON: What did I just say? I don't—what did I just say?
- Chairman: I'm not repeating. You know what you said. I'm asking you withdraw it.
- Councillor SUTTON: I—
- Chairman: The LORD MAYOR got up to speak and you said that's a lie. Now withdraw it. Withdraw it or you're on a formal warning and you'll be out for eight days. Now you've got your choice. Withdraw what you said.
- Councillor SUTTON: I'm happy to withdraw it.
- Chairman: Thank you.
- Councillor SUTTON: But, Madam Chair, I am disappointed by the fact—the way that this—
- Chairman: I asked you to withdraw. You're not debating it. If you want to leave, leave. Otherwise, sit down and be quiet.
- Councillor SUTTON: Well—
- Chairman: Sit down and be quiet. The LORD MAYOR.
- LORD MAYOR: Madam Chairman, I can understand the frustration of Opposition councillors because they have failed to do any homework at all in relation to this matter. Last week, Madam Chairman, I will remind this Chamber that in Question Time I stood up to my feet and I gave details around this very civic cabinet decision to which we have been referring today. If people go back and look at Hansard, I said here last Tuesday that there was an option which the Labor Council had provided for the State Government which could be taken up any time between 1996 and 2017. Sorry, Madam Chairman, I repeat, it was 2000 and—

Councillor interjecting.

- LORD MAYOR: Yes. No, that's right, 1996 and 2017. So, Madam Chairman, the issue is this. We've tried to have a distraction run today by Councillor DICK referring to who was in government at the time. Can I say to you that that very same civic cabinet decision of 1996 refers to this? I'll read the very beginning of that submission that says the purpose of this submission is to formalise Council's in principle agreement of 17 February, 1992, to lease Council land of 1213 Wynnum Road for use as an extension of an adjoining Monte Carlo Caravan Park and option to purchase.
- Now, Madam Chairman, when this E&C decision was then undertaken, in 1996, on 1 November, 1996, it says there that there was substantial consultation within the then Wynnum Road Caravan Park residents, most of whom have since relocated to Monte Carlo extension. The owner of the Wynnum Road Park and the State Government, prior to the 1992 Establishment and Coordination Committee agreement. In other words, Madam Chairman, there was already, prior to the signing of this deed of agreement, an in principle agreement and there had been transitioning of caravans onto that site.
- So, Madam Chairman, there are a number of issues. I understand fully why Labor are embarrassed. They have come here today, completely in contradiction to what I've said in this Chamber last week—that there was a lease of that site on a \$1 a week peppercorn rental, with an option to buy by the State Government. Formal lease and option to buy. Then they come in here earlier today with a motion calling on this Council not to sell part of that land. Well that's just political motivation, Madam Chairman. It can be nothing more because I was very, very clear in my response to the Leader of the Opposition's question last week in terms of the arrangements that are in place.
- I made the point, councillors will remember, that the State Government, and at that time the state Labor Government had many, many years in which to take up that option of the purchase, to formalise that caravan park in place. That option

rested on the table from 1998 when they took office through to 2012, earlier in March this year. It was never taken up.

Madam Chairman, the other issue I just want to say and point out is I wonder what the position would be if this administration today decided to give some land to the State Government for a \$1 a year peppercorn rental. What would be the position of the Opposition today?

Councillor interjecting.

LORD MAYOR:

What would be—

Chairman:

Councillor ABRAHAMS.

LORD MAYOR:

What would be—well we might come down to a park near you, Councillor ABRAHAMS, and turn it into housing and see what reaction we might get from you in relation to that. Madam Chairman, I also would wonder what reaction there would be of just selling parks generally or changing the classification?

So look, the reality is that this site has been of a particular use now for a number of years. Our desire in this Chamber is that we hope that it will continue to operate as a caravan park. It is not our—and I'm talking here about Brisbane City Council—it is not our caravan park to operate. It is a State Government caravan park, courtesy of that \$1 peppercorn annual rental that was arranged back in 1992 in principle, formalised by way of a deed in 1996.

So, Madam Chairman, that is the state of play. Our motion, on the back of Labor's completely incompetent motion, Madam Chairman, at least puts a position forward in terms of this Council. We believe that that site is an important site in terms of affordable housing. Our first preference would be to see it continue as a caravan park. But it is not our decision to make in relation to that. But whatever happens, I am committing this Council today, through this motion, that that site will remain an affordable housing site.

I say this, that to achieve that it will require a reclassification of that land. If we were to observe Labor's motion today, where it says that this Council—and this is what they called on us to do in their motion—to support the current area classification. We would have to, if we supported Labor's motion today, we would by definition of that have to remove these people because it is not consistent with parkland, not consistent with the parkland classification that Labor councillors wanted us to retain, to not change the classification.

So, Madam Chairman, they have been absolutely incompetent every step of the way in relation to this. Let's make it absolutely clear that what we have done now, through this resolution, is to state a very clear intent. That is that that land into the future does need to be reclassified and reclassified for affordable housing purposes.

Chairman:

Further debate. Councillor ADAMS.

Councillor ADAMS:

Thank you, Madam Chair. Madam Chair, I would just like to reiterate the motion we have before us here. This Administration is confined by the initial agreement that was done in 1992 and formalised by the E&C resolution of 1996. It did, you will note, on the front of the E&C submission, actually come to Council. It was a recommendation to Council. I notice Councillor CUMMING, the only councillor who was here at that time, has sat on his hands this afternoon, has not shared with us the debate that was held maybe in 1996. But it did come before Council at that time as well.

In summary, Madam Chair, those opposite claim to be the light on the hill for Brisbane's most vulnerable, but time and time again we see the scare campaigns. We saw it this afternoon with the senior strategy, their campaigns of graffiti, on neighbourhood plans, on aged care facilities. The list is endless. We on the other side make sure—

Chairman

Just the motion, thanks, Councillor ADAMS.

Councillor ADAMS:

Thank you, Madam Chair. I was summing up particularly, Madam Chair, on our commitment to housing affordability and particularly on this site. We have

policies that support affordable housing funding through grants with affordable housing incentive package—

Chairman: Yes. Get back to the actual motion, please, Councillor ADAMS.

Councillor ADAMS: Yes, Madam Chair. The motion is talking about supporting affordable housing—

Chairman: Outcomes on this site.

Councillor ADAMS: —outcomes on this site. I was saying that, as part of Brisbane City Council, we are very much walking the walk when it comes to supporting affordable housing outcomes. This site is one of the many that we will support throughout our strategies.

The uncertainty that these residents may face in the next five years is purely by fault of those that sit opposite when their numbers had the administration in this Council. We will continue to liaise with the State Government as they make their decisions on the future of this site. We will advocate for local residents.

With Councillor Ryan MURPHY now the local councillor who is committed to getting the best outcomes for his constituents, we will continue to support the residents of the Monte Carlo Caravan Park and support affordable housing on this site.

Chairman: I will put the motion.

Motion put

The Chairman submitted the motion to the Chamber and it was declared **carried** on the voices.

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

The voting was as follows:

AYES: 26 - 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 Norm WYNDHAM, and the Leader of the OPPOSITION, Councillor Milton DICK, and Councillors Helen ABRAHAMS, Shayne SUTTON, Peter CUMMING, Kim FLESSER, Steve GRIFFITHS, Victoria NEWTON.

NOES: Nil.

PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS:

Chairman: Councillors, are there any petitions? Councillor McKENZIE.

Councillor McKENZIE: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I have a petition from residents of Denman Street, Greenslopes, about a new development being proposed for that area. Thank you.

Chairman: Further petitions. Councillor GRIFFITHS.

Councillor GRIFFITHS: Yes. Thanks, Madam Chair. I just have a petition for Councillor Nicole JOHNSTON in relation to floating the issues affecting residents in Yeronga.

115/2012-13

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: